Page 688	Page 690
BEFORE THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	EXHIBITS
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES	COMPLAINANT'S
In the Matter of: )	EXHIBITS: IDENTIFIED RECEIVED
TAOTAO USA, INC., TAOTAO )	19 794
GROUP CO., LTD and JUNYUN ) COUNTY XIANGYUAN INDUSTRY ) Docket No. CAA-HQ-2015-8065	28 840
CO., LTD, )	216 695 695
Respondents. ) Room 1152	217 697 697
EPA East Building 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW	
Washington, D.C.	218 697 697
Thursday,	RESPONDENT S EXHIBITS: IDENTIFIED RECEIVED
October 19, 2017 The parties met, pursuant to notice of the	1 692 692
Court, at 9:02 a.m.	10 (Pages 1 and 2) 911 911
BEFORE: SUSAN L. BIRO Chief Administrative Law Judge	18 911
APPEARANCES: For the Complainant:	
ROBERT G. KLEPP, Esquire ED KULSCHINSKY, Esquire	23 912
MARK PALERMO, Esquire	26 914
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance	38 696 696
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20460	39 696 696
(202) 564-5805/4133/8894	
For the Respondents:	
WILLIAM CHU, Esquire SALINA TARIQ, Esquire	
Law Offices of William Chu	
4455 Lyndon B. Johnson Freeway, Suite 1008 Dallas, Texas 75244	
(972) 392-9888	
Page 689	Page 691
Page 689 contents	Page 691
CONTENTS	1
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant:	1 2 (9:02 a.m.)
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant:	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd         10       like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd         10       like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.         11       Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1         2       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd         10       like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.         11       Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.         12       JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	12(9:02 a.m.)3JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be4seated.5MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.6MR. CHU: Good morning.7JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters8before we begin again?9MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd10like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.11Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.12JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've13had him in my courtroom many times before.14Okay, where were we?15Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd         10       like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.         11       Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.         12       JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've         13       had him in my courtroom many times before.         14       Okay, where were we?         15       Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.         16       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd         10       like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.         11       Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.         12       JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've         13       had him in my courtroom many times before.         14       Okay, where were we?         15       Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.         16       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         17       JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1293JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be45MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.6MR. CHU: Good morning.7JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters8before we begin again?9MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd1011Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.12JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've13had him in my courtroom many times before.14Okay, where were we?15Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.16MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.17JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?18MR. KULSCHINSKY: I just have two things, Your
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	12(9:02 a.m.)3JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be4seated.5MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.6MR. CHU: Good morning.7JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters8before we begin again?9MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd10like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.11Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.12JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've13had him in my courtroom many times before.14Okay, where were we?15Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.16MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.17JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?18MR. KULSCHINSKY: I just have two things, Your19Honor, before I finish my direct of Ms. Isin.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	12(9:02 a.m.)3JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be4seated.5MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.6MR. CHU: Good morning.7JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters8before we begin again?9MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd10like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.11Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.12JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've13had him in my courtroom many times before.14Okay, where were we?15Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.16MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.17JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?18MR. KULSCHINSKY: I just have two things, Your19Honor, before I finish my direct of Ms. Isin.20Yesterday Ms. Isin testified that she read Mr.
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	12(9:02 a.m.)3JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be4seated.5MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.6MR. CHU: Good morning.7JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters8before we begin again?9MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd10like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.11Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.12JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've13had him in my courtroom many times before.14Okay, where were we?15Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.16MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.17JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?18MR. KULSCHINSKY: I just have two things, Your19Honor, before I finish my direct of Ms. Isin.20Yesterday Ms. Isin testified that she read Mr.21Shefftz's expert report and that formed the basis of the
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	12(9:02 a.m.)3JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be4seated.5MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.6MR. CHU: Good morning.7JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters8before we begin again?9MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd10like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.11Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.12JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've13had him in my courtroom many times before.14Okay, where were we?15Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.16MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.17JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?18MR. KULSCHINSKY: I just have two things, Your19Honor, before I finish my direct of Ms. Isin.20Yesterday Ms. Isin testified that she read Mr.21Shefftz's expert report and that formed the basis of the
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd         10       like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.         11       Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.         12       JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've         13       had him in my courtroom many times before.         14       Okay, where were we?         15       Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.         16       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         17       JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?         18       MR. KULSCHINSKY: I just have two things, Your         19       Honor, before I finish my direct of Ms. Isin.         20       Yesterday Ms. Isin testified that she read Mr.         21       Shefftz's expert report and that formed the basis of the         22       economic benefit proposal from Complainant. I understand
CONTENTS VOIR WITNESSES: DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS DIRE For the Complainant: Amelie Cara Isin 699	1       (9:02 a.m.)         3       JUDGE BIRO: Good morning everyone. Please be         4       seated.         5       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         6       MR. CHU: Good morning.         7       JUDGE BIRO: Are there any preliminary matters         8       before we begin again?         9       MR. CHU: None for us, Your Honor, other than I'd         10       like to introduce my expert that came this morning. Mr.         11       Jonathan Shefftz. I'm sure you're familiar with him.         12       JUDGE BIRO: I am familiar with Mr. Shefftz. I've         13       had him in my courtroom many times before.         14       Okay, where were we?         15       Mr. Kulchinsky, hello.         16       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Good morning, Your Honor.         17       JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to begin again?         18       MR. KULSCHINSKY: I just have two things, Your         19       Honor, before I finish my direct of Ms. Isin.         20       Yesterday Ms. Isin testified that she read Mr.         21       Shefftz's expert report and that formed the basis of the         22       economic benefit proposal from Complainant. I understand         23       we're going to hear from Mr. Shefftz today, but maybe just

	Page 692		Page 694
1	Respondent's Exhibit 1.	1	know, whatever issues he has with those portions, I'll take
2	MR. CHU: Your Honor, we would join in that	2	it under consideration in the post-hearing briefing period.
3	submission.	3	MR. CHU: Your Honor, will we also be afforded the
4	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Respondent's Exhibit 1 is	4	opportunity to go ahead and submit the depositions that we
5	admitted into the record.	5	took of Ms. Isin, Mr. Jackson as well as Dr. Carroll?
6	(The document referred to was	6	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Is there any objection to
7	marked for identification as	7	that?
8	Respondent's Exhibit No. 1,	8	MR. KULSCHINSKY: I guess our only objection would
9	and was received into	9	be that those witnesses have all been made available to
10	evidence.)	10	testify, and been subjected to cross-examination in this
11	MR. KULSCHINSKY: The other matter is, we would	11	matter.
12	like to offer the deposition transcript of Mr. Matao Cao	12	JUDGE BIRO: Why do we need more of their
13	into evidence. We understand that Respondents do not intend	13	testimony than we already have?
14	to call Mr. Cao at this time. They're representing that	14	MR. CHU: Because, Your Honor, if they're going to
15	he's not available. While the Federal Rules of Civil	15	be afforded the opportunity to submit the complete
16	Procedure don't strictly apply to this matter, Federal Rule	16	deposition, then all I'm saying is we'd like to have that
17	32 does allow a party opponent, or an adverse party to use	17	same opportunity. That's all we're asking, Your Honor.
18	the transcript of an opponent or a party's officer for any	18	JUDGE BIRO: I just don't see the point of that.
19	purpose.	19	We've had those witnesses come and testify live. You've
20	We would represent that Mr. Cao's deposition	20	gotten to cross examine them.
21	transcript does contain a number of statements against	21	MR. CHU: I understand, Your Honor. The reason
22	interest, and we would like to offer it into the record.	22	is, the purpose of the deposition is to discover matters,
23	MR. CHU: We would oppose and object, Your Honor.	23	and so once you make that discovery you formulate your
24	That's not the proper procedure for the use of a deposition.	24	strategy and your question and answers based upon that
25	It should not be made an exhibit.	25	deposition. To submit a complete deposition in this
	Page 693		Page 695
		1	
1	JUDGE BIRO: And how do you think it should be	1	situation tends to thwart what is the purpose of the
1 2	admitted into the record?	1 2	deposition. And so if they're using it the way I think
	admitted into the record? MR. CHU: I believe that they would have to	2 3	deposition. And so if they're using it the way I think they're using it, and laying out everything that's there,
2 3 4	admitted into the record? MR. CHU: I believe that they would have to identify the line and page number that they intend to use so	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	admitted into the record? 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	2 3 4 5	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
2 3 4 5 6	admitted into the record? 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	2 3 4 5 6	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	admitted into the record? 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 challenged.	2 3 4 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. MR. CHU: I understand, but I believe the proper	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. MR. CHU: I understand, but I believe the proper procedure is for them to read it into the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line I to Line 1000. All of it. 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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line I to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we would propose	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>deposition. And so if they're using it the way I think</li> <li>they're using it, and laying out everything that's there,</li> <li>then certain things in depositions shouldn't ever be heard</li> <li>or seen by this Court. So if they're going to be given the</li> <li>opportunity to throw it all into the wash, then all we're</li> <li>saying is please allow us the same courtesy and opportunity</li> <li>to do what they're doing today. Because this is very</li> <li>surprising to me, that a complete deposition would be</li> <li>admitted as an exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. We'll put all the</li> <li>depositions in.</li> <li>We're going to mark Mr. Cao's deposition as the</li> <li>Agency Exhibit 216.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we would propose that the transcript would enter into the record, the parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line I to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand. 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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand. 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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand. 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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand. 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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	admitted into the record? 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 challenged. JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it. 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. CHU: I understand. 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 the record?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>admitted into the record?</li> <li>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 challenged.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand, but I believe the proper procedure is for them to read it into the record.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Oh, we're not doing that.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Is there any other basis for objecting to it, other than you want them to read it into the record?</li> <li>MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>admitted into the record?</li> <li>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 challenged.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand, but I believe the proper procedure is for them to read it into the record.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Oh, we're not doing that.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Is there any other basis for objecting to it, other than you want them to read it into the record?</li> <li>MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Then we're going to admit Mr.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>admitted into the record?</li> <li>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 challenged.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand, but I believe the proper procedure is for them to read it into the record.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Oh, we're not doing that.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Is there any other basis for objecting to it, other than you want them to read it into the record?</li> <li>MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Then we're going to admit Mr.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>admitted into the record?</li> <li>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 challenged.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line 1 to Line 1000. All of it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand, but I believe the proper procedure is for them to read it into the record.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Oh, we're not doing that.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I understand.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Is there any other basis for objecting to it, other than you want them to read it into the record?</li> <li>MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Then we're going to admit Mr.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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?

	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.
2 3	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would	2     THE WITNESS: Good morning.       3     CROSS-EXAMINATION
2 3 4	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218.	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos.	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.)	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else?	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all.	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> <li>12 A No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> <li>12 A No.</li> <li>13 Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head.	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> <li>12 A No.</li> <li>13 Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it</li> <li>14 now, is that right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am.	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> <li>12 A No.</li> <li>13 Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it</li> <li>14 now, is that right?</li> <li>15 A I'm familiar with the ASA.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> <li>12 A No.</li> <li>13 Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it</li> <li>14 now, is that right?</li> <li>15 A I'm familiar with the ASA.</li> <li>16 Q Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> <li>12 A No.</li> <li>13 Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it</li> <li>14 now, is that right?</li> <li>15 A I'm familiar with the ASA.</li> <li>16 Q Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a</li> <li>17 sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing.	<ul> <li>2 THE WITNESS: Good morning.</li> <li>3 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>4 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>5 Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great</li> <li>6 job you've done so far.</li> <li>7 A Thank you.</li> <li>8 Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't</li> <li>9 we?</li> <li>10 A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.</li> <li>11 Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?</li> <li>12 A No.</li> <li>13 Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it</li> <li>14 now, is that right?</li> <li>15 A I'm familiar with the ASA.</li> <li>16 Q Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a</li> <li>17 sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.	2       THE WITNESS: Good morning.         3       CROSS-EXAMINATION         4       BY MR. CHU:         5       Q       Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great         6       job you've done so far.         7       A       Thank you.         8       Q       We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't         9       we?         10       A       It didn't feel like it was a struggle.         11       Q       We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?         12       A       No.         13       Q       Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it         14       now, is that right?         15       A       I'm familiar with the ASA.         16       Q       Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a         17       sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the         18       right?         19       A
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. This is the original copy. May I give this to the	2       THE WITNESS: Good morning.         3       CROSS-EXAMINATION         4       BY MR. CHU:         5       Q       Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great         6       job you've done so far.         7       A       Thank you.         8       Q       We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't         9       we?         10       A       It didn't feel like it was a struggle.         11       Q       We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?         12       A       No.         13       Q       Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it         14       now, is that right?         15       A       I'm familiar with the ASA.         16       Q       Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a         17       sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the         18       right?         19       A
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor.	2       THE WITNESS: Good morning.         3       CROSS-EXAMINATION         4       BY MR. CHU:         5       Q       Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great         6       job you've done so far.         7       A       Thank you.         8       Q       We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't         9       we?         10       A       It didn't feel like it was a struggle.         11       Q       We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?         12       A       No.         13       Q       Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it         14       now, is that right?         15       A       I'm familiar with the ASA.         16       Q       Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a         17       sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the         18       right?         19       A         20       Q       You didn't see where it says "Sensible Policies"?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. This is the original copy. May I give this to the court reporter?	2       THE WITNESS: Good morning.         3       CROSS-EXAMINATION         4       BY MR. CHU:         5       Q       Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great         6       job you've done so far.         7       A       Thank you.         8       Q       We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't         9       we?         10       A       It didn't feel like it was a struggle.         11       Q       We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?         12       A       No.         13       Q       Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it         14       now, is that right?       Is         15       A       I'm familiar with the ASA.         16       Q       Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a         17       sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the         18       right?         19       A         20       Q         21       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. This is the original copy. May I give this to the court reporter? JUDGE BIRO: Are these signed? Do we have signed	2       THE WITNESS: Good morning.         3       CROSS-EXAMINATION         4       BY MR. CHU:         5       Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great         6       job you've done so far.         7       A Thank you.         8       Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't         9       we?         10       A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.         11       Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?         12       A No.         13       Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it         14       now, is that right?         15       A I'm familiar with the ASA.         16       Q Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a         17       sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the         18       right?         19       A No.         20       Q You didn't see where it says "Sensible Policies"?         21       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form and         22       relevance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. (The documents referred to were marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. 217 and 218 and were received in evidence.) JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into the record? You're shaking your head. MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to give us five copies so that we can have a copy for everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. This is the original copy. May I give this to the court reporter? JUDGE BIRO: Are these signed? Do we have signed deposition	2       THE WITNESS: Good morning.         3       CROSS-EXAMINATION         4       BY MR. CHU:         5       Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great         6       job you've done so far.         7       A Thank you.         8       Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't         9       we?         10       A It didn't feel like it was a struggle.         11       Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember?         12       A No.         13       Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it         14       now, is that right?         15       A I'm familiar with the ASA.         16       Q Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a         17       sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the         18       right?         19       A No.         20       Q You didn't see where it says "Sensible Policies"?         21       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form and         22       relevance.         23       MR. CHU: Your Honor, this is a case about the so-

	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
		<u> </u>	
	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?
	Investigation Center.	10	A 37
10	5	1	A Yes.
11	Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that	11	Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that
11 12	Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name	11 12	Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?
11 12 13	Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?	11 12 13	<ul><li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li><li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air</li></ul>
11 12 13 14	Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it? A Yes.	11 12 13 14	<ul><li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li><li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li></ul>
11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition,</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, correct?</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form and relevance.</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form and relevance.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q In preparation for this testimony.</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form and relevance.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Not exactly.</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q In preparation for this testimony.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form and relevance.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not exactly.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q In preparation for this testimony.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so do you remember the date of that</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form and relevance.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not exactly.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q How is it any different?</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q In preparation for this testimony.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so do you remember the date of that paper that was submitted at the NEIC? Year.</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form and relevance.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: Not exactly. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q How is it any different?</li> <li>A I think there are a lot of differences. It's</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name was on it?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right?</li> <li>A The paper? I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q In preparation for this testimony.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so do you remember the date of that</li> </ul>	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that somewhat the same thing?</li> <li>A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air Act and associated regulations.</li> <li>Q So do you perform the same functions as a police officer?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form and relevance.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not exactly.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q How is it any different?</li> </ul>

	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
	Dago 705		Doco 707
1	Page 705	1	Page 707
1 2	A No. Q Well yesterday you were throwing out the word	1 2	that situation?
∠ 3	Q Well yesterday you were throwing out the word willfulness. Is that accurate?	3	<ul><li>A It's possible.</li><li>Q So you might have.</li></ul>
4	A I mentioned the word willfulness. Yes.	4	Q So you might have. 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 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	<ul><li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li><li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li></ul>	2	vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?
2 3	<ul><li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li><li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li><li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li></ul>	2 3	vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right? A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe
2 3 4	<ul><li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li><li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li><li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li><li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li></ul>	2 3 4	vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right? A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right? A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look. Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li><li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li><li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li><li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li><li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li><li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li><li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li><li>A Yes.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. (Pause.)</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly.     <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face, yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly.     (Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would, yes.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models, right? So</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models, right? So</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would.</li> <li>Q So are you telling this Court that it was possible</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly.     (Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models, right? So</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are there any 2009s in that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would.</li> <li>Q So are you telling this Court that it was possible that you had talked with Mr. Matao Cao in 2000 and, was that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models, right? So</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are there any 2009s in that?</li> <li>A Yes, there are.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would.</li> <li>Q So are you telling this Court that it was possible that you had talked with Mr. Matao Cao in 2000 and, was that '12 or '13 that you were in Texas?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models, right? So</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are there any 2009s in that?</li> <li>A Yes, there are.</li> <li>Q Okay. I'm glad you told me that. I thought I</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would.</li> <li>Q So are you telling this Court that it was possible that you had talked with Mr. Matao Cao in 2000 and, was that '12 or '13 that you were in Texas?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models, right? So</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are there any 2009s in that?</li> <li>A Yes, there are.</li> <li>Q Okay. I'm glad you told me that. I thought I might be wrong. Okay.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010.</li> <li>Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation?</li> <li>A It was a conversation. I don't recall details.</li> <li>Q Do you believe you had a face to face?</li> <li>A We may have had a face to face yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if it was Dallas or Carrollton.</li> <li>Q But your notes would indicate where, right?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q Your notes would indicate what city</li> <li>A The inspection work sheets would.</li> <li>Q So are you telling this Court that it was possible that you had talked with Mr. Matao Cao in 2000 and, was that '12 or '13 that you were in Texas?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that right?</li> <li>A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look.</li> <li>Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in drafting. Remember?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles?</li> <li>A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to open it.</li> <li>Q Certainly. <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it?</li> <li>A Yes, I'm looking at it right now.</li> <li>Q And in that it describes the year and the models, right? So</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are there any 2009s in that?</li> <li>A Yes, there are.</li> <li>Q Okay. I'm glad you told me that. I thought I</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	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?
2 3	pick them out. Did I hear that accurately? A Yes.	<ol> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. I'll rephrase. Okay?</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ol>
	<ul><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the</li></ul>	
3	<ul><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li></ul>	3 BY MR. CHU:
3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li><li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>3 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>4 Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>5 that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>6 Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>7 A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the</li> <li>warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the</li> <li>warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you</li> <li>please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word JUDGE BIRO: I believe the word she said was</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> <li>production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> <li>production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you</li> <li>could please break it down for us here, in terms of the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word JUDGE BIRO: I believe the word she said was identify.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> <li>production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you</li> <li>could please break it down for us here, in terms of the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word JUDGE BIRO: I believe the word she said was identify.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. I was going to go there, okay.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> <li>production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you</li> <li>could please break it down for us here, in terms of the</li> <li>details of your methodology in your investigation that</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word JUDGE BIRO: I believe the word she said was identify.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. I was going to go there, okay. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Let's go with that.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> <li>production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you</li> <li>could please break it down for us here, in terms of the</li> <li>details of your methodology in your investigation that</li> <li>identified the 109,000 vehicles, please.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word JUDGE BIRO: I believe the word she said was identify.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. I was going to go there, okay. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Let's go with that. MR. CHU: Sorry, Your Honor. Okay.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> <li>production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you</li> <li>could please break it down for us here, in terms of the</li> <li>details of your methodology in your investigation that</li> <li>identified the 109,000 vehicles, please.</li> <li>A If you're asking how I identified vehicles for</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles?</li> <li>A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles.</li> <li>Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd like me to use?</li> <li>A You can use whichever word JUDGE BIRO: I believe the word she said was identify.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. I was going to go there, okay. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Let's go with that.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Sorry, Your Honor. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory</li> <li>that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton,</li> <li>Texas, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I did ask for such a list. Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other</li> <li>methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just</li> <li>now, is that accurate?</li> <li>A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed</li> <li>that would be included in the production lists that the</li> <li>Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built</li> <li>under those engine families.</li> <li>Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand</li> <li>your methods that you used and so to me when you say</li> <li>production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you</li> <li>could please break it down for us here, in terms of the</li> <li>details of your methodology in your investigation that</li> <li>identified the 109,000 vehicles, please.</li> <li>A If you're asking how I identified vehicles for</li> <li>inspection, I can go into that.</li> </ul>

1	Page 716		Page 718
2	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	2 3	A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012 investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I
3 4	A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.	2 3 4	A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012 investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.
3 4 5	<ul><li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and</li><li>check to be certain.</li><li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li><li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.</li><li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li></ul>
3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed</li> <li>it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> <li>right?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> <li>Q That's fine. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him, right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> <li>Q That's fine. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> <li>right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's established here on the record</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> <li>Q That's fine. Okay.</li> <li>So somehow a shipment coming in from overseas that Taotao USA was associated with caught the attention of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> <li>right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's established here on the record</li> <li>now.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> <li>Q That's fine. Okay.</li> <li>So somehow a shipment coming in from overseas that Taotao USA was associated with caught the attention of Customs in Long Beach, California in 2012. Is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> <li>right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's established here on the record</li> <li>now.</li> <li>So does June 28, 2010 sound like that's the date</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> <li>Q That's fine. Okay.</li> <li>So somehow a shipment coming in from overseas that Taotao USA was associated with caught the attention of Customs in Long Beach, California in 2012. Is that accurate?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> <li>right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's established here on the record</li> <li>now.</li> <li>So does June 28, 2010 sound like that's the date</li> <li>you looked at yesterday?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> <li>Q That's fine. Okay.</li> <li>So somehow a shipment coming in from overseas that Taotao USA was associated with caught the attention of Customs in Long Beach, California in 2012. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A I believe there was an inspection in 2012, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> <li>right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's established here on the record</li> <li>now.</li> <li>So does June 28, 2010 sound like that's the date</li> <li>you looked at yesterday?</li> <li>A I believe so. To the best of my recollection.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and check to be certain.</li> <li>Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why I ask the question.</li> <li>But what does the word quarantine mean in reference to what EIS does?</li> <li>A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up.</li> <li>Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant yesterday, correct?</li> <li>A That's exactly what I meant. Yes.</li> <li>Q So you do remember using that word yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't.</li> <li>Q That's fine. Okay.</li> <li>So somehow a shipment coming in from overseas that Taotao USA was associated with caught the attention of Customs in Long Beach, California in 2012. Is that accurate?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012</li> <li>investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I</li> <li>was not directly involved in that inspection.</li> <li>Q So you didn't travel out there.</li> <li>A I did not travel out there.</li> <li>Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of</li> <li>Customs, correct?</li> <li>A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection,</li> <li>I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between</li> <li>EPA and Customs.</li> <li>Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010</li> <li>you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks no, signed on behalf</li> <li>of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him,</li> <li>right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's established here on the record</li> <li>now.</li> <li>So does June 28, 2010 sound like that's the date</li> <li>you looked at yesterday?</li> </ul>

	Page 720		Page 722
1	Q Please. I want your most accurate testimony	1	A Not to my knowledge.
2	today.	2	Q And when I say what are some of the words that
3	A June 28, 2010, on Bates 822.	3	you use to identify potential violators like I would say
4	Q Thank you. And I just want to say lawyers	4	some of the Korean companies that you're familiar with, that
5	sometimes mix dates, exhibit numbers and things up, so	5	you've worked with in the past?
6	that's why sometimes we like to clarify and get assurances.	6	A I don't know what you're referring to.
7	Okay?	7	Q Have you not had occasion to work with some of the
8	A Yes.	8	auto importers from Korea in your investigations?
9	Q All right, thank you. So the Taotao USA Company,	9	A No.
10	which is an American company, would you agree?	10	Q You mentioned to me something about a program
11	A Yes.	11	where foreign companies, like car companies, can violate the
12	Q Okay. Became a focus of attention for your Air	12	EPA Act, but then they could use certain credits to balance
13	Enforcement Division in 2010 and possibly as early as 2009.	13	out the wrong acts. Do you remember talking about that?
14	Would that be accurate?	14	A Not in that way.
15	A It depends on what you mean by focus of attention.	15	Q I'm sorry, I know it's not in that way, but you
16	Q They were on your radar?	16	talked about something like that, right?
17	A Yes, they were on our radar.	17	A I believe during my deposition I mentioned an
18	Q Okay. Because there's a difference between focus	18	averaging banking and trading program involving emission
19	and radar, right?	19	credits.
20	A It sounds to me like there is, yes.	20	Q Averaging what?
21	Q I'm sorry?	21	A Banking and trading program.
22	A It sounds to me like there is a difference, yes.	22	Q The word is banking, right?
23	Q Okay. And I apologize, I studied engineering as	23	A Correct.
24	an undergrad so I didn't have the benefit of the literary	24	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Is there a relevance to this?
25	education formally. Okay? So if I choose the wrong words	25	JUDGE BIRO: Sustained?
	Page 721		Dago 702
1		1	Page 723
1	then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that	1	The main point about cross-examination is that you
2	then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?	2	The main point about cross-examination is that you can lead and hopefully make points efficiently.
2 3	then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay? A Yes.	2 3	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
2 3 4	<ul><li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's</li></ul>	2 3 4	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.
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li></ul>	2 3	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:
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>A Taotao USA was, I, I have to say, this is to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	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,
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. Can we get to a point</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. Can we get to a point here?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>The main point about cross-examination is that you can lead and hopefully make points efficiently.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. I will try to find better words.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Again, we're talking about the regulatory scheme, right?</li> <li>A We're talking about whatever you want to talk about.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Mischaracterization of the proceeding.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that your understanding or not?</li> <li>A Yes. We are talking about harm to the regulatory scheme.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. Can we get to a point here?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. Can we get to a point here?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?</li> <li>A I don't know what you mean.</li> <li>Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. Can we get to a point here?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So was there anything bad, other than volume,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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?

	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?
			1
	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.
	of hat hor endediate hor espresso in that dag per hat, would		catarytic converter compliance in 2011. Tes.
13	you?	13	Q Thank you.
13 14		13 14	
	you?	1	Q Thank you.
14	you? A I would expect some level of consistency.	14	Q Thank you. And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary
14 15	you? A I would expect some level of consistency. Q Exact in every material respect?	14 15	Q Thank you. And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst,
14 15 16	you? A I would expect some level of consistency. Q Exact in every material respect? A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I	14 15 16	Q Thank you. And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst, would you agree?
14 15 16 17	<ul><li>you?</li><li>A I would expect some level of consistency.</li><li>Q Exact in every material respect?</li><li>A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I mean they vary in size and shape. So.</li></ul>	14 15 16 17	<ul><li>Q Thank you.</li><li>And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary</li><li>was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst,</li><li>would you agree?</li><li>A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were</li></ul>
14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you?</li> <li>A I would expect some level of consistency.</li> <li>Q Exact in every material respect?</li> <li>A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I mean they vary in size and shape. So.</li> <li>Q So there is a method to the madness?</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18	<ul><li>Q Thank you.</li><li>And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary</li><li>was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst,</li><li>would you agree?</li><li>A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were analyzing catalysts, and our methods evolved over time.</li></ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you?</li> <li>A I would expect some level of consistency.</li> <li>Q Exact in every material respect?</li> <li>A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I mean they vary in size and shape. So.</li> <li>Q So there is a method to the madness?</li> <li>A I don't know what you're referring to.</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul><li>Q Thank you.</li><li>And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary</li><li>was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst,</li><li>would you agree?</li><li>A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were analyzing catalysts, and our methods evolved over time.</li><li>Yes.</li></ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>you?</li> <li>A I would expect some level of consistency.</li> <li>Q Exact in every material respect?</li> <li>A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I mean they vary in size and shape. So.</li> <li>Q So there is a method to the madness?</li> <li>A I don't know what you're referring to.</li> <li>Q This talk about how these catalysts are produced.</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary</li> <li>was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst,</li> <li>would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were analyzing catalysts, and our methods evolved over time.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Q And it wasn't until some time after or during 2014</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>you?</li> <li>A I would expect some level of consistency.</li> <li>Q Exact in every material respect?</li> <li>A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I mean they vary in size and shape. So.</li> <li>Q So there is a method to the madness?</li> <li>A I don't know what you're referring to.</li> <li>Q This talk about how these catalysts are produced. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst, would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were analyzing catalysts, and our methods evolved over time.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Q And it wasn't until some time after or during 2014 that the NEIC adopted a method that could be utilized, would</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>you?</li> <li>A I would expect some level of consistency.</li> <li>Q Exact in every material respect?</li> <li>A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I</li> <li>mean they vary in size and shape. So.</li> <li>Q So there is a method to the madness?</li> <li>A I don't know what you're referring to.</li> <li>Q This talk about how these catalysts are produced. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To relevance of this line.</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst, would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were analyzing catalysts, and our methods evolved over time. Yes.</li> <li>Q And it wasn't until some time after or during 2014 that the NEIC adopted a method that could be utilized, would you agree?</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>you?</li> <li>A I would expect some level of consistency.</li> <li>Q Exact in every material respect?</li> <li>A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I mean they vary in size and shape. So.</li> <li>Q So there is a method to the madness?</li> <li>A I don't know what you're referring to.</li> <li>Q This talk about how these catalysts are produced. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To relevance of this line. MR. CHU: It goes to the gravity.</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst, would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were analyzing catalysts, and our methods evolved over time. Yes.</li> <li>Q And it wasn't until some time after or during 2014 that the NEIC adopted a method that could be utilized, would you agree?</li> <li>A I don't necessarily agree with that, no.</li> </ul>

	Page 728		Page 730
1	that up there?	1	Q I see. So if the catalyst was dissolved, can you
2	A I'm sorry, what exhibit did you want me to look	2	tell us how they extracted the precious metals?
3	at?	3	A Would you like me to continue reading?
4	Q Remember this one?	4	Q Please.
5	A Yes.	5	A "The sediment after acid dissolution is alkali
6	Q Now can you tell us what the method that was used	6	dissolved using sodium peroxide. Mix the resulting
7	in the testing of that catalyst?	7	solution. TiO2 is added to coprecipitation enrichment noble
8	A In this exhibit?	8	metal platinum, palladium and rhodium of mixed liquid.
9	Q From the Chinese testing facility.	9	Coprecipitation is dissolved using aqua regia. The
10	A I believe it's described in these documents.	10	absorbance of the resulting solution is measured by atomic
11	Q Right. So can you tell us what that method was?	11	absorption spectrometer and the noble metal platinum,
12	A I don't recall without looking.	12	palladium and rhodium content is calculated from a
13	Q Would you please look?	13	previously determined value for the absorptivity."
14	I'll tell you, would you please read the first two	14	Q Now, from that can you explain to us from an
15	lines, it will move faster.	15	engineering perspective how, what it means to you as to how
16	A Of the test method?	16	it was separated? The precious metals.
17	Q Right, the one in English, not in Chinese.	17	A It looks like the precious metals were
18	Please.	18	precipitated out of the dissolved solution.
19	A So I'm looking on Bates 550. This is the first	19	Q And in layman's terms, precipitating out means
20	test report. And under the results section it says, "The	20	what?
21	sample is dissolved using hydrochloric acid and the inner	21	A It means extracting, probably in a powder format.
22	core is almost completely dissolved."	22	Q Do you think that precious metals can be put into
23	Q Now, you have a license as a professional	23	a powdered format?
24	engineer. You also studied engineering from the Virginia	24	A That's my understanding.
25	Institute, is that correct?	25	Q Now when you mention powder, you're talking about
	Page 729		Page 731
1	A I have a I have a license as a professional	1	some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?
2	A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental	2	some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent? A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my
2 3	A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.	2 3	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.
2 3 4	<ul><li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li><li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li></ul>	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li><li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li><li>Q I see, but you do understand that these are precious metals and that the precipitate would have to come</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li><li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li><li>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</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li><li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li><li>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?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A You're reaching the extent of my knowledge here on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A You're reaching the extent of my knowledge here on the chemistry of this method. I haven't observed this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so you heard Mr. Jackson yesterday or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so you heard Mr. Jackson yesterday or the day before testify that the, one of the ways to test a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> <li>Q Do you remember the emails from Jackie and Matao</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> <li>Q Do you remember the emails from Jackie and Matao Cao saying we can't find a lab in China that the EPA will</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you see here as an engineer, okay,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. And when you see here as an engineer, okay, when it say it's dissolved. Is there any difference in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes, I do remember that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes, I do remember that.</li> <li>Q And</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes, I do remember that.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A Well, I'm sorry. Not in the way you just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I have a I have a license as a professional engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.</li> <li>Q From Virginia Tech?</li> <li>A From Virginia Tech, yes.</li> <li>Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?</li> <li>A It's in Virginia, yeah.</li> <li>Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?</li> <li>A The main campus is, yes.</li> <li>Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?</li> <li>A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?</li> <li>A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But you do understand what you read, right?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q You do, or you did understand what you read back in 2012 when you received this report, right?</li> <li>A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes, I do remember that.</li> <li>Q And</li> </ul>

	Page 732		Page 734
1	that I described. I understand that, right?	1	over application, okay?
2	A Your words, not mine.	2	A Yes.
3	Q So can you tell us what your words were when you	3	Q Isn't it accurate to say that the OEM in China is
4	informed the two individuals that these tests were or were	4	granted the authority to produce VIN numbers through a
5	not acceptable?	5	different agency in the United States?
6	A I think I went through yesterday some of my	6	A I I'm not sure.
7	concerns with the tests, and it didn't involve the test	7	Q You wouldn't know, right?
8	method. They involved the, the actual sample and the	8	A I don't know.
9	vehicle that the sample came from.	9	Q This is what I want to develop, is the depth of
10	Q Would you tell me what page that you want to talk	10	familiarity with VIN numbers and identifiers such as those.
11	about that helps support what you just said?	11	Okay? But you can tell from the VIN number, okay, that a
12	A We can look at the same page, Bates 550.	12	test is being sought for a 2012 model vehicle. Correct?
13	Q Can we start with the test date.	13	A That's what it appears to be, yes.
14	A Do you want to know the test date?	14	Q And is it your understanding that the vehicle
15	Q No, can we start with the test date?	15	manufacturers, be it ATVs, scooters, SUVs, luxury vehicles,
16	A We can start with whatever you want to start with.	16	produce vehicles before the actual year that they're
17	Q That's a yes?	17	identified in. For instance, 2017 vehicles could be
18	A Yes, we can.	18	would be produced, but the actual model year would be known
19	Q Thank you. Now, you mentioned that it was a 2012	19	as 2018?
20	model year vehicle, is that accurate?	20	A It's my understanding that the model year often
21	A It looks to me that it's a model year 2012	21	begins before the calendar year, if that's what you're
22	vehicle. Yes.	22	getting at.
23	Q And you get that from what identifier?	23	Q Yes, I am.
24	A From the VIN number provided.	24	And so for a manufacturer or an importer to test a
25	Q And can you tell this Court what alphabet position	25	2012 vehicle, more than likely if they're seeking a COC
		<u> </u>	
	Page 733		Page 735
1	of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?	1	renewal that that would have been done in the preceding
2	of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year? A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically	2	renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?
2 3	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.	2	renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree? A Yes.
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	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?	2 3 4 5	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
2 3 4 5 6	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	2 3 4 5 6	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?</li><li>A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically</li><li>designates the model year.</li><li>Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th</li><li>position on this page?</li><li>A What I see here on this page is a C which to me</li><li>would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry. Then tell me why that's inaccurate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>A So even if there you're this page shows a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?</li> <li>A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically designates the model year.</li> <li>Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th position on this page?</li> <li>A What I see here on this page is a C which to me would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I wouldn't know that off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q Where would you have to look? Because</li> <li>A We would have to look at the application for a 2012.</li> <li>Q And we did this dance yesterday, remember? You went from one to another. So can you go ahead and do that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?</li> <li>A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically designates the model year.</li> <li>Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th position on this page?</li> <li>A What I see here on this page is a C which to me would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I wouldn't know that off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q Where would you have to look? Because</li> <li>A We would have to look at the application for a 2012.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think we have this application in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>As I also mentioned yesterday, this report came in, you know, six months after we requested it. So there</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?</li> <li>A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically designates the model year.</li> <li>Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th position on this page?</li> <li>A What I see here on this page is a C which to me would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I wouldn't know that off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q Where would you have to look? Because</li> <li>A We would have to look at the application for a 2012.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think we have this application in the exhibit.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?</li> <li>A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically designates the model year.</li> <li>Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th position on this page?</li> <li>A What I see here on this page is a C which to me would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I wouldn't know that off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q Where would you have to look? Because</li> <li>A We would have to look at the application for a 2012.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think we have this application in the exhibit.</li> <li>Q Oh, that wasn't one of them that we went back and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Does this test result test record not purport to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?</li> <li>A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically designates the model year.</li> <li>Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th position on this page?</li> <li>A What I see here on this page is a C which to me would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I wouldn't know that off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q Where would you have to look? Because</li> <li>A We would have to look at the application for a 2012.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think we have this application in the exhibit.</li> <li>Q Oh, that wasn't one of them that we went back and forth on.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Does this test result test record not purport to be a test result for a 2012 model year vehicle?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?</li> <li>A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically designates the model year.</li> <li>Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th position on this page?</li> <li>A What I see here on this page is a C which to me would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I wouldn't know that off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q Where would you have to look? Because</li> <li>A We would have to look at the application for a 2012.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think we have this application in the exhibit.</li> <li>Q Oh, that wasn't one of them that we went back and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I disagree.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q Does this test result test record not purport to</li> </ul>

	Page 736	Page 738
1		
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 25	THE WITNESS: I'm looking at the ASA now.	24 A You keep talking about class. Do you mean engine 25 family?
25	BY MR. CHU:	25 family?
-		
	Page 737	Page 739
1	Page 737 O Okay do you see the paragraph that describes	Page 739
1	Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes	1 Q Is that not described as an engine family class?
2	Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> </ol>
	<ul><li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li><li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model,</li></ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> </ol>
2 3	<ul><li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li><li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li></ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li><li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li></ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> <li>group?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li><li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li><li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same</li></ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> <li>group?</li> <li>A I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> <li>group?</li> <li>A I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine</li> <li>family.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> <li>group?</li> <li>A I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine</li> <li>family.</li> <li>Q I said engine family.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> <li>group?</li> <li>A I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine</li> <li>family.</li> <li>Q I said engine family.</li> <li>A You said engine family class. I just wanted to be</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> <li>group?</li> <li>A I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine</li> <li>family.</li> <li>Q I said engine family.</li> <li>A You said engine family class. I just wanted to be</li> <li>clear.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q Is that not described as an engine family class?</li> <li>A Not in my experience.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that</li> <li>group?</li> <li>A I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine</li> <li>family.</li> <li>Q I said engine family.</li> <li>A You said engine family class. I just wanted to be</li> <li>clear.</li> <li>Q The class known as engine families that are</li> <li>identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to</li> <li>how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C.</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to         12       how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine         13       families. Is that clear?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to         12       how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine         13       families. Is that clear?         14       A
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to         12       how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine         13       families. Is that clear?         14       A       No.         15       Q       Okay. So we'll just stick with engine families,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> </ul>	1QIs that not described as an engine family class?2ANot in my experience.3QI'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that4group?5AI would, I think you're trying to refer to engine6family.7QI said engine family.8AYou said engine family class. I just wanted to be9clear.10QThe class known as engine families that are11identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to12how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine13families. Is that clear?14A15Q16okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> <li>Q If you will please read paragraph four for us.</li> </ul>	1QIs that not described as an engine family class?2ANot in my experience.3QI'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that4group?5AI would, I think you're trying to refer to engine6family.7QI said engine family.8AYou said engine family class. I just wanted to be9clear.10QThe class known as engine families that are11identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to12how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine13families. Is that clear?14A15Q16okay?17A17A18Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> <li>Q If you will please read paragraph four for us.</li> <li>A "Vehicle or engine model means any set of subject</li> </ul>	1QIs that not described as an engine family class?2ANot in my experience.3QI'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that4group?5AI would, I think you're trying to refer to engine6family.7QI said engine family.8AYou said engine family class. I just wanted to be9clear.10QThe class known as engine families that are11identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to12how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine13families. Is that clear?14A15Q16okay?17A18Q20si it your belief that there is a year
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> <li>Q If you will please read paragraph four for us.</li> <li>A "Vehicle or engine model means any set of subject vehicles or engines that are certified in the same EPA</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to         12       how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine         13       families. Is that clear?         14       A       No.         15       Q       Okay. So we'll just stick with engine families,         16       okay?         17       A       Okay.         18       Q       So is it your belief that there is a year         19       associated with the engine family different from the model
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> <li>Q If you will please read paragraph four for us.</li> <li>A "Vehicle or engine model means any set of subject vehicless or engines that are certified in the same EPA engine family built by the same manufacturer in the same</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to         12       how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine         13       families. Is that clear?         14       A       No.         15       Q       Okay. So we'll just stick with engine families,         16       okay?         17       A       Okay.         18       Q       So is it your belief that there is a year         19       associated with the engine family different from the model         20       year?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> <li>Q If you will please read paragraph four for us.</li> <li>A "Vehicle or engine model means any set of subject vehicles or engines that are certified in the same EPA engine family built by the same manufacturer in the same model year as designated by the manufacturer"</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.       0         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to         12       how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine         13       families. Is that clear?         14       A       No.         15       Q       Okay. So we'll just stick with engine families,         16       okay?         17       A       Okay.         18       Q       So is it your belief that there is a year         19       associated with the engine family different from the model         20       year?       21         21       A       No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> <li>Q If you will please read paragraph four for us.</li> <li>A "Vehicle or engine model means any set of subject vehicles or engines that are certified in the same EPA engine family built by the same manufacturer in the same model year as designated by the manufacturer"</li> <li>Q Thank you. That's good enough.</li> </ul>	1       Q       Is that not described as an engine family class?         2       A       Not in my experience.         3       Q       I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that         4       group?         5       A       I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine         6       family.         7       Q       I said engine family.         8       A       You said engine family class. I just wanted to be         9       clear.       0         10       Q       The class known as engine families that are         11       identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to         12       how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine         13       families. Is that clear?         14       A       No.         15       Q       Okay. So we'll just stick with engine families,         16       okay?         17       A       Okay.         18       Q       So is it your belief that there is a year         19       associated with the engine family different from the model         20       year?       Q         21       A       No.         22       Q       Thank you. So why is it that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes model year?</li> <li>A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, on the Bates page ending in 828.</li> <li>Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same thing?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those two words?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could move a little faster.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q If you will please look at Attachment C. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q And look and read for us paragraph four.</li> <li>A The definition of vehicle or engine model?</li> <li>Q If you will please read paragraph four for us.</li> <li>A "Vehicle or engine model means any set of subject vehicles or engines that are certified in the same EPA engine family built by the same manufacturer in the same model year as designated by the manufacturer"</li> <li>Q Thank you. That's good enough. So you see</li> </ul>	1QIs that not described as an engine family class?2ANot in my experience.3QI'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that4group?5AI would, I think you're trying to refer to engine6family.7QI said engine family.8AYou said engine family class. I just wanted to be9clear.10QThe class known as engine families that are11identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to12how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine13families. Is that clear?14A15Q16okay?17A18Q20si it your belief that there is a year19associated with the engine family different from the model20year?21A22Q23Court, this Judge, that it's the wrong engine family year?

	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	Page 741 identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.	1	Page 743 B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for
1 2		1 2	
	identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.	1	B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for
2	identified belonged to the engine class, engine family. That's what you like. Engine family, right?	2	B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?
2 3	identified belonged to the engine class, engine family. That's what you like. Engine family, right? A Engine family.	2 3	<ul><li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li><li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li><li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li><li>A Engine family.</li><li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li><li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li><li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA,</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li><li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li><li>A Engine family.</li><li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li><li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li><li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li><li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li><li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li><li>A Engine family.</li><li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li><li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li><li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li><li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party,</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> <li>At this point, you know, we had been requesting these</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> <li>At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> <li>At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> <li>At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error.</li> <li>Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error.</li> <li>Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> <li>At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error.</li> <li>Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think</li> <li>it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a</li> <li>2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct? A No, that's not what I'm saying. Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error? A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error. Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm</li> <li>doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the</li> <li>engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates</li> <li>number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming</li> <li>facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the</li> <li>engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think</li> <li>it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a</li> <li>2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct? A No, that's not what I'm saying. Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error? A A this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error. Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that accurate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family. So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a 2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family then they should have listed the 2012 engine family.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> <li>At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error.</li> <li>Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that accurate?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a 2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family then they should have listed the 2012 engine family.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And that's what we've been talking about for ten</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you.</li> <li>At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error.</li> <li>Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A That's not my interpretation.</li> <li>Q Okay, but would you agree that sometimes it takes</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a 2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family then they should have listed the 2012 engine family.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And that's what we've been talking about for ten minutes. There's no such thing as a 2011 and then a 2012</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct? A No, that's not what I'm saying. Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error? A A this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error. Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that accurate? A That's not my interpretation. Q Okay, but would you agree that sometimes it takes wrongs to make things right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a 2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family then they should have listed the 2012 engine family.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And that's what we've been talking about for ten minutes. There's no such thing as a 2011 and then a 2012 engine family because it's the same engine family, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I'm saying.</li> <li>Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error?</li> <li>A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error.</li> <li>Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A That's not my interpretation.</li> <li>Q Okay, but would you agree that sometimes it takes wrongs to make things right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>identified belonged to the engine class, engine family.</li> <li>That's what you like. Engine family, right?</li> <li>A Engine family.</li> <li>Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family.</li> <li>So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates number 550?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the engine family or the VIN depicted on this report.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now.</li> <li>I'm only talking about the engine family.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you understand the question?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a 2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family then they should have listed the 2012 engine family.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And that's what we've been talking about for ten minutes. There's no such thing as a 2011 and then a 2012</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for certification for 2012. Correct? A No, that's not what I'm saying. Q But but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, receives this and notices that B, that's something that they can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of typographical error? A A this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. At this point, you know, we had been requesting these documents for six months. There was always some problem related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable ascribing this to a typographical error. Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that accurate? A That's not my interpretation. Q Okay, but would you agree that sometimes it takes wrongs to make things right?

	Page 744		Page 746
1	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.	1	MR. CHU: With chandeliers.
2	JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.	2	JUDGE BIRO: With humongous chandeliers. This
3	BY MR. CHU:	3	would be the worst place to probably be.
4	Q Now let's talk about what you were doing to try to	4	(Laughter).
5	help Taotao USA get it. Can you tell us?	5	(Off the record discussion.)
6	A I think we went through a number of exhibits	6	JUDGE BIRO: I think we can go on. I'm sorry.
7	yesterday where there was email correspondence back and	7	I'm very sorry.
8	forth between me and Christopher Thompson and Mike Hillman	8	MR. CHU: Okay.
9	and possibly even Mr. Wang regarding these catalyst test	9	BY MR. CHU:
10	reports. We had requested them, they came to us in Chinese.	10	Q So are you still with me?
11	We requested translation. Then they came without photos.	11	A Yes.
12	We requested the photos, then there were concerns about the	12	Q What I said was I want to confirm, and not be
13	photos not matching up with what we saw on the work sheets.	13	redundant, that when you said the discrepancies which you
14	This was an iterative process. We sent numerous	14	just identified, again, you never identified the B/C
15	emails, numerous letters. That was, that was a lot of	15	scenario that we just talked about. Right?
16	effort on EPA's part in my opinion.	16	A These catalyst test reports hadn't been submitted
17	Q Did you ever send an email saying I think you made	17	at the time we sent the January letter.
18	a boo-boo here. This B needs to be a C?	18	Q Okay. So, can you tell this Court specifically
19	A I never sent an email like that.	19	what discrepancies you know exactly that you had identified
20	Q Why not?	20	in those two January letters?
21	A This at this point the decision was made to go	21	A If you'd like me to speak exactly, we should go
22	forward with a stipulated penalty agreement.	22	probably look at the letters.
23	Q I'm sorry. This is after, remember, June 2010.	23	Q I'm good with that.
24	That's when that one was signed. So I don't think you're	24	A Okay. Do you know what exhibit numbers they are?
25	accurate in what you just said. Would you agree?	25	Q Again, yesterday this flipping back and forth, I
		1	
	Page 745		Page 747
1	Page 745 A I thought, I think I am accurate.	1	Page 747 just kind of got lost there. So any assistance would be
1 2	_	1 2	
	A I thought, I think I am accurate.	1	just kind of got lost there. So any assistance would be
2	<ul><li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li><li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li><li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection,</li></ul>	2	just kind of got lost there. So any assistance would be great. Because we went from one to another in another book
2 3	<ul><li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li><li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li><li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated</li></ul>	2	<ul><li>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.</li><li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li><li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul><li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li><li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li><li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement,</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow</li> <li>in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or</li> <li>70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or 70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or</li> <li>70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Let me stop you right quick. Discrepancies we had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or</li> <li>70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So it's 71. I apologize, again.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Let me stop you right quick. Discrepancies we had seen, and it's clear on the record here, the EPA failed to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or</li> <li>70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So</li> <li>it's 71. I apologize, again.</li> <li>A So here again we were requesting complete catalyst</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Let me stop you right quick. Discrepancies we had seen, and it's clear on the record here, the EPA failed to ever tell them about this B, C situation, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or</li> <li>70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So it's 71. I apologize, again.</li> <li>A So here again we were requesting complete catalyst test results, and we also had identified some label issues</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Let me stop you right quick. Discrepancies we had seen, and it's clear on the record here, the EPA failed to ever tell them about this B, C situation, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or 70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So it's 71. I apologize, again.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Let me stop you right quick. Discrepancies we had seen, and it's clear on the record here, the EPA failed to ever tell them about this B, C situation, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or 70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So it's 71. I apologize, again.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Let me stop you right quick. Discrepancies we had seen, and it's clear on the record here, the EPA failed to ever tell them about this B, C situation, right?</li> <li>(Earthquake drill announcement.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I don't know what to say, why we're</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or 70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So it's 71. I apologize, again.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I thought, I think I am accurate.</li> <li>Q You're saying go forward with the stipulated agreement, meaning what?</li> <li>A So in January, to the best of my recollection, without looking at the documents, we sent our stipulated penalty demand in January of 2012. And we had an agreement, I believe, in March or April of 2012.</li> <li>Q So that agreement that said \$360,000 reduced to \$160,000 is that the document you're talking about?</li> <li>A Sorry. Can you repeat?</li> <li>Q Describe the January letter for us.</li> <li>A The January letter?</li> <li>Q Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>A There were actually two. The first letter requested catalyst test reports and any other information to explain the discrepancies that we were seeing. That was sent in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Let me stop you right quick. Discrepancies we had seen, and it's clear on the record here, the EPA failed to ever tell them about this B, C situation, right?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I don't know what to say, why we're having an earthquake drill in this building at the moment.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.</li> <li>A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.</li> <li>Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?</li> <li>A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012</li> <li>letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.</li> <li>Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?</li> <li>A 73 does follow in chronological order.</li> <li>Q So is that the letter you're referring to?</li> <li>A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.</li> <li>Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or 70. It's got to be in there somewhere.</li> <li>A It's Exhibit 71.</li> <li>Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So it's 71. I apologize, again.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>

	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	Page 749 A II think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't	1	Page 751 Correct?
1 2	Page 749 A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.	1	Correct?
	A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't		
2	A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.	2	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete
2 3	<ul><li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li><li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But</li></ul>	2 3	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure
2 3 4	<ul><li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li><li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance</li></ul>	2 3 4	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree? A It actually says results, not reports.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree? A It actually says results, not reports. Q I see. Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree? A It actually says results, not reports. Q I see. Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> <li>Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree? A It actually says results, not reports. Q I see. Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result? A Yes. Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> <li>Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no translators used at that time, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree? A It actually says results, not reports. Q I see. Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result? A Yes. Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter, it's your opinion that you did not receive any catalyst
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> <li>Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no translators used at that time, right?</li> <li>A Not to my recollection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree? A It actually says results, not reports. Q I see. Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result? A Yes. Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter, it's your opinion that you did not receive any catalyst tests but you did receive catalyst test results. Is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> <li>Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no translators used at that time, right?</li> <li>A Not to my recollection.</li> <li>Q And Mr. Hillman was not an attorney, you know</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Correct? A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU: Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right? A I don't know. Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree? A It actually says results, not reports. Q I see. Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result? A Yes. Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter, it's your opinion that you did not receive any catalyst tests but you did receive catalyst test results. Is that accurate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> <li>Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no translators used at that time, right?</li> <li>A Not to my recollection.</li> <li>Q And Mr. Hillman was not an attorney, you know that, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree?</li> <li>A It actually says results, not reports.</li> <li>Q I see.</li> <li>Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter, it's your opinion that you did not receive any catalyst tests but you did receive catalyst test results. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A I can't say what I received. All I can say based</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> <li>Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no translators used at that time, right?</li> <li>A Not to my recollection.</li> <li>Q And Mr. Hillman was not an attorney, you know that, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some.</li> <li>Would you agree or disagree?</li> <li>A It actually says results, not reports.</li> <li>Q I see.</li> <li>Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter, it's your opinion that you did not receive any catalyst tests but you did receive catalyst test results. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A I can't say what I received. All I can say based on this letter is what I didn't receive, and based on this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't recall when.</li> <li>Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance with</li> <li>A Initially, yes. Yes.</li> <li>Q And throughout the year 2011. Right?</li> <li>A I believe so, yes.</li> <li>Q And that would include the time period before the ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, were you not?</li> <li>A At least partly.</li> <li>Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the EPA, did he not?</li> <li>A I don't recall if it was, if it yeah, I know</li> <li>Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics.</li> <li>Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no translators used at that time, right?</li> <li>A Not to my recollection.</li> <li>Q And Mr. Hillman was not an attorney, you know that, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Correct?</li> <li>A It just says "you have not provided complete catalyst test results". I'm not sure MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst reports, right?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. Would you agree or disagree?</li> <li>A It actually says results, not reports.</li> <li>Q I see.</li> <li>Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter, it's your opinion that you did not receive any catalyst tests but you did receive catalyst test results. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A I can't say what I received. All I can say based</li> </ul>

	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.
		1	
	Page 753		Page 755
1		1	_
1	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's	1 2	Q Are you aware of like a military school for
2	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when	2	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline
2 3	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation.		Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.
2 3 4	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking	2 3 4	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague.
2 3 4 5	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the	2 3 4 5	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
2 3 4 5 6	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but
2 4 5 7 8 9	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but
2 3 5 7 8 9 10	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed? THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates. MR. CHU: Good.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed? THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates. MR. CHU: Good. BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed? THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed? THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates. MR. CHU: Good. BY MR. CHU: Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed? THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know. THE WITNESS: (Laughing).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed? THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: (Laughing). JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements? THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates. MR. CHU: Good. BY MR. CHU: Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your testimony?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: (Laughing). JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the Respondents</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your testimony?</li> <li>A I said I was aware that, that there were companies</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation.</li> <li>And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor.</li> <li>And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: (Laughing).</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the</li> <li>Respondents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your testimony?</li> <li>A I said I was aware that, that there were companies that had used Harrison Wolf.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation.</li> <li>And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor.</li> <li>And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: (Laughing).</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the</li> <li>Respondents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: through their agents</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your testimony?</li> <li>A I said I was aware that, that there were companies that had used Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation.</li> <li>And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor.</li> <li>And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: (Laughing).</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the</li> <li>Respondents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: through their agents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your testimony?</li> <li>A I said I was aware that, that there were companies that had used Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: (Laughing).</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the</li> <li>Respondents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: through their agents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: in response to the ASA.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your testimony?</li> <li>A I said I was aware that, that there were companies that had used Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when they're doing their best to try to work with the situation.</li> <li>And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor.</li> <li>And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing after the ASA was executed?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, you don't know.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: (Laughing).</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the</li> <li>Respondents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: through their agents</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: in response to the ASA.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Are you aware of like a military school for importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline institution where they can learn how to get it right.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>Do you know of any school they can go to to learn to comply with EPA's emission requirements?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on how to apply for certificates.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Good.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your testimony?</li> <li>A I said I was aware that, that there were companies that had used Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>A I can paraphrase your, your question.</li> </ul>

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	Page 759 MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All
1 2	Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.	2	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right.
2 3	<ul><li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li><li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li></ul>	2 3	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay, thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you.</li> <li>Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey.</li> <li>Anyway.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if someone was writing that had a first language either in one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it. MR. CHU: Okay, thank you. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey. Anyway. BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if someone was writing that had a first language either in one of the Asian languages. Have you ever noticed that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it. MR. CHU: Okay, thank you. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey. Anyway. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So now, CEE, that's a EPA approved facility.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if someone was writing that had a first language either in one of the Asian languages. Have you ever noticed that? A No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it. MR. CHU: Okay, thank you. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey. Anyway. BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if someone was writing that had a first language either in one of the Asian languages. Have you ever noticed that? A No. Q Okay. Have you ever heard the phrase Chinglish or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it. MR. CHU: Okay, thank you. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey. Anyway. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So now, CEE, that's a EPA approved facility.</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if someone was writing that had a first language either in one of the Asian languages. Have you ever noticed that? A No. Q Okay. Have you ever heard the phrase Chinglish or Hinglish in the English usage?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it. MR. CHU: Okay, thank you. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey. Anyway. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So now, CEE, that's a EPA approved facility.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if someone was writing that had a first language either in one of the Asian languages. Have you ever noticed that? A No. Q Okay. Have you ever heard the phrase Chinglish or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is what I want to know.</li> <li>A I don't know how you spell it. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it. MR. CHU: Okay, thank you. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q But we know who we're talking about, right?</li> <li>A I know who I'm talking about.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q If it does, I apologize. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone from Jersey. Anyway. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So now, CEE, that's a EPA approved facility.</li> <li>A ccurate?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q They're on the web site, aren't they? The EPA web</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All right. BY MR. CHU: Q So you know when I say that who we're talking about, right? A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada that employs Canadians, right? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. I don't know anything else about the ownership of the company or BY MR. CHU: Q And some of the writings from that company are somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if someone was writing that had a first language either in one of the Asian languages. Have you ever noticed that? A No. Q Okay. Have you ever heard the phrase Chinglish or Hinglish in the English usage? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.

	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 25	Q So she was not attempting to satisfy the demand and complaints that you had?	24	(Laughter.)
23		25	//
	Dago 761		
	Page 761		Page 763
1	A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was	1	Page 763 BY MR. CHU:
1 2		1 2	
	A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.	1	BY MR. CHU: Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?
2	<ul><li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li><li>Q That did not include responding to your written</li></ul>	2	BY MR. CHU: Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis? A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li><li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	BY MR. CHU:QSo as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA wasnegligent or not in your analysis?AI'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.QHow many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li><li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li><li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. CHU: Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis? A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes. Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A I fyou're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> <li>Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret Goldstein emails.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> <li>Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret Goldstein emails.</li> <li>A I'm not quite sure which concerns and complaints</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs, if</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> <li>Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret Goldstein emails.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs, if that's what you're asking.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> <li>Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret Goldstein emails.</li> <li>A I'm not quite sure which concerns and complaints you're talking about.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs, if</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> <li>Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret Goldstein emails.</li> <li>A I'm not quite sure which concerns and complaints you're talking about.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs, if that's what you're asking.</li> <li>Q Okay, good. And just to make it clear, because it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> <li>Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret Goldstein emails.</li> <li>A I'm not quite sure which concerns and complaints you're talking about.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q I'd ask you to look at this and see if this, if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs, if that's what you're asking.</li> <li>Q Okay, good. And just to make it clear, because it was kind of tricky in the answers yesterday, I didn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance report under the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q That did not include responding to your written demands and complaints?</li> <li>A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was.</li> <li>Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters in January?</li> <li>A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes.</li> <li>Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not have happened. So did she or did she not?</li> <li>A She sent emails to me. Correct.</li> <li>Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they not?</li> <li>Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret Goldstein emails.</li> <li>A I'm not quite sure which concerns and complaints you're talking about.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>Q I'd ask you to look at this and see if this, if you remember this being one of the excerpts from those</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was negligent or not in your analysis?</li> <li>A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes.</li> <li>Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA?</li> <li>A I don't recall the exact number.</li> <li>Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind you, you identified quite a number yesterday.</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten or more. You don't really remember?</li> <li>A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs, if that's what you're asking.</li> <li>Q Okay, good. And just to make it clear, because it was kind of tricky in the answers yesterday, I didn't receive a couching of in a year. But we're really more</li> </ul>

	Page 764	Page 766
1	Isn't it?	1 little chart we had up for at least half an hour or so
2	A I	2 yesterday? You don't re, do you remember the chart, is
3	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, vague.	3 what I'm asking you?
4	JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.	4 A I don't know which one you're referring to.
5	THE WITNESS: Model year is more important than	5 Q The chart where you went and compiled information
6	what?	6 from Customs, pulling out information about the number of
7	BY MR. CHU:	7 vehicles, the pricing associated with the invoice, and then
8	Q Having received a report in a certain year.	8 the number of vehicles. Do you remember that?
9	A I would say both are important. Timeliness of	9 A The total declared value of Taotao's imports?
10	reports as well as what was actually tested.	10 Q Right. You didn't put a title name to that chart,
11	Q Certainly. But yesterday in your answers you kept	11 did you?
12	on talking about I didn't get a certain report in a year.	12 A I don't recall.
13	You didn't talk about model year reports. Remember that?	13 Q Well what would the name for that chart have been
14	A I don't know what you mean by model year reports.	14 had you named it?
15	Q Okay. A model year as we just saw, is the year in	15 A Taotao USA's importations between 2009 and 2016.
16	which, a year that is defined by the manufacturer. Do you	16 Q Very good. So when I talk about the number of
17	remember reading that?	17 vehicles, you said you'd have to take a look at it, but you
18	A Yes.	18 just don't know what exhibit number that was, right?
19	Q Is that accurate?	19 A That's correct.
20	A Model year is a defined term in the regulations.	20 (Pause.)
21	Q But did that ASA not also say that is, well, I'll	21 Q Does the number 1,290 ring a bell in terms of one
22	turn back to that.	22 of those counts?
23	A Sure.	23 JUDGE BIRO: That would be count nine.
24	Q Sixty-seven ASA.	24 MR. CHU: Thank you. I thought I heard a bell on
25	A I'm looking at the ASA.	25 this side. Count nine.
	Page 765	Page 767
1	O Do you see the part that you had read for us	1 JUDGE BIRO: And there are 391 for count ten.
1 2	Q Do you see the part that you had read for us earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?	
	<ul><li>Q Do you see the part that you had read for us</li><li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li><li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li></ul>	
2	earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?	2 MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3	earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year? A As is designated by the manufacturer.	<ol> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul><li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li><li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li><li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li></ul>	<ol> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li><li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li><li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li><li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>2 MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>3 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>4 Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>5 was how much?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li><li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li><li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li><li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li><li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>2 MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>3 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>4 Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>5 was how much?</li> <li>6 A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>3 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>4 Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>5 was how much?</li> <li>6 A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>7 Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>3 BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>4 Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>5 was how much?</li> <li>6 A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>7 Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>8 decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this. Strike that.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this.</li> <li>Strike that.</li> <li>So I'm going to move on from willful or</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this. Strike that. So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this. Strike that. So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this. Strike that. So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q For reference, you're very clear on what that is, right?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> <li>characterization.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this. Strike that. So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q For reference, you're very clear on what that is, right?</li> <li>A I believe I remember the engine families. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> <li>characterization.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this. Strike that. So I'm going to move on from willful or</li> <li>negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q For reference, you're very clear on what that is, right?</li> <li>A I believe I remember the engine families. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you remember the number of vehicles associated</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> <li>characterization.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q What's the highest factor you could use?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this.</li> <li>Strike that.</li> <li>So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q For reference, you're very clear on what that is, right?</li> <li>A I believe I remember the engine families. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you remember the number of vehicles associated with count ten?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> <li>characterization.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q What's the highest factor you could use?</li> <li>A The highest factor in the penalty policy is major.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this.</li> <li>Strike that.</li> <li>So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q For reference, you're very clear on what that is, right?</li> <li>A I believe I remember the engine families. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you remember the number of vehicles associated with count ten?</li> <li>A Not off the top of my head, no.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> <li>characterization.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q What's the highest factor you could use?</li> <li>A 6.5.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this. Strike that. So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q For reference, you're very clear on what that is, right?</li> <li>A I believe I remember the engine families. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you remember the number of vehicles associated with count ten?</li> <li>A Not off the top of my head, no.</li> <li>Q Would you please look at it.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> <li>characterization.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q What's the highest factor you could use?</li> <li>A The highest factor in the penalty policy is major.</li> <li>A 6.5.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So you used the very high number, is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>earlier? What's it say about who determines a model year?</li> <li>A As is designated by the manufacturer.</li> <li>Q And that's what I said, right?</li> <li>A I don't even recall what you said.</li> <li>Q And then you said something about the regulations.</li> <li>So what's more important? What's said in the ASA for what we're talking about, or what's said in the regulation?</li> <li>A I suppose it depends what context you're talking about.</li> <li>Q Okay. Let's ask this.</li> <li>Strike that.</li> <li>So I'm going to move on from willful or negligence, okay? And now we're going to talk about counts eight, nine and ten. Okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q For reference, you're very clear on what that is, right?</li> <li>A I believe I remember the engine families. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you remember the number of vehicles associated with count ten?</li> <li>A Not off the top of my head, no.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles</li> <li>was how much?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you</li> <li>decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you</li> <li>not?</li> <li>A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of</li> <li>major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.</li> <li>Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.</li> <li>A Uh</li> <li>Q You just said very high factor.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the</li> <li>characterization.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q What's the highest factor you could use?</li> <li>A 6.5.</li> </ul>

	Page 768		Page 770
1	MR. CHU: I'll withdraw it. Okay, let's go on.	1	Q Right, and you discussed the fact that you had to
2	BY MR. CHU:	2	speculate that these particular vehicles would probably have
3	Q Now, and you based that on the fact that you chose	3	the highest levels of emissions. Is that accurate?
4	to ignore the history of emissions testing associated with	4	A I don't recall that.
5	Taotao USA. Is that accurate?	5	Q Well isn't that what you have to do? If you claim
6	A No.	6	there are no test results, to get to 6.5 you had to
7	Q Well, if you remember the testimony of Mr.	7	basically violate the DLJ letter and say that we are
8	Jackson, he said emission wise, that it was 50 to 60 percent	8	punishing them for egregious emissions violations.
9	in reference to the standard and they were doing a good job	9	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Calls for a legal
10	there. Do you remember that?	10	conclusion.
11	A I remember he talked about some low hour testing.	11	JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
12	I I don't recall that it was counts nine and ten	12	THE WITNESS: I disagree.
13	specifically.	13	BY MR. CHU:
14	Q Well, count nine and ten would have had to have	14	Q Okay. Egregiousness, when there are no test
15	some emissions testing before a certificate was ever	15	results, would you agree we're referring to emissions tests?
16	approved, recertified, or whatever language you want to use.	16	A There were no emission tests to refer to for
17	A A certificate application usually includes	17	counts nine and ten.
18	submission test results, correct.	18	Q I understand, but we're talking about emission
19	Q So contrary to your statement to this Court that	19	tests. My question wasn't was there or was there not. But
20	there are no test results, that's not true, is it?	20	we're talking about emission tests in determining the
21	A It is true.	21	egregious factor that you placed.
22	Q That there were no test results?	22	A Egregiousness is, is, in this case based on the
23	A There were no test results for the vehicles that	23	absence of emission tests.
24	were built.	24	Q But not in the absence of data in history, right?
25	Q I understand that, but as far as the model, when	25	A I'm not sure what you're referring to.
	Page 769		
	-		Page 771
1	we talk about the group of vehicles relating to what you	1	Q Well, history refers to what Mr. Jackson testified
2	we talk about the group of vehicles relating to what you identified to the left-hand side here, you didn't identify	2	Q Well, history refers to what Mr. Jackson testified to, that there's not been a problem with violating the Clean
2 3	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	2 3	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.
2 3 4	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?	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	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.	2 3 4 5	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.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>we talk about the group of vehicles relating to what you identified to the left-hand side here, you didn't identify</li> <li>it. I'm sorry. It's another document where you talk about engine families. Okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So when you identify nine and ten in those engine</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>we talk about the group of vehicles relating to what you identified to the left-hand side here, you didn't identify</li> <li>it. I'm sorry. It's another document where you talk about engine families. Okay?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So when you identify nine and ten in those engine families, you weren't talking about a specific vehicle. You</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay. <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it. BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> <li>Q So you had that data available to you as well when</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Okay. So when you said there were no emission</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it. BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> <li>Q So you had that data available to you as well when you decided to perform the calculations on counts nine and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Okay. So when you said there were no emission results for this engine family</li> <li>A Uh-huh.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Okay. So when you said there were no emission results for this engine family</li> <li>A Uh-huh.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Okay. So when you said there were no emission results for this engine family</li> <li>A Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q that's not accurate, is it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you chose to ignore that historical</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I was I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.</li> <li>Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Okay. So when you said there were no emission results for this engine family</li> <li>A Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q that's not accurate, is it?</li> <li>A Perhaps the better way of phrasing it would be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A Vaguely.</li> <li>Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?</li> <li>A I didn't hear anything about that.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you chose to ignore that historical information, did you not?</li> </ul>

	Page 772		Page 774
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
	Page 773		Page 775
1			
	long, arduous and difficult or a plight from what I see.	1	into those other areas excent they did and that's a fact
2	long, arduous and difficult or a plight from what I see. BY MR. CHU:	1 2	into those other areas except they did and that's a fact. MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that
	BY MR. CHU:		MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that
2	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to	2	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next
2 3	BY MR. CHU:	2 3	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that
2 3 4	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that?	2 3 4	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4 5	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of	2 3 4 5	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development,	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying. MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying. MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying. MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Sure. MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying. MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Sure. MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I believe. Fairness allows me to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. You know the license plates? A Yes, I know the license plates. Q What do you notice the wording on those plates?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying. MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Sure. MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I believe. Fairness allows me to JUDGE BIRO: You're saying that the evidence that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. You know the license plates? A Yes, I know the license plates. Q What do you notice the wording on those plates? A I'm sorry?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying. MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Sure. MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I believe. Fairness allows me to JUDGE BIRO: You're saying that the evidence that a company went into other manufacturing areas is evidence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. You know the license plates? A Yes, I know the license plates. Q What do you notice the wording on those plates? A I'm sorry? JUDGE BIRO: No taxation without representation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. CHU: Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? A I saw how they manufacture other types of products. Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying. MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Sure. MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I believe. Fairness allows me to JUDGE BIRO: You're saying that the evidence that a company went into other manufacturing areas is evidence that the current area in which it manufactures is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. You know the license plates? A Yes, I know the license plates. Q What do you notice the wording on those plates? A I'm sorry? JUDGE BIRO: No taxation without representation. MR. CHU: Thank you, thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that?</li> <li>A I saw how they manufacture other types of products.</li> <li>Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying.</li> <li>MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sure.</li> <li>MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I believe. Fairness allows me to</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: You're saying that the evidence that a company went into other manufacturing areas is evidence that the current area in which it manufactures is not generating enough revenue?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. You know the license plates? A Yes, I know the license plates. Q What do you notice the wording on those plates? A I'm sorry? JUDGE BIRO: No taxation without representation. MR. CHU: Thank you, thank you. JUDGE BIRO: I know what's on them, and I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that?</li> <li>A I saw how they manufacture other types of products.</li> <li>Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying.</li> <li>MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sure.</li> <li>MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I believe. Fairness allows me to</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: You're saying that the evidence that a company went into other manufacturing areas is evidence that the current area in which it manufactures is not generating enough revenue?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Not current, there's nothing about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. You know the license plates? A Yes, I know the license plates. Q What do you notice the wording on those plates? A I'm sorry? JUDGE BIRO: No taxation without representation. MR. CHU: Thank you, thank you. JUDGE BIRO: I know what's on them, and I don't even live here. Go ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that?</li> <li>A I saw how they manufacture other types of products.</li> <li>Q Correct. And so if the development, manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation and counsel is testifying.</li> <li>MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sure.</li> <li>MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I believe. Fairness allows me to</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: You're saying that the evidence that a company went into other manufacturing areas is evidence that the current area in which it manufactures is not generating enough revenue?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that that possibly these extractions let me go to the next question. BY MR. CHU: Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? A On this trip or Q No, in the city. A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, right? A I'm sorry? Q You don't drive. A Uh Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. You know the license plates? A Yes, I know the license plates. Q What do you notice the wording on those plates? A I'm sorry? JUDGE BIRO: No taxation without representation. MR. CHU: Thank you, thank you. JUDGE BIRO: I know what's on them, and I don't

	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
		1	
	Page 777		Page 779
1	THE WITNESS: Somewhat.	1	case. They're not all the same, are they?
1 2	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU:	1 2	case. They're not all the same, are they? A They're different companies.
2 3	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were	1	<ul><li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li><li>A They're different companies.</li><li>Q I'm sorry?</li></ul>
2 3 4	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold	2 3 4	<ul><li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li><li>A They're different companies.</li><li>Q I'm sorry?</li><li>A They appear to have different names.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li><li>A They're different companies.</li><li>Q I'm sorry?</li><li>A They appear to have different names.</li><li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion,	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: just like I looked at things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> <li>Because you identified, you did research on them and you produced web page identifying information on them.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: just like I looked at things before.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> <li>Because you identified, you did research on them and you produced web page identifying information on them.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: just like I looked at things before. MR. CHU: Yes. Your Honor. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> <li>Because you identified, you did research on them and you produced web page identifying information on them.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q How many vehicles did Taotao Group fail to meet</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: just like I looked at things before. MR. CHU: Yes. Your Honor. Okay. BY MR. CHU:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> <li>Because you identified, you did research on them and you produced web page identifying information on them.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q How many vehicles did Taotao Group fail to meet requirements that they were obligated to meet?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: just like I looked at things before. MR. CHU: Yes. Your Honor. Okay. BY MR. CHU: Q You worked on that Pep Boy case, didn't you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> <li>Because you identified, you did research on them and you produced web page identifying information on them.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q How many vehicles did Taotao Group fail to meet requirements that they were obligated to meet?</li> <li>A Would you like me to look at the documents? I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: just like I looked at things before. MR. CHU: Yes. Your Honor. Okay. BY MR. CHU: Q You worked on that Pep Boy case, didn't you? A I did.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> <li>Because you identified, you did research on them and you produced web page identifying information on them.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q How many vehicles did Taotao Group fail to meet requirements that they were obligated to meet?</li> <li>A Would you like me to look at the documents? I don't recall off the top of my head.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Somewhat. BY MR. CHU: Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an agreement to do. Is that not accurate? MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy settlements. JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: just like I looked at things before. MR. CHU: Yes. Your Honor. Okay. BY MR. CHU: Q You worked on that Pep Boy case, didn't you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>case. They're not all the same, are they?</li> <li>A They're different companies.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A They appear to have different names.</li> <li>Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American company in the beginning of our discussions, right?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And the two other companies are companies in what country?</li> <li>A China.</li> <li>Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they not?</li> <li>A As far as I know.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group.</li> <li>Because you identified, you did research on them and you produced web page identifying information on them.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q How many vehicles did Taotao Group fail to meet requirements that they were obligated to meet?</li> <li>A Would you like me to look at the documents? I</li> </ul>

	Page 780		Page 782
1		1	
1	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection	1	Q Okay, so let's just talk about the penalty because
	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 10	you have an amount on Taotao Group that's not duplicate or aggregate, or in the aggregate. Are you?
10 11	responsible for 15.	11	A As far as I know it's not inaccurate.
12	JUDGE BIRO: Well, if they both participated in	12	
13	manufacturing the same vehicle, they can. Somebody	13	Q I said aggregate.
	manufactured the catalyst. Somebody manufactured the rest	14	A Aggregate? Q Adding numbers, adding things.
14 15	of it. So arguably, they could both be manufacturers. In this case maybe they're not, but they could theoretically be	15	
16	two manufacturers of a car.	16	
17	MR. CHU: Agreed, but I think that, maybe to	17	Q There are two companies on your chart here. Is 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?
20	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
	Page 781		Page 783
1	Page 781 BY MR. CHU:	1	Page 783 as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet
1 2		1	5
	BY MR. CHU:	1	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet
2	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated	2	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?
2 3	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group?	2	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA.
2 3 4	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was	2 3 4	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry?
2 3 4 5	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on	2 3 4 5	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and
2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet.	2 3 4 5 6	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.
2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group.	2 3 4 5 6 7	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation. MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation. MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation. MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU: Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? A Yes, together with Taotao USA. Q I'm sorry? A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together. MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation. MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU: Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?</li> <li>A Yes, together with Taotao USA.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?</li> <li>A Not individually, no.</li> <li>Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head, I'm sorry. BY MR. CHU: Q It was one of the last exhibits by your lawyers,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?</li> <li>A Yes, together with Taotao USA.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?</li> <li>A Not individually, no.</li> <li>Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again, where</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going.</li> <li>MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head, I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q It was one of the last exhibits by your lawyers, 213.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?</li> <li>A Yes, together with Taotao USA.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?</li> <li>A Not individually, no.</li> <li>Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again, where</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's the evidence.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head, I'm sorry. BY MR. CHU: Q It was one of the last exhibits by your lawyers, 213. A At 213, so we would need to sum up the total	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?</li> <li>A Yes, together with Taotao USA.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?</li> <li>A Not individually, no.</li> <li>Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again, where</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's the evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can you?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head, I'm sorry. BY MR. CHU: Q It was one of the last exhibits by your lawyers, 213. A At 213, so we would need to sum up the total vehicles in counts one through four. To answer your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?</li> <li>A Yes, together with Taotao USA.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?</li> <li>A Not individually, no.</li> <li>Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again, where</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's the evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can you?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, I think it would be the same</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head, I'm sorry. BY MR. CHU: Q It was one of the last exhibits by your lawyers, 213. A At 213, so we would need to sum up the total vehicles in counts one through four. To answer your question. I don't have a calculator here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?</li> <li>A Yes, together with Taotao USA.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?</li> <li>A Not individually, no.</li> <li>Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again, where</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's the evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can you?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, I think it would be the same as the one for Taotao USA and Taotao Group. If you wanted</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. CHU: Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated with Taotao Group? MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. I've been right there on Taotao Group. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the objection. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head, I'm sorry. BY MR. CHU: Q It was one of the last exhibits by your lawyers, 213. A At 213, so we would need to sum up the total vehicles in counts one through four. To answer your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers?</li> <li>A Yes, together with Taotao USA.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry?</li> <li>A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and Taotao USA together.</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did a calculation for them together. She didn't do an individual calculation.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that may I clarify that? Are you saying you never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group?</li> <li>A Not individually, no.</li> <li>Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again, where</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's the evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can you?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, I think it would be the same</li> </ul>

	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	
6	A res. Q And we see the number of vehicles here, do we not,	6	JUDGE BIRO: So are we asking how many in total is 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
13 14	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are	13 14	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer.
13 14 15	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County.	13 14 15	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on
13 14 15 16	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I	13 14 15 16	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here.
13 14 15 16 17	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the,	13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what	13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint and several liability and you're claiming that
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what I'm saying. Let's not talk about that. Can we just extract	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint and several liability and you're claiming that MR. CHU: That's okay. I'm saying that it's okay
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what I'm saying. Let's not talk about that. Can we just extract this down to does this or does this not represent the number	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint and several liability and you're claiming that MR. CHU: That's okay. I'm saying that it's okay for them to seek that. You know, my challenge is to, the
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what I'm saying. Let's not talk about that. Can we just extract this down to does this or does this not represent the number of vehicles manufactured by that specific manufacturer for	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint and several liability and you're claiming that MR. CHU: That's okay. I'm saying that it's okay for them to seek that. You know, my challenge is to, the jurisdiction of the Court, as to the entities in China will
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what I'm saying. Let's not talk about that. Can we just extract this down to does this or does this not represent the number of vehicles manufactured by that specific manufacturer for the importer, the certificate holder, Taotao USA. I believe	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint and several liability and you're claiming that MR. CHU: That's okay. I'm saying that it's okay for them to seek that. You know, my challenge is to, the jurisdiction of the Court, as to the entities in China will stand on that, but I'm not going to discuss it today.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what I'm saying. Let's not talk about that. Can we just extract this down to does this or does this not represent the number of vehicles manufactured by that specific manufacturer for the importer, the certificate holder, Taotao USA. I believe that's what this says. I'd just like to hear her say yeah.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint and several liability and you're claiming that MR. CHU: That's okay. I'm saying that it's okay for them to seek that. You know, my challenge is to, the jurisdiction of the Court, as to the entities in China will stand on that, but I'm not going to discuss it today. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So what
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. CHU: That's what I see. JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are against Taotao USA and Junyun County. MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what I'm saying. Let's not talk about that. Can we just extract this down to does this or does this not represent the number of vehicles manufactured by that specific manufacturer for the importer, the certificate holder, Taotao USA. I believe	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group so Taotao Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on here. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint and several liability and you're claiming that MR. CHU: That's okay. I'm saying that it's okay for them to seek that. You know, my challenge is to, the jurisdiction of the Court, as to the entities in China will stand on that, but I'm not going to discuss it today.

	Page 788	Page 790
1	MR. CHU: The issue is, I want to focus in on	1 Group, it's your opinion that Taotao Group would not have an
2	Taotao Group which they	2 issue with the ability to pay, was that the purpose?
3	JUDGE BIRO: Which is the manufacturer of those	3 A Yes.
4	number of vehicles in counts one through four.	4 Q Thank you. And is it accurate to say that you had
5	MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor.	5 no internet research, Alibaba results, for Junyun County
6	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.	6 Xiangyuan Industry Company LTD.
7	MR. CHU: And I want to get her to state on the	7 A I believe that was one of the companies mentioned
8	record that, on behalf of EPA, we have determined a penalty	8 on the Taotao Group page. I believe Taotao Group owns
9	of \$225,472.50. If they want to stipulate to that, I can	9 Junyun County.
10	move on.	10 Q So you're telling this Court based upon your
11	JUDGE BIRO: I'm still a little confused.	11 research, okay, that you have submitted evidence and
12	MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm confused as well, Your	12 information indicating that the ownership interest of Junyun
13	Honor. I'm not	13 County Xiangyuan Industry Company is owned as a subsidiary
14	JUDGE BIRO: Why don't you ask the next question?	14 of the Taotao Group company. Is that accurate?
15	Maybe that will clarify it.	15 A That's my understanding, yes.
16	BY MR. CHU:	16 Q I'm asking do you believe that you offered
17	Q Did you did you not did you or did you not	17         evidence and supported that? Because I'm going to ask you
18	make a penalty calculation as to vehicles manufactured by	18 what that evidence is.
19	the Taotao Group Company LTD in China?	19 MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, asked and answered.
20	A I calculated a penalty for Taotao Group and Taotao	20 JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.
21	USA combined.	21 BY MR. CHU:
22	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's the answer. You've got	22 Q Okay. So what is that evidence that you submitted
23	to move on now.	23 showing ownership?
24	BY MR. CHU:	24 A Well, the web page cites it and then I believe we
25	Q And is that amount \$225,472.50?	25 have a PowerPoint which shows that as well.
		David 701
	Page 789	Page 791
1	A Yes.	1 Q But you have no documents from the government of
1 2	_	
	A Yes.	1 Q But you have no documents from the government of
2	<ul><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q Okay. So are you asking this Court to make Taotao</li></ul>	1 Q But you have no documents from the government of 2 China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?
2 3	A Yes. Q Okay. So are you asking this Court to make Taotao Group responsible for the vehicles manufactured by Junyun	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.
2 3 4	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?	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. So are you asking this Court to make Taotao</li> <li>Group responsible for the vehicles manufactured by Junyun</li> <li>County Xiangyuan Industry Company as well?</li> <li>MR. HAWKINS: Again, Your Honor. I'm going to</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Q But you have no documents from the government of</li> <li>China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q And I understand that you classified these groups,</li> <li>these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	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	<ol> <li>Q But you have no documents from the government of</li> <li>China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q And I understand that you classified these groups,</li> <li>these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing</li> <li>this?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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.	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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?	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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:	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?       15         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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 s(1,375,676.45. BY MR. CHU: Q And my question was, are you asking this Court,	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that         17       you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?       15         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that         17       you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you         18       who the owner is. Isn't that accurate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>So you've divided up the penalty?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?       15         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that         17       you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you         18       who the owner is. Isn't that accurate?         19       A       Yes, I believe so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>So you've divided up the penalty?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?       15         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that         17       you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you         18       who the owner is. Isn't that accurate?         19       A       Yes, I believe so.         20       Q       And it says 100 percent shareholder, and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>So you've divided up the penalty?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> </ul>	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?       15         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that         17       you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you         18       who the owner is. Isn't that accurate?         19       A       Yes, I believe so.         20       Q       And it says 100 percent shareholder, and you         21       remember that, right? Do you need me to show you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>So you've divided up the penalty?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q You say I think so?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Okay, good. Thank you very much.</li> </ul>	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?       15         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that         17       you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you         18       who the owner is. Isn't that accurate?         19       A       Yes, I believe so.         20       Q       And it says 100 percent shareholder, and you         21       remember that, right? Do you need me to show you         2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>So you've divided up the penalty?</li> <li>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 s(1,375,676.45).</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q You say I think so?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> </ul>	1       Q       But you have no documents from the government of         2       China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?         3       A       I don't think so.         4       Q       And I understand that you classified these groups,         5       these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing         6       this?         7       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of         8       the question.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         10       BY MR. CHU:         11       Q       Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?         12       A       Okay.         13       Q       Is it your position that Daction is owned by one         14       of the Respondents?       15         15       A       I'm not, I'm not certain.         16       Q       Well is that information clear on the records that         17       you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you         18       who the owner is. Isn't that accurate?         19       A       Yes, I believe so.         20       Q       And it says 100 percent shareholder, and you         21       remember that, right? Do you need me to show you         22

	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	<ul><li>38. I know you've seen the color version of this, right?</li></ul>
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		17	
18	Q Do you remember the discussion I had with the		and admitted if I didn't offer it. I thought we had.
19	Court about a person named Lee?	18	That's what my mistake was.
	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	11
	Daga 702		
	Page 793		Page 795
1	A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.	1	Page 795 BY MR. CHU:
1 2		1 2	
	A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.		BY MR. CHU:
2	A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.	2	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second
2 3	A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry. JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?	2 3	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> </ul>	2 3 4	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you?
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity.</li> <li>I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this?</li> <li>MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A ''A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act.'' Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three companies.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three companies.</li> <li>A Oh, I only see Qiong Lee's name. I don't see any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Is there a file? Is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three companies.</li> <li>A Oh, I only see Qiong Lee's name. I don't see any other company's name.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Is there a file? Is the question why isn't there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three companies.</li> <li>A Oh, I only see Qiong Lee's name. I don't see any other company's name.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So yesterday when you said they're all</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you?</li> <li>A I do remember that.</li> <li>Q Will you read that starting with A, please?</li> <li>A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act."</li> <li>Q What was the EPA's basis for that?</li> <li>A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division.</li> <li>Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Is there a file? Is the question why isn't there?</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three companies.</li> <li>A Oh, I only see Qiong Lee's name. I don't see any other company's name.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So yesterday when you said they're all the same, you did not, you're not including Daction, are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Is there a file? Is the question why isn't there? MR. CHU: Yes. THE WITNESS: I don't know that there isn't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three companies.</li> <li>A Oh, I only see Qiong Lee's name. I don't see any other company's name.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So yesterday when you said they're all the same, you did not, you're not including Daction, are you?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Is there a file? Is the question why isn't there? MR. CHU: Yes. THE WITNESS: I don't know that there isn't. There may be one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. I'm sorry.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor ?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates</li> <li>number EPA, 2610.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Is that clear on your screen there?</li> <li>A Yes, it is.</li> <li>Q Now do you remember whether or not those named entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of Daction or not?</li> <li>A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner in 2012.</li> <li>Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three companies.</li> <li>A Oh, I only see Qiong Lee's name. I don't see any other company's name.</li> <li>Q Thank you. So yesterday when you said they're all the same, you did not, you're not including Daction, are you?</li> <li>A I don't recall saying they're all the same.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY MR. CHU: Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it because you don't remember it, do you? A I do remember that. Q Will you read that starting with A, please? A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air Act." Q What was the EPA's basis for that? A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air Enforcement Division. Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet or an area that talks about these types of problems when you join that department? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Is there a file? Is the question why isn't there? MR. CHU: Yes. THE WITNESS: I don't know that there isn't. There may be one. BY MR. CHU:

	Page 796	Page 79	8
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 th	ie
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 Chine	ese
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.	<ul> <li>18 Q In fact you deal a lot with her, don't you?</li> <li>19 A A lot is a relative term.</li> </ul>	
19	Q Two thousand and		
20	A Seven.	20 Q That is one of the individuals that in fact went 21 with Mr. Jackson to China this year, right?	
21 22	Q About the same time that the birth of Taotao USA came into place, right?	22 A I don't know who he took with him.	
22	A If it was 2007, yes.	23 Q You didn't hear that?	
23	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 79	99
1	Page 797 A I think that's	1 here, Would you agree?	99
1 2			
	A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A I think that's</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I think that's</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I think that's</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I think that's</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU: Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU: Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU: Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU: Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know. BY MR. CHU:	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these</li> <li>Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these</li> <li>Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these</li> <li>Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?</li> <li>A That's my opinion.</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Well you want to take his wife's house, don't you?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these</li> <li>Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?</li> <li>A That's my opinion.</li> <li>Q Yes. And so therefore when I say culprit, we</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Well you want to take his wife's house, don't you?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> </ul>	1       here, Would you agree?         2       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form         3       that question.         4       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         5       BY MR. CHU:         6       Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your         7       writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the         8       enforcement action?         9       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.         10       Argumentative, irrelevant.         11       JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.         12       THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it         13       applies.         14       BY MR. CHU:         15       Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these         16       Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?         17       A That's my opinion.         18       Q Yes. And so therefore when I say culprit, we         19       normally use that term when we associate or discuss things	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Well you want to take his wife's house, don't you?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Wasn't that the purpose of what you did yesterday</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>here, Would you agree?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form</li> <li>that question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your</li> <li>writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the</li> <li>enforcement action?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.</li> <li>Argumentative, irrelevant.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it</li> <li>applies.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these</li> <li>Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?</li> <li>A That's my opinion.</li> <li>Q Yes. And so therefore when I say culprit, we</li> <li>normally use that term when we associate or discuss things</li> <li>that are in violation of the law, acts, people, et cetera,</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Well you want to take his wife's house, don't you?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Wasn't that the purpose of what you did yesterday by telling this Court that they have a house, okay, his wife</li> </ul>	1here, Would you agree?2MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form3that question.4JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.5BY MR. CHU:6Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your7writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the8enforcement action?9MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.10Argumentative, irrelevant.11JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.12THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it13applies.14BY MR. CHU:15Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these16Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?17A That's my opinion.18Q Yes. And so therefore when I say culprit, we19normally use that term when we associate or discuss things20that are in violation of the law, acts, people, et cetera,21do we not?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Well you want to take his wife's house, don't you?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Wasn't that the purpose of what you did yesterday by telling this Court that they have a house, okay, his wife has a house that's her residence in Texas. Isn't that what</li> </ul>	1       here, Would you agree?         2       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form         3       that question.         4       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         5       BY MR. CHU:         6       Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your         7       writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the         8       enforcement action?         9       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.         10       Argumentative, irrelevant.         11       JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.         12       THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it         13       applies.         14       BY MR. CHU:         15       Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these         16       Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?         17       A That's my opinion.         18       Q Yes. And so therefore when I say culprit, we         19       normally use that term when we associate or discuss things         20       that are in violation of the law, acts, people, et cetera,         21       A I suppose.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I think that's MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal conclusion.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the owners of the company? Do you know?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague question.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the context. I don't know.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of the Respondents, have you not?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Well you want to take his wife's house, don't you?</li> <li>A I don't think so.</li> <li>Q Wasn't that the purpose of what you did yesterday by telling this Court that they have a house, okay, his wife has a house that's her residence in Texas. Isn't that what you want this Court to do?</li> </ul>	1       here, Would you agree?         2       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form         3       that question.         4       JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.         5       BY MR. CHU:         6       Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your         7       writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the         8       enforcement action?         9       MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.         10       Argumentative, irrelevant.         11       JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.         12       THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it         13       applies.         14       BY MR. CHU:         15       Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these         16       Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct?         17       A That's my opinion.         18       Q Yes. And so therefore when I say culprit, we         19       normally use that term when we associate or discuss things         20       that are in violation of the law, acts, people, et cetera,         21       A I suppose.         22       A I suppose.         23       Q Okay Now your bachelor's degree, one of your	

	Page 800		Page 802
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?
	with the Respondents?	18	MR. CHU: Other than the complaint.
18		1 1 1	T (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 0
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
19 20	MR. CHU: She's already said she didn't. And I'm asking her about, you know, whether or not they have this	20	and to the current time, this complaint was filed in 2015.
19 20 21	MR. CHU: She's already said she didn't. And I'm asking her about, you know, whether or not they have this available to them. And then the follow-up question	20 21	and to the current time, this complaint was filed in 2015. You want to hit the manufacturers which are separate
19 20 21 22	MR. CHU: She's already said she didn't. And I'm asking her about, you know, whether or not they have this available to them. And then the follow-up question JUDGE BIRO: Could she have used Chinese	20 21 22	and to the current time, this complaint was filed in 2015. You want to hit the manufacturers which are separate entities, and I'm asking her why didn't you on your
19 20 21 22 23	MR. CHU: She's already said she didn't. And I'm asking her about, you know, whether or not they have this available to them. And then the follow-up question JUDGE BIRO: Could she have used Chinese interpreters.	20 21 22 23	and to the current time, this complaint was filed in 2015. You want to hit the manufacturers which are separate entities, and I'm asking her why didn't you on your enforcement side have the cultural awareness and the decency
19 20 21 22	MR. CHU: She's already said she didn't. And I'm asking her about, you know, whether or not they have this available to them. And then the follow-up question JUDGE BIRO: Could she have used Chinese	20 21 22	and to the current time, this complaint was filed in 2015. You want to hit the manufacturers which are separate entities, and I'm asking her why didn't you on your

	Page 804		Page 806
1	liabilities and telling them that if they don't do X, 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
20	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
25	paper.		····· ····· ······ ···· ···· ···· ···· ····
	Page 805		Page 807
1	Page 805 A That's that would be speculation.	1	Page 807 haven't, you know, covered.
1 2		1 2	
	A That's that would be speculation.	1	haven't, you know, covered.
2	A That's that would be speculation. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.	2	haven't, you know, covered. JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?
2 3	<ul><li>A That's that would be speculation.</li><li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li><li>BY MR. CHU:</li></ul>	2 3	haven't, you know, covered. JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking</li> </ul>	2 3 4	haven't, you know, covered. JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	haven't, you know, covered. JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right. MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking</li> <li>that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	haven't, you know, covered. JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right. MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer. MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	haven't, you know, covered. JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right. MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer. MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking</li> <li>that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been</li> <li>certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> </ul>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going</li> <li>to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going</li> <li>to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going</li> <li>to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your</li> <li>calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going</li> <li>to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your</li> <li>calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the</li> <li>gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical. JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical. JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter and the requirement that we offer her resume or curriculum</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And that adjustment was based on the 2010</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A That's that would be speculation. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. BY MR. CHU: Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical. JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert. MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter and the requirement that we offer her resume or curriculum vitae. But we never formally offered her as an expert in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And that adjustment was based on the 2010 administrative settlement agreement, right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter and the requirement that we offer her resume or curriculum vitae. But we never formally offered her as an expert in this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical. JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter and the requirement that we offer her resume or curriculum vitae. But we never formally offered her as an expert in this JUDGE BIRO: Right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And that adjustment was based on the 2010 administrative settlement agreement, right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q The previous violation of the administrative</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical. JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter and the requirement that we offer her resume or curriculum vitae. But we never formally offered her as an expert in this</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Right. MR. CHU: So I'm going to accept that as saying</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And that adjustment was based on the 2010 administrative settlement agreement, right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q The previous violation of the administrative settlement agreement of 2010, was that the COC application</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A That's that would be speculation. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical. JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been certified as an expert.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I thought that's why the JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a fact witness.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter and the requirement that we offer her resume or curriculum vitae. But we never formally offered her as an expert in this JUDGE BIRO: Right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: So I'm going to accept that as saying she's not an expert for any purposes in this case.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>haven't, you know, covered.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's all right.</li> <li>MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And that adjustment was based on the 2010 administrative settlement agreement, right?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q The previous violation of the administrative settlement agreement of 2010, was that the COC application for certain non-road vehicles did not list adjustable</li> </ul>

	Page 808		Page 810
1	A More or less.	1	Q Okay. And were all the vehicles subject to the
2	Q And those all included in on-road vehicles?	2	adjustable parameter violations corrected pursuant to the
3	MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm sorry. Can we speak a	3	subject vehicle corrective action plan in the ASA?
4	little more slowly, please? There's a little bit of an echo	4	A As far as I know, yes.
5	and	5	Q And Taotao paid the Agency \$260,000 for that
6	MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. I'll move back a little,	6	violation?
7	too. I'll just repeat that.	7	A Yes, it did.
8	BY MS. TARIQ:	8	Q And Taotao USA, Inc., and only Taotao USA, Inc.,
9	Q The previous violation in the 2010 administrative	9	was a part of that administrative penalty agreement
10	settlement agreement was that the COC applications for	10	administrative settlement agreement?
11	certain non-road vehicles did not list adjustable	11	A Yes.
12	parameters. Correct?	12	Q And do you know that, okay. Sorry.
13	A The violation was importation of thousands of	13	And it is your understanding that you considered
14	uncertified vehicles with non-compliant carburetors.	14	all the factors listed in the penalty policy under
15	Q Okay. And all those included non-road vehicles?	15	adjustment for history of non-compliance?
16	A Those were all non-road vehicles, yes.	16	A I believe so.
17	Q And none of the engine family applications that	17	Q And those factors are: one, how similar the
18	were identified in the ASA are identified in this complaint?	18	previous violation was; how recent the previous violation
19	A I don't believe those applications are identified	19	was; the number of previous violations; the violator's
20	in the, in sorry, in the complaint?	20	efforts to remedy previous violations?
21	Q Yes, in this amended, in this complaint.	21	A Yes.
22	A Those vehicles are not in this complaint, no.	22	Q And those are the only four factors in the penalty
23	JUDGE BIRO: Ms. Tariq, can you enunciate just a	23	policy?
24	little bit more?	24	A I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
25	MS. TARIQ: Yes. Sorry.	25	Q And those are the only four factors in the penalty
	Page 809		- 011
	Page 609		Page 811
1	JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry.	1	Page 811 policy for a history of non-compliance?
1 2		1 2	Ū.
	JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry.		policy for a history of non-compliance?
2	JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. BY MS. TARIQ:	2	policy for a history of non-compliance? A I'd have to look at it to double check.
2 3	JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. BY MS. TARIQ: Q And the applications that are identified in this	2 3	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.
2 3 4	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?	2 3 4	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.)
2 3 4 5	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	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>remember correctly. Yeah, if you go to the next page, Bates</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>remember correctly. Yeah, if you go to the next page, Bates</li> <li>480, in the third paragraph down, if there was more than one</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>remember correctly. Yeah, if you go to the next page, Bates</li> <li>480, in the third paragraph down, if there was more than one prior violation, you could adjust up to 70 percent.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> <li>Q So 35 percent.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> <li>Q So 35 percent.</li> <li>A Right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> <li>Q So 35 percent.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q Have you ever applied a 35 percent increase for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> <li>Q So 35 percent.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q Have you ever applied a 35 percent increase for history of non-compliance against a manufacturer in the 50</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> <li>Q Bo 35 percent.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> <li>Q So 35 percent.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I believe so. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>policy for a history of non-compliance?</li> <li>A I'd have to look at it to double check.</li> <li>Q Okay, I believe it's CX22. (Pause.)</li> <li>A I see the description on Bates ending in 479. (Pause.)</li> <li>Q Those are the only four factors?</li> <li>A It looks like it. Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?</li> <li>A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I</li> <li>remember correctly. Yeah, if you go to the next page, Bates</li> <li>480, in the third paragraph down, if there was more than one prior violation, you could adjust up to 70 percent.</li> <li>Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.</li> <li>A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.</li> <li>Q So 35 percent.</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>

	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	1	Page 815
1	Page 813 BY MS. TARIO:		Page 815
1 2	BY MS. TARIQ:	1	professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure
	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this		professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?
2	BY MS. TARIQ:	2	professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct? A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.
2 3	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?	2	professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct? A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer. I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that
2 3 4	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent? A No.	2 3 4	professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct? A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer. I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.
2 3 4 5	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent? A No. Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry	2 3 4 5	professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct? A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer. I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that
2 3 4 5 6	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent? A No. Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li><li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li><li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li><li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent? A No. Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li><li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li><li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li><li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li><li>A Yes.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent? A No. Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications. A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent? A No. Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications. A To the best of my recollection, that's correct. Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MS. TARIQ: Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent? A No. Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications. A To the best of my recollection, that's correct. Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we chose to group them the way we did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> <li>Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we chose to group them the way we did.</li> <li>Q Okay. And all the vehicles manufactured by Taotao</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> <li>Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff that is a professional engineer?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we chose to group them the way we did.</li> <li>Q Okay. And all the vehicles manufactured by Taotao Group are on newer vehicles that are part of this complaint?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> <li>Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff that is a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I'm not, I don't think she is a professional</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we chose to group them the way we did.</li> <li>Q Okay. And all the vehicles manufactured by Taotao Group are on newer vehicles that are part of this complaint?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> <li>Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff that is a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I'm not, I don't think she is a professional engineer.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we chose to group them the way we did.</li> <li>Q Okay. And all the vehicles manufactured by Taotao Group are on newer vehicles that are part of this complaint?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And once again, the 2010 administrative settlement</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> <li>Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff that is a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I'm not, I don't think she is a professional engineer. I could be wrong, but, to the best of my recollection. I haven't looked at these documents for a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we chose to group them the way we did.</li> <li>Q Okay. And all the vehicles manufactured by Taotao Group are on newer vehicles that are part of this complaint?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And once again, the 2010 administrative settlement agreement only included non-road vehicles.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer. I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> <li>Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff that is a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I'm not, I don't think she is a professional engineer. I could be wrong, but, to the best of my recollection. I haven't looked at these documents for a while.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this complaint as a respondent?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications.</li> <li>A To the best of my recollection, that's correct.</li> <li>Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Not just Taotao USA.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the \$1,375,676.45?</li> <li>A That's correct. I would note that we could have alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we chose to group them the way we did.</li> <li>Q Okay. And all the vehicles manufactured by Taotao Group are on newer vehicles that are part of this complaint?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And once again, the 2010 administrative settlement</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure compliance, correct?</li> <li>A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer.</li> <li>I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that engineer was.</li> <li>Q It would likely be to ensure compliance.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q With the ASA agreement.</li> <li>A With the compliance plan.</li> <li>Q And do you recall that such an engineer was retained?</li> <li>A Can you repeat that?</li> <li>Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement?</li> <li>A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA hired Harrison Wolf.</li> <li>Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I believe they have one on staff.</li> <li>Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff that is a professional engineer?</li> <li>A I'm not, I don't think she is a professional engineer. I could be wrong, but, to the best of my recollection. I haven't looked at these documents for a</li> </ul>

	Page 816		Page 818
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.
20		20	Do you remember that?
21	Q Did that test report include engine family CTAOC.049MC1?	22	A No.
		23	
23 24	A I believe so.	23	Q I'm just going to find the exhibit number.
24 25	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
	Dama 817		
	Page 817		Page 819
1	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you	1	Page 819 can't find it.
1 2	2	1 2	
	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you	1	can't find it.
2	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?	2	can't find it. BY MS. TARIQ:
2 3	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall? A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.	2 3	can't find it. BY MS. TARIQ: Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's</li> </ul>	2 3 4	can't find it. BY MS. TARIQ: Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.
2 3 4 5	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall? A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry. Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.	2 3 4 5	can't find it. BY MS. TARIQ: Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced. I'll go back
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	can't find it. BY MS. TARIQ: Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced. I'll go back A Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall? A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry. Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) A I have it in front of me.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to</li> <li>count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to</li> <li>count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was</li> <li>tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall? A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry. Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) A I have it in front of me. Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to</li> <li>count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was</li> <li>tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles</li> <li>belonging to count four had been produced.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall? A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry. Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) A I have it in front of me. Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012? A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall? A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry. Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) A I have it in front of me. Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012? A Yes. Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to</li> <li>count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was</li> <li>tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles</li> <li>belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall? A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry. Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) A I have it in front of me. Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012? A Yes. Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to</li> <li>count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was</li> <li>tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles</li> <li>belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after</li> <li>the COC expires?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) <ul> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012. <ul> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.     <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.         (Pause.)         A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?         A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.         Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four         A Yes.</li> <li>Q in March of 2012.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) <ul> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four <ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q in March of 2012.</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.         (Pause.)         A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?         A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.         Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four         A Yes.</li> <li>Q in March of 2012.</li> <li>A Yes, that sounds right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This calls for speculation.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.     <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q in March of 2012.</li> <li>A Yes, that sounds right.</li> <li>Q Was the catalyst collected in March of 2012 then tested in June of 2013?</li> </ul></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Speculation, yeah.</li> <li>Go ahead.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.     <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q - in March of 2012.</li> <li>A Yes, that sounds right.</li> <li>Q Was the catalyst collected in March of 2012 then tested in June of 2013?</li> <li>A That sounds like it's possible, yeah.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Speculation, yeah.</li> <li>Go ahead.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please. (Pause.) <ul> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q in March of 2012.</li> <li>A Yes, that sounds right.</li> <li>Q Was the catalyst collected in March of 2012 then tested in June of 2013?</li> <li>A That sounds like it's possible, yeah.</li> <li>Q So the catalyst was sent to ERG to be tested over</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Speculation, yeah.</li> <li>Go ahead.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Have you ever seen an incident where there</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.         (Pause.)         <ul> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q - in March of 2012.</li> <li>A Yes, that sounds right.</li> <li>Q Was the catalyst collected in March of 2012 then tested in June of 2013?</li> <li>A That sounds like it's possible, yeah.</li> <li>Q So the catalyst was sent to ERG to be tested over a year after Customs collected it and about six months after</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Speculation, yeah.</li> <li>Go ahead.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Have you ever seen an incident where there wouldn't, a manufacturer would produce something and then it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.     <ul> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q in March of 2012.</li> <li>A Yes, that sounds right.</li> <li>Q Was the catalyst collected in March of 2012 then tested in June of 2013?</li> <li>A That sounds like it's possible, yeah.</li> <li>Q So the catalyst was sent to ERG to be tested over a year after Customs collected it and about six months after Harrison Wolf submitted a report on count four?</li> </ul></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Speculation, yeah.</li> <li>Go ahead.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Have you ever seen an incident where there wouldn't, a manufacturer would produce something and then it would not be imported for six months after the expiration of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you recall?</li> <li>A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry.</li> <li>Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's CX77 please.         (Pause.)         <ul> <li>A I have it in front of me.</li> <li>Q Does that show that it was submitted in December of 2012?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a little to March of 2012.</li> <li>Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q - in March of 2012.</li> <li>A Yes, that sounds right.</li> <li>Q Was the catalyst collected in March of 2012 then tested in June of 2013?</li> <li>A That sounds like it's possible, yeah.</li> <li>Q So the catalyst was sent to ERG to be tested over a year after Customs collected it and about six months after</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>can't find it.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to count four were produced.</li> <li>I'll go back</li> <li>A Thank you.</li> <li>Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles belonging to count four had been produced.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after the COC expires?</li> <li>A That's right.</li> <li>Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Speculation, yeah.</li> <li>Go ahead.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Have you ever seen an incident where there wouldn't, a manufacturer would produce something and then it</li> </ul>

	Page 820	Page 822
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	agree? A Yes.	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> </ol>
2 3	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> </ol>
2 3 4	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG?	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> <li>to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically.	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> <li>to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.</li> <li>Q Okay. And then would you please read your</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> <li>to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.</li> <li>Q Okay. And then would you please read your</li> <li>response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty?	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> <li>to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.</li> <li>Q Okay. And then would you please read your</li> <li>response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your</li> <li>message. The paragraph after that.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> <li>to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.</li> <li>Q Okay. And then would you please read your</li> <li>response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your</li> <li>message. The paragraph after that.</li> <li>A It's kind of cut off by the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit.	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> <li>to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.</li> <li>Q Okay. And then would you please read your</li> <li>response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your</li> <li>message. The paragraph after that.</li> <li>A It's kind of cut off by the</li> <li>Q Oh, I'm sorry.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275.	<ol> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last</li> <li>line over here, or that email, the last</li> <li>A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline</li> <li>to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.</li> <li>Q Okay. And then would you please read your</li> <li>response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your</li> <li>message. The paragraph after that.</li> <li>A It's kind of cut off by the</li> <li>Q Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A screen.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you.	1BY MS. TARIQ:2QMs. Isin, can you just read the read the last3line over here, or that email, the last4APlease let us know if an extension of the deadline5to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.6QOkay. And then would you please read your7response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your8message. The paragraph after that.9AIt's kind of cut off by the10QOh, I'm sorry.11A screen.12"Also we will consider an extension to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ:	1BY MS. TARIQ:2QMs. Isin, can you just read the read the last3line over here, or that email, the last4APlease let us know if an extension of the deadline5to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.6QOkay. And then would you please read your7response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your8message. The paragraph after that.9AIt's kind of cut off by the10QOh, I'm sorry.11A screen.12"Also we will consider an extension to the13September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal	1       BY MS. TARIQ:         2       Q       Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last         3       line over here, or that email, the last         4       A       Please let us know if an extension of the deadline         5       to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.         6       Q       Okay. And then would you please read your         7       response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your         8       message. The paragraph after that.         9       A       It's kind of cut off by the         10       Q       Oh, I'm sorry.         11       A       screen.         12       "Also we will consider an extension to the         13       September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to         14       know when we can expect to receive the report."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275	1BY MS. TARIQ:2QMs. Isin, can you just read the read the last3line over here, or that email, the last4APlease let us know if an extension of the deadline5to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.6QOkay. And then would you please read your7response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your8message. The paragraph after that.9AIt's kind of cut off by the10QOh, I'm sorry.11A screen.12"Also we will consider an extension to the13September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to14know when we can expect to receive the report."15QSo, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG?</li> <li>A I don't recall specifically.</li> <li>Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 21,275.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four?</li> </ul>	1BY MS. TARIQ:2QMs. Isin, can you just read the read the last3line over here, or that email, the last4APlease let us know if an extension of the deadline5to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.6QOkay. And then would you please read your7response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your8message. The paragraph after that.9AIt's kind of cut off by the10QOh, I'm sorry.11A screen.12"Also we will consider an extension to the13September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to14know when we can expect to receive the report."15QSo, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to16December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four? A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would	1BY MS. TARIQ:2QMs. Isin, can you just read the read the last3line over here, or that email, the last4APlease let us know if an extension of the deadline5to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.6QOkay. And then would you please read your7response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your8message. The paragraph after that.9AIt's kind of cut off by the10QOh, I'm sorry.11A screen.12"Also we will consider an extension to the13September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to14know when we can expect to receive the report."15QSo, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to16December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG?</li> <li>A I don't recall specifically.</li> <li>Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 21,275.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four?</li> </ul>	1       BY MS. TARIQ:         2       Q       Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last         3       line over here, or that email, the last         4       A       Please let us know if an extension of the deadline         5       to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.         6       Q       Okay. And then would you please read your         7       response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your         8       message. The paragraph after that.         9       A       It's kind of cut off by the         10       Q       Oh, I'm sorry.         11       A       screen.         12       "Also we will consider an extension to the         13       September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to         14       know when we can expect to receive the report."         15       Q       So, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to         16       December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still         17       negligent in willful and negligent at least, just talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four? A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would have to go through. I would note that the SGS report is for	1       BY MS. TARIQ:         2       Q       Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last         3       line over here, or that email, the last         4       A       Please let us know if an extension of the deadline         5       to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.         6       Q       Okay. And then would you please read your         7       response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your         8       message. The paragraph after that.         9       A       It's kind of cut off by the         10       Q       Oh, I'm sorry.         11       A       screen.         12       "Also we will consider an extension to the         13       September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to         14       know when we can expect to receive the report."         15       Q       So, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to         16       December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still         17       negligent in willful and negligent at least, just talking         18       about count four here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four? A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would have to go through. I would note that the SGS report is for a post importation vehicle. We had in our settlement	1BY MS. TARIQ:2QMs. Isin, can you just read the read the last3line over here, or that email, the last4APlease let us know if an extension of the deadline5to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.6QOkay. And then would you please read your7response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your8message. The paragraph after that.9AIt's kind of cut off by the10QOh, I'm sorry.11A screen.12"Also we will consider an extension to the13September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to14know when we can expect to receive the report."15QSo, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to16December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still17negligent in willful and negligent at least, just talking18about count four here.19A19A14Well, yeah, like I said, you know, there are still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG?</li> <li>A I don't recall specifically.</li> <li>Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 21,275.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four?</li> <li>A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would have to go through. I would note that the SGS report is for a post importation vehicle. We had in our settlement agreement catalyst testing was required to be pre-</li> </ul>	1BY MS. TARIQ:2QMs. Isin, can you just read the read the last3line over here, or that email, the last4APlease let us know if an extension of the deadline5to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.6QOkay. And then would you please read your7response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your8message. The paragraph after that.9AIt's kind of cut off by the10QOh, I'm sorry.11A screen.12"Also we will consider an extension to the13September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to14know when we can expect to receive the report."15QSo, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to16December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still17negligent in willful and negligent at least, just talking18about count four here.19A19A20some other issues. This was a post-importation vehicle,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>agree?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG?</li> <li>A I don't recall specifically.</li> <li>Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty?</li> <li>A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 21,275.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four?</li> <li>A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would have to go through. I would note that the SGS report is for a post importation vehicle. We had in our settlement agreement catalyst testing was required to be pre-importation. Thee's, you know, a number of discrepancies</li> </ul>	1       BY MS. TARIQ:         2       Q       Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last         3       line over here, or that email, the last         4       A       Please let us know if an extension of the deadline         5       to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.         6       Q       Okay. And then would you please read your         7       response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your         8       message. The paragraph after that.         9       A       It's kind of cut off by the         10       Q       Oh, I'm sorry.         11       A       screen.         12       "Also we will consider an extension to the         13       September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to         14       know when we can expect to receive the report."         15       Q       So, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to         16       December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still         17       negligent in willful and negligent at least, just talking         18       about count four here.         19       A       Well, yeah, like I said, you know, there are still         20       some other issues. This was a post-importation vehicle,         21
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four? A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would have to go through. I would note that the SGS report is for a post importation vehicle. We had in our settlement agreement catalyst testing was required to be pre- importation. Thee's, you know, a number of discrepancies still.	1       BY MS. TARIQ:         2       Q       Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last         3       line over here, or that email, the last         4       A       Please let us know if an extension of the deadline         5       to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.         6       Q       Okay. And then would you please read your         7       response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your         8       message. The paragraph after that.         9       A       It's kind of cut off by the         10       Q       Oh, I'm sorry.         11       A       screen.         12       "Also we will consider an extension to the         13       September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to         14       know when we can expect to receive the report."         15       Q       So, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to         16       December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still         17       negligent in willful and negligent at least, just talking         18       about count four here.         19       A       Well, yeah, like I said, you know, there are still         20       some other issues. This was a post-importation vehicle,         21
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	agree? A Yes. Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later in 2013 to ERG? A I don't recall specifically. Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in the proposed penalty? A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you have the exhibit. JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 vehicles belonging to count four? A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would have to go through. I would note that the SGS report is for a post importation vehicle. We had in our settlement agreement catalyst testing was required to be pre- importation. Thee's, you know, a number of discrepancies still. Q Did Harrison Wolf request an extension to the	1       BY MS. TARIQ:         2       Q       Ms. Isin, can you just read the read the last         3       line over here, or that email, the last         4       A       Please let us know if an extension of the deadline         5       to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable.         6       Q       Okay. And then would you please read your         7       response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your         8       message. The paragraph after that.         9       A       It's kind of cut off by the         10       Q       Oh, I'm sorry.         11       A       screen.         12       "Also we will consider an extension to the         13       September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to         14       know when we can expect to receive the report."         15       Q       So, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to         16       December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still         17       negligent in willful and negligent at least, just talking         18       about count four here.         19       A       Well, yeah, like I said, you know, there are still         20       some other issues. This was a post-importation vehicle,         21

## Page 824

## Page 826

	Page 624		Page 620
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.
20	the willfulness and negligence factor and she provided an	21	MS. TARIQ: Okay. We'll move on from there.
21	answer to that.	22	BY MS. TARIQ:
22		23	Q But these extension requests were requested by the
	MS. TARIQ: I would just say that it's not just	24	professional engineer hired by Taotao USA pursuant to the
24 25	the negligence. The relevance would be showing that all	25	stipulated settlement agreement who are making these
20	vehicles belonging to count four basically Taotao did	25	supulated settlement agreement who are making these
	Dago 825		$\mathbf{D}$
	Page 825		Page 827
1	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count	1	requests.
2	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the	2	requests. A Yes.
2 3	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed	2 3	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or
2 3 4	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they	2 3 4	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs?
2 3 4 5	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no	2 3 4 5	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know.
2 3 4 5 6	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle.	2 3 4 5 6	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA
2 3 4 5 6 7	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she	2 3 4 5 6 7	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results?
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. BY MS. TARIQ:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an extension, and then at the very top it says, from Margaret	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>requests.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs?</li> <li>A I I wouldn't know.</li> <li>Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results?</li> <li>A I didn't know that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006.</li> <li>A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.)</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, if you would look at EPA 000198 on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an extension, and then at the very top it says, from Margaret Goldstein to I believe Ms. Isin, and it says we'll plan to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, if you would look at EPA 000198 on Exhibit 6.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an extension, and then at the very top it says, from Margaret Goldstein to I believe Ms. Isin, and it says we'll plan to get it to you by December 1st. Is that what you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, if you would look at EPA 000198 on Exhibit 6. A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an extension, and then at the very top it says, from Margaret Goldstein to I believe Ms. Isin, and it says we'll plan to get it to you by December 1st. Is that what you're referring to?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, if you would look at EPA 000198 on Exhibit 6. A Yes. Q Do you see the catalytic converter described?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an extension, and then at the very top it says, from Margaret Goldstein to I believe Ms. Isin, and it says we'll plan to get it to you by December 1st. Is that what you're referring to? MS. TARIQ: Yes. And then below that, the email	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, if you would look at EPA 000198 on Exhibit 6. A Yes. Q Do you see the catalytic converter described? A Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count four. I think that would take down the penalty, the proposed penalty significantly reduce the proposed penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she give a 90 day extension? MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then should Taotao be penalized for that? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an extension, and then at the very top it says, from Margaret Goldstein to I believe Ms. Isin, and it says we'll plan to get it to you by December 1st. Is that what you're referring to?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	requests. A Yes. Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or another lab to have backlogs? A I I wouldn't know. Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get the catalytic converter test results? A I didn't know that. Q Okay. Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or Oh, C06. Okay. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance where we're going to be looking at CBI. JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, if you would look at EPA 000198 on Exhibit 6. A Yes. Q Do you see the catalytic converter described?

1	Page 828		Page 830
±	moment, and I'm going to move you to	1 this	matter, which is that the catalytic converters on the
2	(Pause.)	2 pro	duction 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 agr	ee that there's only one catalytic converter design
5	(Pause.)	5 spe	cification in all three of those COC applications? Six,
6	Q Does that look like the same catalytic converter	6 nin	e, 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 ma	tch 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 cata	alytic converters? That was the testimony or the
13	there would be a few questions from Ms. Tariq, but it's been	13 evi	dence
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.		Q catalytic converter.
19	MS. TARIQ: Thank you.		A I believe there were two on count ten. To the
20	THE WITNESS: Sorry, your question?	20 bes	t of my recollection.
21	BY MS. TARIQ:		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?		CEE pursuant to the test plan? In 2014?
24	A The design appears to be the same. The part		A Yes.
25	number does seem to be different. But, yeah.	25	Q And would you agree that there was three samples
	Page 829		Page 831
1	Q And then without I guess, just, are you aware of	1 of t	he vehicle that were tested at CEE?
2			
	CX10, you've looked at it before. Would you agree that that	2 .	A Yes.
3	CX10, you've looked at it before. Would you agree that that would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?		<ul><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified</li></ul>
3 4		3	
	would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?	3 4 bec	Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified
4	would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?	3 dec 4 bec 5 spe	Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design
4 5	would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10? A I'm just checking it real quick.	3 bec 5 spe 6 .	Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?
4 5 6	would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10? A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)	3 bec 5 spe 6 .	<ul><li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at</li></ul>
4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> </ul>	3 4 bec 5 spe 6 7 6 8 CE	<ul><li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at</li></ul>
4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> </ul>	3 6 4 bec 5 spe 6 . 7 6 8 CE 9 .	<ul><li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li></ul>
4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number</li> </ul>	3 4 bec 5 spe 6 . 7 6 8 CE 9 . 10 det	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> </ul>	3 4 bec 5 spe 6 7 6 8 CE 9 10 det 11 6 12 app	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> </ul>	3 4 bec 5 spe 6 7 6 8 CE 9 10 det 11 6 12 app	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it</li> </ul>	3     4       5     spe       6        7        8     CE       9        10     deta       11        12     app       13        14	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> </ul>	3     4       5     spe       6        7        8     CE       9        10     deta       11        12     app       13        14        15     the	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> </ul>	3       4         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       dett         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten.	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and . they do have emission test data from count six.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design?</li> <li>CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> </ul>	3       4         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       dete         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	3       4         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       deta         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17          18	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the test vehicle, test data vehicle from</li> </ul>	3       4       becc         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       deta         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17          18          19       using	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved ng the same test data?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the test vehicle, test data vehicle from CX6, is that the same test data vehicle? 5815?</li> </ul>	3       4       becc         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       deta         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17          18          19       usin         20	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved ang the same test data?</li> <li>A The applications were? Yes.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the test vehicle, test data vehicle from CX6, is that the same test data vehicle? 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	3       4       becc         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       dett         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17          18          19       usin         20          21	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved ng the same test data?</li> <li>A The applications were? Yes.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the test vehicle, test data vehicle from CX6, is that the same test data vehicle? 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So CX 6, 9 and 10 have the same catalytic</li> </ul>	3       4         5       spe         6          7       6         7       6         8       CE         9          10       dett         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17          18          19       usin         20          21          22	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved ag the same test data?</li> <li>A The applications were? Yes.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>Ms. Isin, you did not group count nine and ten</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the test vehicle, test data vehicle from CX6, is that the same test data vehicle? 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So CX 6, 9 and 10 have the same catalytic converter design, and the same test data vehicle?</li> </ul>	3       4         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       deta         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17          18          19       usin         20          21          22          23       tog	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved ag the same test data?</li> <li>A The applications were? Yes.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>Ms. Isin, you did not group count nine and ten ether when scaling in your proposed penalty.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? CX10?</li> <li>A I'm just checking it real quick. (Pause.)</li> <li>A CX10, Bates number 332.</li> <li>Q I can put it up here if you want.</li> <li>A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number it looks to be the same.</li> <li>Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over applications?</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top.</li> <li>A Oh, yes.</li> <li>Q 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And is the test vehicle, test data vehicle from CX6, is that the same test data vehicle? 5815?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So CX 6, 9 and 10 have the same catalytic</li> </ul>	3       4         5       spe         6          7          8       CE         9          10       deta         11          12       app         13          14          15       the         16       ten,         17          18          19       usin         20          21          22          23       tog         24	<ul> <li>Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified ause the catalytic converter did not match the one design cification in that application?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at E.</li> <li>A Well, they passed the low hour test with the erioration factor.</li> <li>Q And the low hour test was the test that was roved by the Agency.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although Agency does not have emission test data for nine and they do have emission test data from count six.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved ag the same test data?</li> <li>A The applications were? Yes.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>Ms. Isin, you did not group count nine and ten</li> </ul>

	Page 832		Page 834
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
	Page 833		Page 835
1		1	
1 2	Page 833 nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design	1 2	Page 835 something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's
	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency		something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?
2	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design	2	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's
2 3	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification?	2 3	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.
2 3 4	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes.	2 3 4	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for
2 3 4 5	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was	2 3 4 5	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.
2 3 4 5 6	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and	2 3 4 5 6	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification?</li><li>A Most likely, yes.</li><li>Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. (Pause.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?</li> <li>And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct? A Yes. Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct? A Yes. Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct? A Yes. Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.             MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.             JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.             MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.             (Pause.)             BY MS. TARIQ:             Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?             A Yes.             Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness?</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?</li> <li>And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness?</li> <li>A Assuming there were no other issues with the test.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q The Agency is, the Agency approved the COC	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct? A Yes. Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness? A Assuming there were no other issues with the test. Q And that's because the penalty policy says that if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q The Agency is, the Agency approved the COC application, carry-over COC application, in 2014 and 2013	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?</li> <li>And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness?</li> <li>A Assuming there were no other issues with the test.</li> <li>Q And that's because the penalty policy says that if a company voluntarily provides test results to the Agency,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q The Agency is, the Agency approved the COC application, carry-over COC application, in 2014 and 2013 knowing that the application I'm sorry, 2014, 2015,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?</li> <li>And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness?</li> <li>A Assuming there were no other issues with the test.</li> <li>Q And that's because the penalty policy says that if a company voluntarily provides test results to the Agency, the Agency may reduce the egregiousness from major to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q The Agency is, the Agency approved the COC application, carry-over COC application, in 2014 and 2013 knowing that the application - I'm sorry, 2014, 2015, knowing that the 2013 application did not meet the design	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?</li> <li>And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness?</li> <li>A Assuming there were no other issues with the test.</li> <li>Q And that's because the penalty policy says that if a company voluntarily provides test results to the Agency, the Agency may reduce the egregiousness from major to moderate?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q The Agency is, the Agency approved the COC application, carry-over COC application, in 2014 and 2013 knowing that the application I'm sorry, 2014, 2015,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?</li> <li>And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness?</li> <li>A Assuming there were no other issues with the test.</li> <li>Q And that's because the penalty policy says that if a company voluntarily provides test results to the Agency, the Agency may reduce the egregiousness from major to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency discovered that count six did not meet the design specification? A Most likely, yes. Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. (Pause.) MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. (Pause.) BY MS. TARIQ: Q The Agency is, the Agency approved the COC application, carry-over COC application, in 2014 and 2013 knowing that the application did not meet the design specification that was given in that application. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>something's been found to violate and the other doesn't?</li> <li>And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's possible in the Agency's different departments.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for speculation.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I'll move on.</li> <li>(Pause.)</li> <li>BY MS. TARIQ:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts nine and ten, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the results to the Agency, and the results showed that the vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be assessed at moderated egregiousness?</li> <li>A Assuming there were no other issues with the test.</li> <li>Q And that's because the penalty policy says that if a company voluntarily provides test results to the Agency, the Agency may reduce the egregiousness from major to moderate?</li> <li>A You're asking if the penalty policy says that?</li> </ul>

	Page 836		Page 838
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
		1	
	Page 837		Page 839
1	Page 837 test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have	1	Page 839 scheme but that do not involve actual or potential
1 2		1	_
	test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have		scheme but that do not involve actual or potential
2	test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned	2	scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?
2 3	test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have	2	scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions? A Those would be moderate.
2 3 4	test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards.	2 3 4	scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions? A Those would be moderate. Q And where are you getting that from?
2 3 4 5	test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards. A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li><li>A Those would be moderate.</li><li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li><li>A From the penalty policy.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li><li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li><li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li><li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li><li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li><li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li><li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li><li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li><li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li><li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li><li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li><li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li> <li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li> <li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li> <li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li> <li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li> <li>the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement</li> <li>discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have</li> <li>emissions that do not exceed the certification emission</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li> <li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li> <li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li> <li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li> <li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li> <li>the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement</li> <li>discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have</li> <li>emissions that do not exceed the certification emission</li> <li>levels under the applicable certificate.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li> <li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li> <li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li> <li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li> <li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li> <li>the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement</li> <li>discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have</li> <li>emissions that do not exceed the certification emission</li> <li>levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards. A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question? Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. MS. TARIQ: The only concern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li> <li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li> <li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li> <li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li> <li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li> <li>the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement</li> <li>discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have</li> <li>emissions that do not exceed the certification emission</li> <li>levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li> <li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li> <li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li> <li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li> <li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li> <li>the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement</li> <li>discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have</li> <li>emissions that do not exceed the certification emission</li> <li>levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the</li> <li>relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li> <li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li> <li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li> <li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A Tm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li> <li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li> <li>the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement</li> <li>discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have</li> <li>emissions that do not exceed the certification emission</li> <li>levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the</li> <li>relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about</li> <li>counts one through eight being moderate based on emission</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about counts one through eight being moderate based on emission test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning. Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about counts one through eight being moderate based on emission test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis for that characterization.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning. Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A Trn sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about counts one through eight being moderate based on emission test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis for that characterization.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The relevance is that one and eight</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning.</li> <li>Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: No.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: We would like to offer it into</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards. A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question? Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate. MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. MS. TARIQ: The only concern MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about counts one through eight being moderate based on emission test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis for that characterization. MS. TARIQ: The relevance is that one and eight have been assessed as moderate even though the only examples	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning. Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: No.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: We would like to offer it into evidence at this time, if there were any objections.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have</li> <li>the probative value and utility mission testing concerned</li> <li>when a test plan has been approved and emission results have</li> <li>been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A Trn sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that</li> <li>you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if</li> <li>the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement</li> <li>discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have</li> <li>emissions that do not exceed the certification emission</li> <li>levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the</li> <li>relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about</li> <li>counts one through eight being moderate based on emission</li> <li>test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis</li> <li>for that characterization.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The relevance is that one and eight</li> <li>have been assessed as moderate even though the only examples</li> <li>provided in the penalty policy are where there are no</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning. Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: No.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: We would like to offer it into evidence at this time, if there were any objections?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about counts one through eight being moderate based on emission test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis for that characterization.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The relevance is that one and eight have been assessed as moderate even though the only examples provided in the penalty policy are where there are no emission results available or emission results are provided</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning.</li> <li>Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: No.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: We would like to offer it into evidence at this time, if there were any objections.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Are there any objections?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A Trn sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about counts one through eight being moderate based on emission test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis for that characterization.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The relevance is that one and eight have been assessed as moderate even though the only examples provided in the penalty policy are where there are no emission results available or emission results are provided by the violator voluntarily after the initiation of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning. Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: No.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: We would like to offer it into evidence at this time, if there were any objections.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Are there any objections?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: CX-28 is admitted into the record.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have the probative value and utility mission testing concerned when a test plan has been approved and emission results have been submitted that have passed emission standards.</li> <li>A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question?</li> <li>Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have emissions that do not exceed the certification emission levels under the applicable certificate.</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The only concern</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about counts one through eight being moderate based on emission test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis for that characterization.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: The relevance is that one and eight have been assessed as moderate even though the only examples provided in the penalty policy are where there are no emission results available or emission results are provided</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>scheme but that do not involve actual or potential emissions?</li> <li>A Those would be moderate.</li> <li>Q And where are you getting that from?</li> <li>A From the penalty policy.</li> <li>Q That says if there are no actual or potential emissions you should apply the moderate?</li> <li>A No. Moderate and major both have actual or potential harm.</li> <li>Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is applied?</li> <li>A I suppose minor.</li> <li>Q All right.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning.</li> <li>Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into evidence.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: No.</li> <li>MS. TARIQ: We would like to offer it into evidence at this time, if there were any objections.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Are there any objections?</li> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor.</li> </ul>

	Page 840		Page 842
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 25	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

	Page 844		Page 846
1	companies in Asia?	1	discussions, Taotao USA was representing the manufacturers.
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.	2	And when and so Taotao USA, Mr. Matao Cao told us he had
3	JUDGE BIRO: And you indicated that from China,	3	an inability to pay, I assumed it was on behalf of all of
4	Taotao ranked I think you said between first and fourth?	4	them. Yeah, that's my assumption. They because they all
5	THE WITNESS: First to third.	5	submitted financial information.
6	JUDGE BIRO: First to third. In number of	6	JUDGE BIRO: Did you get any tax returns from any
7	vehicles imported.	7	of the other entities who are Respondents in this case other
8	THE WITNESS: In declared value.	8	than Taotao USA?
9	JUDGE BIRO: Declared value. So not numbers. But	9	THE WITNESS: No tax returns from the Chinese
10	amount to value.	10	companies. We got some financial statements. And we got a
11	THE WITNESS: It might be the same with number.	11	narrative explaining, you know, why they felt they couldn't
12	I, but my analysis was with declared value.	12	continue in business.
13	JUDGE BIRO: Do you know how many total Chinese	13	JUDGE BIRO: But you didn't receive any financial
14	companies or how many I guess, how many companies import	14	tax returns? I mean not financial. Strike that.
15	from China?	15	You didn't receive any Chinese tax returns from
16	THE WITNESS: I don't know the exact number. I	16	the other two Chinese entities.
17	can tell you that imports of this product type from China	17	THE WITNESS: No.
18	are between three to fifteen percent of the total imports of	18	JUDGE BIRO: And did you receive any documentation
19	this product type. Into the United States.	19	regarding corporate documentation, what in our country
20	JUDGE BIRO: And the product types are motorbikes	20	would be articles of incorporation or bylaws or other
21	and ATVs. Is that one product type?	21	financial statements that are filed with the government in
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.	22	regard to a corporation in connection with those Chinese
23	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.	23	companies?
24	Other places that we import motorbikes and ATVs	24	THE WITNESS: I don't recall receiving anything
25	from, would that include India and Korea?	25	like that.
	Page 845		Page 847
			Page 047
1	THE WITNESS: I believe other top importer	1	JUDGE BIRO: Of the 109,000 more or less vehicles
1 2	THE WITNESS: I believe other top importer countries, or countries of origin are Mexico, Italy. You	1	
		1	JUDGE BIRO: Of the 109,000 more or less vehicles
2	countries, or countries of origin are Mexico, Italy. You	2	JUDGE BIRO: Of the 109,000 more or less vehicles that came to the U.S. ports, how many of them were
2 3	countries, or countries of origin are Mexico, Italy. You know, it varies year from year. I'm just kind of going off	2	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?
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	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	2 3 4 5	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.
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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
2 3 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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 knowcatalytic 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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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 knowcatalytic 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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	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 knowcatalytic 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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	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 reason not to believe it. JUDGE BIRO: There's no reason wy 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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

	Page 848		Page 850
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	Page 849 MR. CHU: Just a couple.	1	Page 851 A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as
1 2		1 2	_
	MR. CHU: Just a couple.	1	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as
2	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to	2	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the
2 3	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.	2 3	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether
2 3 4	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd)	2 3 4	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and
2 3 4 5	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU:	2 3 4 5	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao,	2 3 4 5 6	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right? A Which emails? Q The ones that have been introduced already, the	2 3 4 5 6 7	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right? A Which emails? Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right? A Which emails? Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA. A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right? A Which emails? Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA. A Yes. Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right? A Which emails? Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA. A Yes. Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right? A Which emails? Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA. A Yes. Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise? A I think he got his point across.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. CHU: Just a couple. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU: Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right? A Which emails? Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA. A Yes. Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise? A I think he got his point across. Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd)</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd)</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd)</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor</li> <li>Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd)</li> <li>BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the general manager at Taotao USA. Is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to scall your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the court reporter, if I may.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the general manager at Taotao USA. Is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to scall your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the court reporter, if I may. (Pause.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the general manager at Taotao USA. Is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q So do is it you believe that the general</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the court reporter, if I may. (Pause.) JUDGE BIRO: And these are just Matao Cao's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the general manager at Taotao USA. Is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q So do is it you believe that the general manager handled those negotiations with Mr. Thompson.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the court reporter, if I may. (Pause.) JUDGE BIRO: And these are just Matao Cao's depositions?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the general manager at Taotao USA. Is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q So do is it you believe that the general manager handled those negotiations with Mr. Thompson.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the court reporter, if I may. (Pause.) JUDGE BIRO: And these are just Matao Cao's depositions? MR. KULSCHINSKY: We provided Mr. Cao's deposition
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. CHU: Just a couple.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to the stand again and ask a few questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) BY MR. CHU:</li> <li>Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, right?</li> <li>A Which emails?</li> <li>Q The ones that have been introduced already, the communications with you and Taotao USA.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear and concise?</li> <li>A I think he got his point across.</li> <li>Q Right, so it was not perfect, right?</li> <li>A It was not 100% perfect, no.</li> <li>Q But you had no problem, neither you nor Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the general manager at Taotao USA. Is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q So do is it you believe that the general manager handled those negotiations with Mr. Thompson.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A I assume I guess to answer the question, um, as accurately as possible, I would need to look at the information request that we sent and remind myself whether oh, you're sorry, we're talking about counts nine and ten. Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my recollection, we received no information that they had been remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. THE WITNESS: Thanks. (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to call your next witness? MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the court reporter, if I may. (Pause.) JUDGE BIRO: And these are just Matao Cao's depositions?

	Page 852		Page 854
1	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. All right.	1	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; 156A; 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; 190A; 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
1	Page 853 Ms. Tariq?	1	Page 855 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.
			and equate that to every vehicle not being proper.
10	record for these exhibits.	10	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret
10 11	record for these exhibits. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right.	10 11	
			And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret
11	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right.	11	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three
11 12	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus	11 12	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA.
11 12 13	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor.	11 12 13	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the
11 12 13 14	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you.	11 12 13 14	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of
11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu?	11 12 13 14 15	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took
11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for	11 12 13 14 15 16	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested,
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for the floor.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested, rather than what they did later on, requiring 35 catalysts
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for the floor. We would ask for a directed verdict in favor of	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested, rather than what they did later on, requiring 35 catalysts to be tested.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for the floor. We would ask for a directed verdict in favor of the Respondents in this matter. One, as to the two Chinese companies they failed to establish any responsibility that they would have under the circumstances in these alleged	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested, rather than what they did later on, requiring 35 catalysts to be tested. And the evidence shows clearly, which is already in the record, that of those vehicles, they were test results for the year 2012. And the model numbers, the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for the floor. We would ask for a directed verdict in favor of the Respondents in this matter. One, as to the two Chinese companies they failed to establish any responsibility that they would have under the circumstances in these alleged violations associated with vehicles imported by Taotao USA.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested, rather than what they did later on, requiring 35 catalysts to be tested. And the evidence shows clearly, which is already in the record, that of those vehicles, they were test results for the year 2012. And the model numbers, the evidence will show, matches up. So you can't say 23,000
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for the floor. We would ask for a directed verdict in favor of the Respondents in this matter. One, as to the two Chinese companies they failed to establish any responsibility that they would have under the circumstances in these alleged violations associated with vehicles imported by Taotao USA. Number two, we would move on a directed verdict,	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested, rather than what they did later on, requiring 35 catalysts to be tested. And the evidence shows clearly, which is already in the record, that of those vehicles, they were test results for the year 2012. And the model numbers, the evidence will show, matches up. So you can't say 23,000 vehicles automatically were not in conformity for damages
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. With that consensus MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. Mr. Chu? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for the floor. We would ask for a directed verdict in favor of the Respondents in this matter. One, as to the two Chinese companies they failed to establish any responsibility that they would have under the circumstances in these alleged violations associated with vehicles imported by Taotao USA.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested, rather than what they did later on, requiring 35 catalysts to be tested. And the evidence shows clearly, which is already in the record, that of those vehicles, they were test results for the year 2012. And the model numbers, the evidence will show, matches up. So you can't say 23,000

	Page 856		Page 858
1	damages to show that 23,000 vehicles were correct.	1	annual report can possibly be of any benefit. Rather than
2	Because when you look at the evidence, well here's	2	mixing years up. Because it requires you in the new model
3	a test that says that 2012 model was not.	3	year to do a catalyst test of that new model year.
4	So how can you include 23,000?	4	So when you submit your application, you have to
5	So the evidence will show the calculation, the	5	go ahead and get that testing done.
6	methods are wrong. The evidence will show that there was	6	The evidence will show through emails and
7	full cooperation to the best of the ability of this foreign	7	communications with the EPA, they did not know that
8	entity. There were no considerations taking (sic) there to	8	Taotao USA did not know how to satisfy the EPA Air
9	try to work with a country like China who at that time was	9	Enforcement Divisions' demands of a catalyst test. They
10	not as strong as it is today, but a up-and-coming place.	10	were lost. They took Chinese companies that completely, the
11	And the evidence will show that China, this	11	evidence will show, crushed, dissolved these catalysts to
12	Chinese company, the Taotao USA company, said we wanted to	12	get down to the wash cost elimination, down to the precious
13	be a role model here. And they did their best. They	13	metals, down to separating them, down to measuring the
14		14	
14	listened to the EPA. They went ahead and listened to the	15	finite amount and the ratios. That was the whole thing.
	suggestions.		But that was never acceptable. The evidence will
16	When they said something, they paid special	16 17	show that the EPA said it's Chinese, not meaning that it's
17	attention. It wasn't a suggestion, it wasn't a lead, it	1	in Chinese, but it's Chinese and we just are not going to be
18 19	wasn't a gift. They said some companies use this company,	18 19	able to accept these.
20	and they latched onto that. The evidence will show that	20	So they went ahead and followed Margaret
20	they felt that was going to help with the situation. The ASA, the evidence will show, is clearly poorly	20	Goldstein, okay, and went ahead and used SGS, which in 2012,
21		21	three was okay. But all of a sudden, which is not the
	written. Absolutely bad. It doesn't tell when to begin,	1	evidence, and I'm not submitting this evidence, but if the
23	when to stop. We know when it was signed. It talks about	23	Court considers it, the test results contradicted their own
24	the annual report. Well, annual report is a misnomer. An	24	test results on the same year, the model.
25	annual checkup is an annual checkup.	25	So the testing was a big issue. The evidence will
	Page 857		Page 859
1	Page 857 So what is the time frame, time reference? Then	1	Page 859 show that in a paper authored at least with Ms. Isin's
1 2		1	
	So what is the time frame, time reference? Then	1	show that in a paper authored at least with Ms. Isin's
2	So what is the time frame, time reference? Then you have to guess in that ASA as to what it is they want.	2	show that in a paper authored at least with Ms. Isin's name on it, okay? That the method acceptable for analyzing
2 3	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	2	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.
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	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.	2 3 4 5	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
2 3 4 5 6	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	2 3 4 5 6	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5 6 7	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.
2 3 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.

	Page 860	Page 862
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
	Page 861	Page 863
1	Page 861	Page 863
1	Whereupon,	1 going to testify about economic benefit component of the
2	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> </ol>
2 3	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> </ol>
2 3 4	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows:	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> <li>MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated.	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> <li>MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in</li> </ol>
2 3 4	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> <li>MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU:	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> <li>MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in</li> <li>the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.</li> <li>Chu? Is that sufficient?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> <li>MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in</li> <li>the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.</li> <li>Chu? Is that sufficient?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record.	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> <li>MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in</li> <li>the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.</li> <li>Chu? Is that sufficient?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last	<ol> <li>going to testify about economic benefit component of the</li> <li>penalty policy.</li> <li>Can we</li> <li>MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in</li> <li>the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.</li> <li>Chu? Is that sufficient?</li> <li>MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z.	1       going to testify about economic benefit component of the         2       penalty policy.         3       Can we         4       MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.         5       JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in         6       the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.         7       Chu? Is that sufficient?         8       MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as         10       an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask	1       going to testify about economic benefit component of the         2       penalty policy.         3       Can we         4       MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.         5       JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in         6       the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.         7       Chu? Is that sufficient?         8       MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.         9       JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as         10       an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of         11       the penalty policy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court.	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in?	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in? MR. CHU: AS an economist as well as a expert with	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.16JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in? MR. CHU: AS an economist as well as a expert with the penalty policy calculations.	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.16JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component17of the penalty policy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in? MR. CHU: AS an economist as well as a expert with the penalty policy calculations. MR. PALERMO: I object to the characterization of	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.16JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component17of the penalty policy.18Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in? MR. CHU: AS an economist as well as a expert with the penalty policy calculations. MR. PALERMO: I object to the characterization of penalty policy calculations. I have no problem	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.16JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component17of the penalty policy.18Okay.19MR. CHU: Thank you. May I proceed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in? MR. CHU: AS an economist as well as a expert with the penalty policy calculations. MR. PALERMO: I object to the characterization of penalty policy calculations. I have no problem JUDGE BIRO: You would agree to have Mr. Shefftz	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.16JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component17of the penalty policy.18Okay.19MR. CHU: Thank you. May I proceed?20JUDGE BIRO: Please proceed.21BY MR. CHU:22Q Sir, you've had an opportunity to review data in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in? MR. CHU: I object to the characterization of penalty policy calculations. MR. PALERMO: I object to the characterization of penalty policy calculations. I have no problem JUDGE BIRO: You would agree to have Mr. Shefftz qualified as an expert as an economist? MR. PALERMO: Correct. JUDGE BIRO: Otay.	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.16JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component17of the penalty policy.18Okay.19MR. CHU: Thank you. May I proceed?20JUDGE BIRO: Please proceed.21BY MR. CHU:22Q Sir, you've had an opportunity to review data in23this case, have you not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Whereupon, JONATHAN SHEFFTZ having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. CHU: Q Please state your name for the record. A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify him in? MR. CHU: AS an economist as well as a expert with the penalty policy calculations. MR. PALERMO: I object to the characterization of penalty policy calculations. I have no problem JUDGE BIRO: You would agree to have Mr. Shefftz qualified as an expert as an economist? MR. PALERMO: Correct.	1going to testify about economic benefit component of the2penalty policy.3Can we4MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that.5JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in6the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr.7Chu? Is that sufficient?8MR. CHU: I'm okay with that.9JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as10an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of11the penalty policy.12MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying13it, the ability to pay components of the policy.14JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo?15MR. PALERMO: I have no objection.16JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component17of the penalty policy.18Okay.19MR. CHU: Thank you. May I proceed?20JUDGE BIRO: Please proceed.21BY MR. CHU:22Q Sir, you've had an opportunity to review data in

	Page 864		Page 866
1	background and experience and expertise, would you please	1	reactions, that EPA had not performed what I would consider
2	tell this Court your findings and your opinions based upon	2	to be an analysis of the economic benefit, but had simply
3	those findings?	3	applied a \$15 rule of thumb across each engine at issue in
4	A Sure. To help make sure, though, that I get the	4	the case.
5	numbers exactly right, is my report here somewhere in these	5	I looked up the penalty policy and it seemed clear
6	binders?	6	to me that that was focused on cases where emissions
7	JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a white binder in front	7	controls were outright missing as opposed to this case where
8	of you, Mr. Shefftz?	8	the issue is, at least as I understand it, the mismatch
9	(Pause.)	9	between what is on the COCs and what was found during the
10	THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm the first one. That's easy.	10	testing of the engines.
11	JUDGE BIRO: That's how special you are.	11	JUDGE BIRO: I don't mean to cut you off.
12	BY MR. CHU:	12	THE WITNESS: Sure.
13	Q If you will look at Exhibit 1, is that what you	13	JUDGE BIRO: But the Agency has indicated they
14	were looking for?	14	accept your fourth scenario for economic benefit.
15	A Yes.	15	THE WITNESS: Okay. Sure.
16	So my analysis has two components as described in	16	JUDGE BIRO: So whatever happened before about the
17	the qualification discussion earlier. Economic benefit and	17	rule of thumb, we can just move on.
18	ability to pay.	18	THE WITNESS: Okay.
19	Under economic benefit I analyzed four different	19	So then I set up my four scenarios and a tabular
20	scenarios, or we could call it three different scenarios	20	summary of the bottom line results appears on flipping
21	with a slight variation in the calculation of one of them,	21	through here on page on page 21. Sorry for the small
22	but four different economic benefit figures at least.	22	font but I was trying to get this all to fit onto one page.
23	And then for ability to pay in my report I	23	So the first scenario is my analysis of an
24	described an ABEL analysis run that I performed and since	24	approach whereby the violations at issue in this case are
25	then I have read the reports and deposition testimony of	25	avoided by keeping essentially the catalytic converters the
	Page 865		Page 867
1	EPA's financial witness, Dr. James Carroll, and I have some	1	same but changing the COCs.
2	EPA's financial witness, Dr. James Carroll, and I have some opinions on his opinions.	2	same but changing the COCs. Now perhaps some analysts would take the point
2 3	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	2	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
2 3 4	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.	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	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	2 3 4 5	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.
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>same but changing the COCs.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>same but changing the COCs.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>same but changing the COCs.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>I used employment cost information for environmental engineers, taking standard information from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>same but changing the COCs.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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 1-flipping back now page 14.</li> <li>I used employment cost information for environmental engineers, taking standard information from the Department of Labor.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>same but changing the COCs.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>I used employment cost information for environmental engineers, taking standard information from the Department of Labor.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>same but changing the COCs.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>I used employment cost information for environmental engineers, taking standard information from the Department of Labor.</li> <li>Now this is an area of my analysis that could include:</li> </ul>

	Page 868		Page 870
1	lower, or instead in the United States?	1	occurred had the catalytic converters in their tested
2	Is it something that should have been done	2	compositions matched up with what was on the certificates of
3	internally?	3	conformity.
4	Is it something that should have been outsourced	4	And then I went through the usual exercise of
5	to other companies?	5	calculating the after tax and its present value, just like
6	I don't know the answer to that, but I thought	6	in EPA's own BEN model.
7	this was an important component of the analysis, so I wanted	7	In Table 4A, some of the figures resulted in cost
8	to at least have a rough proxy in there for what the	8	savings for the different engine classes if the compositions
9	economic benefit would look like for avoiding that	9	had matched up with the certificates of conformity. This is
10	additional level of effort, so to speak, over the years that	10	because in some of the tests, although there were shortfalls
11	seemed to be at issue in this case.	11	in certain metals, there were actually excesses of other
12	Then for scenarios two, three and four. These are	12	metals.
13	all fairly similar to one another, both in approach an in	13	So in this table I simply let the savings offset
14	results. Here it's keeping the COCs the same and instead	14	the costs and therefore for some of these there's a negative
15	altering the precious metals content to match up what was in	15	economic benefit for certain counts.
16	the COCs.	16	In my scenario three by contract, which appears on
17	Now on page, we're back on page 21 here. All the	17	page 17, what I did here was any shortfalls are essentially
18	four different rows here are alternatives, not additive.	18	rounded up to zero.
19	However, the result in figure one is essentially subsumed,	19	Now, why did I do that? Well, I'm not sure it
20	incorporated in the results for scenarios two, three and	20	really makes that much sense to do that. On the other hand,
21	four. Because I'm taking the position here, based on my	21	I thought that perhaps a scenario where some of these excess
22	understanding of the case, that it wasn't just a matter of	22	metals amounts are allowed to offset the shortfalls would
23	having different previous metals compositions in the	23	not be looked upon positively by EPA. It's possible one
24	catalytic converters, but ensuring that those compositions	24	could even take the view that maybe the manufacturer had
25	matched up with the COCs.	25	additional amounts of the metals that it wouldn't be using
	Page 869	1	Page 871
1	Page 869 So therefore, some level of effort, and therefore	1	Page 871 for anything else.
1 2	So therefore, some level of effort, and therefore	1 2	Page 871 for anything else. I'm not really sure that makes any sense, but I
	So therefore, some level of effort, and therefore some cost would have been involved in that beyond just the		for anything else.
2	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.	2	for anything else. I'm not really sure that makes any sense, but I
2 3	So therefore, some level of effort, and therefore some cost would have been involved in that beyond just the	2 3	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
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	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	2 3 4 5	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
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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

	Page 872		Page 874
1	(Clearing throat.) Excuse me. Is there some	1	composition of the catalytic converters so that they matched
2	water?	2	up with the certificates of conformity.
3	Then on page 19 in Table 6, that represents the	3	And specifically scenario three is the one where I
4	results thanks. That represents the results of my	4	essentially just set aside any savings that appear that they
5	economic benefit analysis using that spreadsheet.	5	would have resulted from the compliance I'm sorry, from
6	Now I really can't tell you anything about that	6	catalytic converter compositions that matched up with the
7	spreadsheet because I don't know anything else about it	7	COCs, given that some of the tests shows an excess of some
8	other than it had two columns that appeared to be	8	metals.
9	representing the cost for the actual catalytic converters	9	You'll also notice that that rounded off \$221,000
10	that were used in the vehicles at issue in this case, and	10	figure which precisely here is the \$220,731. It's barely
11	the cost for catalytic converters that would have met the	11	any different than row four, the \$219,000 figure which is
12	COC compositions.	12	based upon the, what I believe to be the Respondent's
13	JUDGE BIRO: What page are we looking at?	13	spreadsheet showing kind of, well, I'm not sure exactly how
14	THE WITNESS: So I was looking now at page 19.	14	they came up, actually I'm not sure at all how they came up
15	So Table 6, which follows a very similar format to	15	with their figures for the compliant versus the actual
16	my previous tables, except instead of having all the rows	16	catalytic converters. But either way, it's somewhat of a
17	for building up the compliance catalytic converter	17	moot point since the two figures are almost exactly the
18	composition by going through metal by metal and looking at	18	same.
19	the shortfall or the excess in the tests, instead it has	19	Row two is the figure when the savings from excess
20	cost per unit procured, cost per unit specified. Those are	20	amounts of metals are allowed to be offset against the
21	my words based on my understanding of the spreadsheet I	21	shortfalls. Once again, it's really not that much of a
22	received.	22	difference. \$194,000 versus \$220,000.
23	And you can see it has the kind of funny-looking	23	So I think that's my summary of the economic
24	Chinese currency symbol that Excel conveniently provided to	24	benefit there. I'll pause if, you know
25	me. And then I came up with a savings per engine class,	25	JUDGE BIRO: Did you want to ask him any specific
	Dago 972		Dago 975
1	Page 873		Page 875
1	apply a foreign exchange rate to it, and then go through the		
0			questions?
2	usual after-tax net present value calculations.	2	MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.
3	usual after-tax net present value calculations. And once again, those results going through in	2 3	MR. CHU: No, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
3 4	usual after-tax net present value calculations. And once again, those results going through in total, across the two different manufacturers, are on	2 3 4	MR. CHU: No, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you want to proceed with cross on that issue or
3 4 5	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.	2 3 4 5	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?
3 4 5 6	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	2 3 4 5 6	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
3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5 6 7	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.
3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.
3 4 5 7 8 9	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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?
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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

		,	
	Page 876		Page 878
1	provided to me to be very comprehensive. Everything	1	point I thought at least a first start Would be to run EPA's
2	appeared to be there. Unfortunately, a lot of what was	2	own ABEL model.
3	there was in what seemed to be Chinese, and therefore I	3	Now the ABEL model is not perfect, but it's still
4	could not understand.	4	pretty good at what it does. I can't claim credit for the
5	And I did receive what appeared to be financial	5	original analytical approach of the ABEL model, even though
6	statements, or at least components of financial statements.	6	I developed the current Windows version of the model and
7	In other words, I didn't see what appeared to be a cover of	7	continue to provide support to EPA on it.
8	a report or what commonly we would have in the United States	8	However, for a case like this where as far as I
9	at least, to be things like the letter from the auditors to	9	could tell the only reasonable means of paying a penalty
10	management, or a statement of management, or accompanying	10	would be for Taotao USA to cover it via internally generated
11	notes.	11	cash flow going into the future. ABEL seemed to be a pretty
12	However, what I was provided, what I reviewed did	12	good fit. In other words, this was the type of company and
13	seem to include the three core elements of an income	13	the type of situation for which the ABEL model was designed.
14	statement, a statement of cash flows, and a balance	14	So I was testifying in other contexts, typically I
15	statement.	15	would not use the ABEL model per se, just because it is not
16	However, there are still so many questions that I	16	very forthcoming in all of its details and calculations
17	was not able to get answered. Things like:	17	behind the scenes. The BEN model is that way. I designed
18	Exactly what period is being covered here? Is it	18	it to be that way. The ABEL model has some very complicated
19	a full 12 months? Is it a calendar year? Is it a fiscal	19	statistical distribution calculations going on behind the
20	year corresponding to something other than a calendar year?	20	scenes.
21	And there were what seemed to be partial year	21	Often our kind of number one rule of thumb when I
22	statements, except I wasn't quite sure if they were partial	22	was at IAC or still have led presentations with staff since
23	year statements or something like often you'll see the 12	23	then is don't ever try to explain the entire ABEL model in
24	months ended by March 31st of the year. So in other words a	24	Court. However, I felt that since the opposing audience
25	12 month period that doesn't correspond to a calendar year,	25	here in a way was EPA that it would be okay to do that here.
	· · · ·		
	Page 877		Page 879
1	but it still does represent a whole year's worth of results.	1	So without going into all the details, roughly the
2	I did some of my own analysis on those with an	2	result was about \$700,000 in ability to pay at the
3	ABEL-like spreadsheet on my own. But given that I did not	3	statistical confidence level that EPA typically uses when
4	have enough confidence that the financial statements	4	presenting the BEN model.
5	represented what I would like them to represent, I did not	5	So since then, I have read the reports of EPA's
6	include that in my report. And therefore, I really don't	6	financial witness, Dr. James Carroll, as well as read his
7	have an expert opinion regarding the ability of those two	7	deposition transcript
8	Chinese manufacturers to pay a penalty.	8	MR. PALERMO: Your Honor, at this point I'd like
9	However, I did have comprehensive information on	9	to object to Dr or Mr. Shefftz testifying as an expert
10	the American company, Taotao USA. And specifically I had	10	witness on the reports of Dr. Carroll, as those reports were
11	the U.S. federal tax returns, which are something that's	11	prepared by an expert in financial corporate finance and
12	more straightforward, and as we all know.	12	accounting, and a foundation hasn't been laid as to whether
13	So at the time when I wrote my report in June I	13	Mr. Shefftz has the requisite expertise in those areas.
14	was not aware of any ability to pay analysis that EPA had	14	JUDGE BIRO: What about that?
15	performed or at least that EPA had provided to Respondents,	15	MR. CHU: Your Honor, I believe that since the
16	other than what I understood to be some citations to an	16	financial expert was permitted to comment on Mr. Shefftz, I
17	interview of I think one of the Chinese manufacturers, just	17	think it's only equally beneficial to the situation to the
18	talking vaguely about how the company was very big and had a	18	Court to hear what this expert has to say about that expert
19	lot of employees or something like that.	19	so that the Court can weight whatever way the Court wants to
20	And although I've used quotes like that sometimes	20	deal with the testimony.
21	in my own ability to pay analyses whether for EPA or for	21	He attacked Mr. Shefftz' work as well.
22	other clients, I would not base an entire ability to pay	22	JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Shefftz, do you do any corporate
23	analysis on just that.	23	tax work?
24	So I restricted my analysis only to the American	24	THE WITNESS: Corporate tax? Well, I mean I
21	5 5 5	1	

25

25

company. And given that nothing else had been done at that

analyze corporate finances all the time as part of my work.

	Page 880		Page 882
1	And indeed my economic benefit analysis here entails	1	discrepancy between the purchases that Taotao USA reports on
2	corporate financial analysis, and that's all part of my	2	its tax returns versus the value of imported goods declared
3	consulting practice. So.	3	to Customs officials.
4	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, overruled. Go ahead.	4	I would agree with his opinion there, which I
5	THE WITNESS: So the first issue is that although	5	believe is something like and we can turn to the report
6	it's not in any of Dr. Carroll's either of Dr. Carroll's	6	here to get it exact but he says something like, he's
7	two reports in his deposition testimony he does discuss	7	unable to reach an opinion on that matter.
8	the ABEL computer model.	8	The same with me. I don't know if this is some
9	Now he didn't actually run the ABEL computer	9	discrepancy that is easily explained away, and it seems like
10	model, he relied on EPA's running of it. However, he	10	he does not either.
11	essentially and I'm not trying to mischaracterize what he	11	Now if Dr. Carroll has somewhere been claiming
12	said here. I'm just trying to be as straightforward as	12	that the tax returns are inaccurate with regard specifically
13	possible while not having the transcript in front of me.	13	to the net income, the taxable income that Taotao is
14	But he essentially said the ABEL model was either not	14	reporting to the federal government, that's another matter
15	applicable here or not relevant here or not a good	15	altogether, which would require adjustments to the inputs of
16	analytical tool. That was essentially the gist of what he	16	the ABEL model. But although I did not attend his testimony
17	was saying.	17	earlier in this hearing, my understanding is he is not
18	And his basis for that, as far as I could tell	18	alleging anything like that.
19	from the deposition testimony, was that when he or rather	19	The next part of his analysis and can someone
20	on his behalf alternative ABEL runs were performed using	20	tell me what exhibit his is at so I can, his report is at,
21	different measures of Taotao's book value, the ABEL results	21	so that I can cite it specifically?
22	stayed the same.	22	MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry, do you mean the amended
23	Now there are two aspects to the ABEL analysis.	23	report?
24	One is the ratio analysis, which does not figure directly	24	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?
25	into the ability to pay results. Now that certainly had to	25	MS. TARIQ: The amended report?
	Page 881		Page 883
1	Page 881	1	Page 883
1 2	have changed when the ABEL model was run with his different	1	THE WITNESS: The very first one where he made his
2	have changed when the ABEL model was run with his different figures for assets and liabilities, but from the deposition	2	THE WITNESS: The very first one where he made his adjustments to the balance sheet.
2 3	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	2 3	THE WITNESS: The very first one where he made his adjustments to the balance sheet. MS. TARIQ: CX-192, I believe.
2	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.	2 3 4	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
2 3 4	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	2 3	THE WITNESS: The very first one where he made his adjustments to the balance sheet. MS. TARIQ: CX-192, I believe.
2 3 4 5	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	2 3 4 5	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.
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5 6 7	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.
2 4 5 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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.)
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS: 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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

	Page 884		Page 886
1	could perhaps simply be called in.	1	have to pay it back, or at least that's certainly the
2	In the most recent tax return, that's a relatively	2	expectation on the lender's part.
3	small amount, about \$76,000. Conceptually, that might be	3	Could Taotao pay back a loan based on liquidating
4	something that should be added to my roughly \$700,000 figure	4	all its inventories or some portion of them? Yes, but that
5	from the ABEL result. However I need to know more about	5	Would certainly also affect its ability to continue in
6	that.	6	business, since its business is importing these vehicles and
7	Specifically, the first question that Would come	7	then selling them. So although it could be a source of
8	to mind is has the owner been foregoing any returns from the	8	collateral being used to secure a loan, it's not really a
9	company, either in the form of dividends or salary or any	9	source of paying a penalty unless we're talking about
10	other compensation to keep the company going, and instead,	10	shutting down and liquidating the business.
11	just accepting a loan for some period of time in lieu of	11	Same on financing based on accounts receivable.
12	that?	12	These are monies that are coming in based on past sales.
13	There might be other questions, too. I don't know	13	And that's how the company stays in business is by getting
14	anything about it at this point. But I just wanted to	14	money for what it sold previously.
15	essentially bound the value of that since it's not very big.	15	So in some ways I'm saying yes, that money should
16	It's not insignificant, but it's a relatively small amount.	16	be used to pay the penalty when I produce my ABEL result
17	Then going out of order here just because	17	since ultimately ABEL is talking about money coming in from
18	conceptually I wanted to address it that way, number four is	18	the sales of these vehicles. But it's not like this is
19	liquidation of other assets. This is a larger amount. I'm	19	really a separate category than internally generated cash
20	forgetting what it is off the top of my head. It was at	20	flow as represented in the ABEL model.
21	least, actually I can flip through it right now. I might as	21	For a loan based on equity, in some ways that's
22	well get it on the record.	22	similar to the previous ones. Equity is assets minus
23	(Pause.)	23	liabilities, so these assets have to be something that's
24	THE WITNESS: So after apologizing for my small	24	either being regenerated through cash flow or that are
25	fonts, this one's even smaller.	25	somehow not related to the ability to continue in business.
	Page 885	1	
			Page 887
1	On the next page which is Exhibit A under	1	More expansively, in this report Dr. Carroll comes
1 2	reported, 2015, the other assets are approximately \$121,000.	2	More expansively, in this report Dr. Carroll comes up with a calculation for equity that's summarized,
2 3	reported, 2015, the other assets are approximately \$121,000. Now I have worked on cases before and analyzed	2 3	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
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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.
2 3 4 5	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	2 3 4 5	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
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5 6 7	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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

	Page 888		Page 890
1		1	
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
б	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

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is the one that's easiest to get to.

then stays roughly the same by 2015.

If you look in Appendix A in the first set of

columns that are reported for 2012 through 2015, the line

from 2012 to 2013, but then it drops considerably to 2014,

In fact, it drops by about \$2.3 million from 2013

for accounts payable, you can see that it's pretty similar

to 2014, which indicates to me in the absence of any other23or do you just want to stop there?information that this is something that's being paid off.24QIf you can explain what a quarter engineer means.Or it could be that Taotao USA is having so much trouble25ASure, I mean, so, well, I mean the basis for it?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q And it was, you used a proxy of a quarter

A It's on page 14. Table 2 provides the data and

And so -- I don't know if you want me to explain,

engineer. Could you explain that?

A Yes. So on page --

(Pause.)

the calculations for that.

		-	
	Page 892		Page 894
1	The basis for why I used it, or strictly speaking what	1	was here and it wasn't omitted entirely which is so often
2	Q Roughly, it's not a full-time engineer, but it's	2	the situation when I'm working for EPA and EPA is providing
3	an engineer working a quarter of his or her time on the	3	me with kind of the bare bones compliance cost estimates.
4	compliance?	4	Q Did you consider any information to decide whether
5	A So for this I'm not saying necessarily that there	5	this quarter engineer was appropriate? Proxy was
6	should be someone showing up for work at Taotao USA exactly	6	appropriate?
7	ten hours every week.	7	A I tried, I requested copied or I asked if there
8	Instead, I'm trying to come up with some measure	8	were any readily available invoices for consultants that
9	of some additional amount beyond just the precious metals	9	actually had been retained, because one approach I thought
10	cost differentials in my scenario three, representing	10	of was to look at what had been done in this area, and
11	additional oversight or supervision for ensuring that the	11	therefore, apply some multiple of that to say that more of
12	catalytic converters actually match up with what's on the	12	the same should have been done.
13	COCs.	13	However, that was not readily available. So
14	Because in so many of the cases I work on,	14	somewhat arbitrarily I did take a quarter time, but then I
15	especially when instead of coming up with the compliance	15	also arbitrarily continued it all the way through for four
16	costs on my own like I have, EPA simply says here are these	16	years worth, even though my understanding is, at least my
17	discrete costs coming from an environmental engineer or some	17	recollection is that I don't think that the imports of these
18	sort of enforcement officer that would have been necessary	18	engines occurred over an entire four-year period, although
19	to prevent the violations in this case. Since I was	19	maybe I'm remembering that wrong right now. But I wanted to
20	building this up entirely on my own and had more leeway to	20	be sure a relatively long period was covered.
21	take what I felt was a more comprehensive approach, I didn't	21	Q Did you consider a quality control program to
22	want to just stop at the kind of bottom line or rather bare	22	ensure production vehicles matched the vehicle design that
23	bones precious metals concentrations.	23	was described in the Respondent's certificates of conformity
24	I wanted to add in there some measure of	24	applications?
25	additional supervision and oversight or consulting that	25	A Essentially what I'm using here is, I'm using that
25	additional supervision and oversight of consulting that	23	A Essentially what the using here is, the using that
	Page 893		Page 895
1	would have been necessary to ensure that those precious	1	as a proxy for things like that. So I don't know exactly
2	metals concentrations matched up with the COCs.	2	what that would have cost. I would have loved to have some,
3	Now whether that would have been say more money	3	to see perhaps some proposal on what a comprehensive program
4	paid to Harrison Wolf, did I get that backwards? Wolf	4	like that would cost, and then I would use that.
5	and Harrison, whatever the consulting firm that I've seen	5	For example in some cases where I've testified for
6	pop up in some information on the public docket and the	6	EPA, there have been internal proposals from a company like
7	email I glanced at this morning on the television screen	7	that that were never pursued, and so therefore I simply
8	there from the peanut gallery. Or whether it could be more	8	based my analysis off some internal company proposal or
9	supervision on behalf of the Chinese manufacturers. I don't	9	some, or a bid from an outside consultant that was never
10	know. But I just wanted to come up with some amount that	10	acted upon by the company.
11	could be used as a proxy for what may have been necessary.	11	Here I did not have anything like that, but
12	And often there's no one right answer to these	12	certainly if there was a cost estimate for a program like
13	things. When we're talking about cases where there are	13	that, then that could be a way of refining this analysis
14	specific pieces of equipment that needed to be purchased or	14	that I've done here.
15	in the component of my analysis here we're talking about	15	Q I just want to turn to your list of your four
16	pieces of metal, quite literally. Very small pieces of	16	scenarios. I'm trying to find the page.
17	metal, but something very tangible like that, my experience	17	(Pause.)
18	is that when compliance costs are more of the nature of	18	JUDGE BIRO: Page 21 of his report.
19	best practices or whether it's BMPs if I'm remembering the	19	BY MR. PALERMO:
20	a a a a a state at a sec	1	
	buzz word correctly, that's not strictly speaking what I'm	20	Q Page 21, sir.
21	buzz word correctly, that's not strictly speaking what I'm modeling here.	20 21	Q Page 21, sir. So scenario one was additional staffing and/or

22

23

24

25

22 But when it gets kind of into softer things like 23 that where there's no strict cutoff, there can be a much 24 wider range of opinion on what the necessary costs would 25

have been. But I wanted to ensure that at least something

52 (Pages 892 to 895)

consulting. Was it -- is it my understanding that you were

to make sure the certificates of conformity matched -- or

certificate of conformity applications matched the, what

looking at what additional paperwork was needed to be done

	Page 896		Page 898
1	catalytic converters were used?	1	versus scenarios two, three and four are entirely
2	A Well, so although I'm not giving a yes or no	2	alternative and disregarding those additional costs and
3	answer, I think this will be more helpful.	3	including only the cost differentials for the metals
4	What I'm doing here is that that table we were	4	compositions and the catalytic converters, I wanted to take
5	just looking at previously, I'm kind of having that perform	5	a more comprehensive and indeed a more aggressive approach
6	double duty.	6	or a more upwardly-biased approach, and one that is actually
7	I'm using that for what it would have cost to	7	contrary to my client's financial interest, but I felt I had
8	ensure that COCs were done differently to match the actual	8	the latitude to do the most accurate approach that I felt
9	engines, to match the actual catalytic converters that were	9	was justified here.
10	used. And I'm using that same amount for having said the	10	So I increased the economic benefit, taking not
11	catalytic converters had more expensive metals compositions	11	just the kind of piecemeal or bare bones approach of the
12	to match the COCs. Still, I'm saying some additional level	12	more expensive catalytic converters, but still retaining in
13	of staffing, consulting, supervision, oversight, et cetera,	13	my economic benefit figures for scenarios two, three and
14	would have been necessary, and I'm using that same proxy.	14	four, some notion of a proxy for additional staffing,
15	So in some alternative universe where this	15	consulting, supervision, et cetera.
16	analysis was even more elaborate than it already is, it	16	Q Did you consider additional testing that would
17	we could I could have, I might have come up with a	17	need to be done to comply?
18	scenario where number one, additional staffing and/or	18	A Conceptually I considered it, but I did not have
19	consulting would have been tailored specifically for someone	19	any information at the time on what those tests or what
20	just coming up with different COCs.	20	the tests that had been performed did cost, and what
21	And then for scenarios two through four, the	21	additional tests would have cost.
22	component of that in addition to the different catalytic	22	Q Do you know if Taotao USA is in compliance with
23	converters would have been something slightly different. In	23	certificate of conformity regulations at this time?
24	other words, more of a quality control approach ensuring,	24	MR. CHU: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion
25	and testing, ensuring that the engines that came in matched	25	and relevancy as to this witness.
			-
		1	
	Page 897		Page 899
1	Page 897 the COCs that had already been specified.	1	Page 899 JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
1 2	the COCs that had already been specified. But at this level, given that I lacked that	1 2	JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I have no idea.
	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		JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I have no idea. BY MR. PALERMO:
2	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	2	JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I have no idea. BY MR. PALERMO: Q Has Taotao USA communicated to you regarding any
2 3	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	2 3 4 5	JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. THE WITNESS: I have no idea. BY MR. PALERMO:
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5 6 7	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.
2 3 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>the COCs that had already been specified.</li> <li>But at this level, given that I lacked that</li> <li>ability to refine it further, I used that same table both</li> <li>for the entirety of my calculation in scenario one, and then</li> <li>as a kind of subsumed component or an incorporated component</li> <li>in the economic benefit figures of rows two, three and four.</li> <li>Q So you're saying that the same amount of time in</li> <li>personnel for doing the additional paperwork in scenario one</li> <li>and carrying out the quality control program to ensure the</li> <li>catalytic converters matched the COC applications, that you</li> <li>were getting the right catalytic converters from the</li> <li>suppliers, that you were ensuring the suppliers knew what</li> <li>the requirements were for such catalytic converters? You're</li> <li>saying it's the same amount of time and resources?</li> <li>A Tm using the same rough proxy for both.</li> <li>So in other words, or to explain it further, when</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>the COCs that had already been specified.</li> <li>But at this level, given that I lacked that</li> <li>ability to refine it further, I used that same table both</li> <li>for the entirety of my calculation in scenario one, and then</li> <li>as a kind of subsumed component or an incorporated component</li> <li>in the economic benefit figures of rows two, three and four.</li> <li>Q So you're saying that the same amount of time in</li> <li>personnel for doing the additional paperwork in scenario one</li> <li>and carrying out the quality control program to ensure the</li> <li>catalytic converters matched the COC applications, that you</li> <li>were getting the right catalytic converters from the</li> <li>suppliers, that you were ensuring the suppliers knew what</li> <li>the requirements were for such catalytic converters? You're</li> <li>saying it's the same amount of time and resources?</li> <li>A I'm using the same rough proxy for both.</li> <li>So in other words, or to explain it further, when</li> <li>I went through scenario one, at least conceptually in my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the COCs that had already been specified.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I'm using the same rough proxy for both.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Although some analyst might take the approach that well, that's just writing down different numbers on a piece</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.

	Page 900		Page 902
1	A I did not attempt to do a tax audit, no.	1	this case.
2	Q Did you ever question whether some of the numbers	2	A Yes.
3	were accurate? Or an accurate reflection of the company's	3	Q JCXI and the Taotao Group, were those, are you
4	business?	4	familiar with those names?
5	A Well, the receivables, the accounts receivables, I	5	A Yes.
6	said earlier, it certainly makes sense in Dr. Carroll's	6	Q In your deposition you had indicated that you had
7	reports that they appear to be missing entirely. It would	7	taken data from those records and placed them in a
8	be very odd for a company like that to have exactly zero	8	spreadsheet, do you recall that?
9	accounts receivable. So to that extent, I questioned that	9	MR. CHU: Your Honor, I'm going to ask that
10	aspect of it.	10	counsel identify the line and page number if he's attempting
11	I did look through to see if there is anything	11	to use the deposition at this time.
12	that really stood out and made me wonder. However, looking	12	JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.
13	through it, generally the relationships between the numbers	13	THE WITNESS: Yes, and since we're kind of in
14	matched up with a company that is importing engines I'm	14	general cutting to the chase here I can just explain I
15	sorry importing vehicles from a foreign supplier,	15	can just essentially repeat the gist of that testimony if
16	warehousing them, and then selling them to various other	16	you want.
17	retailers and then receiving payment for it.	17	BY MR. PALERMO:
18	In other words it didn't seem sometimes I'll	18	Q Well, do you recall telling us that in your
19	look through tax returns and there will be travel and	19	calculation which was an ABEL analysis, right, or ABEL-like
20	entertainment expenses that just seem way out of proportion,	20	analysis.
21	or expenses that either in their magnitude or their type	21	A Right. I mean I can just explain it and then you
22	just don't seem to make any sense at all. Nothing like that	22	can ask I just wanted to hurry things up if you want, and
23	stood out to me by looking at the tax returns.	23	unless you want to
24	I did find Dr. Carroll's relatively short two-page	24	Q I already heard your testimony about it, I just
25	report interesting about the discrepancy between what's on	25	have a short few follow-up questions.
		1	
	Page 901		Page 903
1	the tax returns and what's declared to Customs to be	1	Page 903 A Okay.
1 2	the tax returns and what's declared to Customs to be interesting. But as he said, I wasn't able to conclude	1 2	A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet
	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.	2 3	<ul><li>A Okay.</li><li>Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li><li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question</li></ul>
2	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	2 3 4	A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet
2 3 4 5	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	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	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	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q You had indicated to us that the results of that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q You had indicated to us that the results of that calculation showed that one of the companies could pay part</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right. One company could pay the entire amount I put in,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>One company could pay the entire amount I put in, and one company could pay the other. But if I'm remembering</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>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,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>Me 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</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Q But there was some indication of ability to pay at least part of that overall penalty by each company based on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>Me 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.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>Me 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.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Okay. Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet</li> <li>Q No, I I do not there's not a question pending, sir.</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>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?</li> <li>A I don't think that's quite right.</li> <li>Me 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.</li> <li>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?</li> </ul>

	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	
19	administrative notice of?		JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
20	MR. CHU: Permission to approach?	19	MR. CHU: And Your Honor, the next presentation is
20	JUDGE BIRO: What do you want me to take	20	just requesting admission of certain exhibits.
21	administrative notice of exactly?	21	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
22	2	22	MR. KLEPP: Your Honor, may I be heard?
23 24	MR. CHU: It's the 1981 version of the	23	Just a point of order. I see a lot of writing on
	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
_	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	a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.	2	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor.
2 3	a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it. JUDGE BIRO: Okay.	2 3	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
2 3 4	a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the	2 3 4	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012. May I, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs. JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from MR. CHU: It's current to this present time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at this time, to offer Respondent's Exhibit 10, 18, 23, 26, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's current to this present time</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 2017.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at this time, to offer Respondent's Exhibit 10, 18, 23, 26, and 27.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012. May I, Your Honor? JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs. JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from MR. CHU: It's current to this present time JUDGE BIRO: 2017. MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. And those were the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at this time, to offer Respondent's Exhibit 10, 18, 23, 26, and 27. JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's current to this present time</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 2017.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. And those were the same CFRs that were utilized in 2012.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at this time, to offer Respondent's Exhibit 10, 18, 23, 26, and 27. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Exhibit 10 is an email from Margaret of Harrison
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's current to this present time</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 2017.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. And those were the same CFRs that were utilized in 2012.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at this time, to offer Respondent's Exhibit 10, 18, 23, 26, and 27. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Exhibit 10 is an email from Margaret of Harrison Wolf dated July 25, 2012 to Jackie Wang.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>a you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll take notice of it.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version in 2012.</li> <li>May I, Your Honor?</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Okay.</li> <li>So this has been marked for some other purpose. I presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request to take administrative notice of these statutes. These CFRs.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from</li> <li>MR. CHU: It's current to this present time</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: 2017.</li> <li>MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. And those were the same CFRs that were utilized in 2012.</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: Isn't this an issue that we addressed in our accelerated decision?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	me a copy that's clean? MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the objection, we have this seems not at all related to penalty. JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable times, but it could be that I'm tired. But I'll take it into consideration to the extent that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can always look to the CFRs. MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at this time, to offer Respondent's Exhibit 10, 18, 23, 26, and 27. JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Exhibit 10 is an email from Margaret of Harrison Wolf dated July 25, 2012 to Jackie Wang. Do you have anybody's response to this document?

	Page 908		Page 910
1	MS. TARIQ: The rest of it includes just invoices	1	
1 2	from Harrison Wolf and additional emails.		The next, page three through seven appear to be invoices from Harrison Wolf Consulting. I think those we
3	And then we do have a business records affidavit,	3	would have an objection to.
4	Exhibit 27, that authenticates all these documents.	4	JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry, you don't have any
+ 5	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.	5	objection
6	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, first we'd like	6	MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, we would have an objection
7	clarification about is this all Respondents' current		to those based both on relevance and foundation.
8	Exhibit 10 in the binder that we have as a number of	8	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
9	different types of documents? They all bear that stamp.	9	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Pages 8 through 46, just appear
10	JUDGE BIRO: Can you come up here? I can't really	10	to be duplicative of Complainant's Exhibit 77. No objection
11	hear you very well.	11	other than that it appears duplicative.
12	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Maybe this is comfortable if	12	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
13	we're side by side we can understand what we're discussing	13	And is that all of Exhibit 10?
14	literally on the same page.	14	MR. KULSCHINSKY: That appears to be everything
15	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.	15	that's marked as Exhibit 10 in the binder.
16	So Exhibit 10. What are we doing here?	16	MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, just about relevance,
17	MS. TARIQ: Offering Exhibit 10 into evidence. It	17	these are just monies paid by Taotao to get in compliance.
18	includes so this was all part of the pre-hearing exchange	18	JUDGE BIRO: I agree. It might be relevant, but
19	but it was listed on the pre-hearing exchange as RX and	19	you don't have anybody to authenticate it.
20	let me just I believe it was RX-6, RX-7, and the last	20	They're not Taotao's documents. They might have
21	portion of it is just, I believe, the same as CX-77. But it	21	been received by Taotao but I don't know that. You don't
22	was listed in the pre-hearing exchange. I'm just going to	22	even have somebody here to, that could be available to
23	find the number that was that it was listed at.	23	authenticate it, and you don't have anybody who could be
24	JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so these documents were a part	24	cross-examined.
25	of the pre-hearing exchange.	25	So no.
	Page 909	1	
	Page 909		Page 911
1	MS. TARIQ: Yes.	1	Page 911 I will admit Exhibit 10, pages 1 and 2, and I'm
1 2	_	1 2	_
	MS. TARIQ: Yes.	1	I will admit Exhibit 10, pages 1 and 2, and I'm
2	MS. TARIQ: Yes. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, that's great. So do you have a	2	I will admit Exhibit 10, pages 1 and 2, and I'm not going to admit the rest. It's either duplicative or you
2 3	MS. TARIQ: Yes. JUDGE BIRO: Okay, that's great. So do you have a witness to sponsor them?	2 3	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.
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5 6 7	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	2 3 4 5	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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

Page 912Page1additional test reports that are intermingled with this, we1to Mr. Jackson the first day. I'm not sure if they we2don't believe were provided to the Agency before this2admitted into evidence or not. So.3litigation began. And we'd object to relevance among other3(The document referred to4matters.4was marked for identification5JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So we're not going to admit5as Respondent's Exhibit No.618.626.)	e 914 re
2don't believe were provided to the Agency before this2admitted into evidence or not. So.3litigation began. And we'd object to relevance among other3(The document referred to4matters.4was marked for identification5JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So we're not going to admit5as Respondent's Exhibit No.	
3litigation began. And we'd object to relevance among other3(The document referred to4matters.4was marked for identification5JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So we're not going to admit5as Respondent's Exhibit No.	
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 dor	't have
10 correct. 10 it as admitted into the record, and we went over, I the	nink,
11 JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we're not going to admit RX-18. 11 all of the exhibits for the Respondent which the onl	y 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 Exhi	bit 26.
14to CEE. Our expert Larry Swinke (phonetic) would have come14JUDGE BIRO: Do you have an objection?	
15and authenticated these, but we agreed that he would not15MR. KULSCHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.	
16come and testify. I guess, then, it's just up to16We would object to this exhibit. It's, I think a	
17Complainants now, if you object to it, because he's not17was discussed on the record, it appears to have been	1 made
18   here.     18   for litigation. Again, on relevance and lack of found	
19     (The document referred to       19     and that it wasn't provided to the Agency until late	n 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 1	•
<ul> <li>MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, I think we would</li> <li>calling one of the Agency attorneys that received it.</li> <li>object both on relevance and Complainant's understanding</li> <li>JUDGE BIRO: We're not putting an Agency</li> </ul>	
	attorney
25 with regard to Mr. Swinke was 25 on the stand.	
Page 913 Page	e 915
1 JUDGE BIRO: With regard to who? 1 MR. CHU: It was a document that was testif	ied 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. S	o 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	
10     discussed as part of that conversation. And so we would     10     other person from the company, that might be really	y great,
11 object to their admission, and further object to their 11 but you don't have anybody from the company.	10
12     relevance.       12     MR. CHU: On the 26, Your Honor, I'll call	-
13MS. TARIQ: I mean, just that these invoices were13to testify as to that document that was sent by me, the14what the monies paid pursuant to the test order. But14signed.	nat was
14     what the momes part parsuant to the test order. But     14     signed.       15     other than that     15     JUDGE BIRO: We do not put attorneys on t	he stand
16     JUDGE BIRO: Okay, well you don't have anybody to     16     MR. CHU: I understand	ne stand.
17     authenticate them, so Exhibit 23 is not going to be     17     JUDGE BIRO: You cannot testify in your of	wn case
18     admitted.       18     You cannot be a witness in your own case.	vii cuse.
19     You know, that's why people do stipulations before     19     MR. CHU: As to a correspondence? I under	stand.
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 bel	
20 nearing. That's why it's rearry good if you want to get [20] I but fibilion, i in just offering because that s = 1 bet	
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	шу
	шу
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	
21things in, and we can have saved so much time if we had21that's a letter signed by me to the EPA on behalf of22stipulated to exhibits on both sides.22client.	

	Page 916		Page 918
1	JUDGE BIRO: It wasn't a pleading filed in this	1	JUDGE BIRO: No, you need more than just a
2	case.	2	statement from the company. You need somebody from the
3	MR. CHU: Yes, I understand that. Okay, and as I	3	company.
4	said, I didn't want to violate any contact rules by sending,	4	MR. CHU: I understand, Your Honor.
5	having that request sent from my office to their client,	5	I'm just saying this is what I normally use to
6	EPA. So I sent it directly to the EPA	6	prove up records from the company, is this type of document,
7	JUDGE BIRO: Well you should have had them	7	but I hear what the Court is saying. I get it. I'm just
8	stipulate to it before we got here.	8	saying and then you said show me something that allows
9	MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we don't dispute	9	that. We'll bring that up in the briefing.
10	that this was included in a supplement to Respondent's pre-	10	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Why don't we do that. You can
11	hearing exchange.	11	argue for the admissibility of these records again in your
12	JUDGE BIRO: It was	12	briefing, and I'll take it under consideration.
13	MR. KULSCHINSKY: That it was provided to us in	13	MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor.
14	that format. So it	14	I'm not arguing with the Court, I'm saying I
15	JUDGE BIRO: So do you not object to it going into	15	understand.
16	the record?	16	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
17	MR. KULSCHINSKY: I believe we do object to it	17	All right.
18	going into the record just based on its relevance, general	18	Is there any other witness you want to call, Mr.
19	lack of probative value, and it's unreliable. It doesn't	19	Chu?
20	demonstrate anything other than that counsel was able to	20	MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.
21	prepare a letter requesting this and provided it to us as an	21	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
22	exhibit in this litigation.	22	Are there any other documents you wish to put into
23	So we just object to its inclusion.	23	evidence?
24	(Pause.)	24	MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.
25	MR. CHU: Your Honor, I must be mistaken on the	25	JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So for the Respondents I have
	D 017		
			Dago 919
-	Page 917		Page 919
1	document. I thought it was talking about the letter we had	1	Respondents Exhibit 1, Respondents Exhibit 33. We've marked
2	document. I thought it was talking about the letter we had talked about, and I'm going to take a minute to look for	2	Respondents Exhibit 1, Respondents Exhibit 33. We've marked as Respondents Exhibit 38 is the deposition of Ms. Isin.
2 3	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	2 3	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.
2 3 4	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	2 3 4	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
2 3 4 5	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.	2 3 4 5	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.
2 3 4 5 6	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.	2 3 4 5 6	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	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?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	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.
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	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.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	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.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	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?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	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?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	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 post-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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 self-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	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 post- hearing briefs once you get the transcript which will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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 self- authenticating. If you have certified copies. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	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 post- hearing briefs once you get the transcript which will hopefully be in the next 30 days or so. And once we get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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 self- authenticating. If you have certified copies. But otherwise, business records require somebody.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	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 post- hearing 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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 self- authenticating. If you have certified copies. But otherwise, business records require somebody. MR. CHU: Right, and that's what I'm saying. WE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	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 post- hearing 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,

	Page 920	
1	out our decision. And we'll send it to you in writing.	
2	Thank you.	
3	MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor. We would close	
4	JUDGE BIRO: Huh?	
5	MR. CHU: We would close, rest, without usually	
6	I like to hear them say closed, and I'll say closed.	
7	JUDGE BIRO: Okay.	
8	MR. KLEPP: We would close, Your Honor. Thank	
9	you.	
10	MR. CHU: We close as well.	
11	JUDGE BIRO: All right. Have a good evening.	
12	Thank you very much.	
13	(Whereupon, at 4:06 p.m., the hearing in the	
14	above-entitled matter concluded.)	
15	//	
16	//	
17	//	
18	//	
19	//	
20	//	
21	//	
22	//	
23	//	
24	//	
25	//	
	Page 921	
	Page 921 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C.	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges.	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges.	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	
	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE DOCKET NO.: CAA-HQ-2015-8065 CASE TITLE: Taotao USA, Inc., Taotao Group Co., LTD and Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Co., LTD HEARING DATE: October 19, 2017 LOCATION: Washington, D.C. I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Administrative Law Judges. Date: October 19, 2017 Rick SanbornOfficial Reporter Heritage Reporting Corporation 1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206	

				Page 1
A	905:23,25	777:6 782:17	addendums	913:6
<b>a.m</b> 688:12	accent 710:13	785:18 790:4	860:7 913:25	admission
<b>a.iii</b> 088.12 691:2	710:14,16	790:14 791:18	adding 782:14	906:20 909:14
ABEL 864:24	757:11 760:5,6	798:7,8 800:2	782:14 881:9	913:11
878:2,3,5,11	accept 731:20	850:9 898:8	addition 885:10	admit 693:22,24
878:13,15,18	805:22 814:17	900:3,3	896:22	909:7 911:1,2
878:23 880:8,9	858:18 861:12	accurately	additional	912:5,11 915:5
880:14,20,21	866:14	713:2 851:2	867:10,24	admitted 692:5
880:23 881:1,5	acceptable	921:10	868:10 869:24	693:2 695:10
881:7,13,17,18	732:5 823:5	accuse 804:23	870:25 873:22	772:6,15 786:3
881:23 882:16	858:15 859:2,5	accused 762:22	891:13 892:9	794:2,6,10,17
884:5 886:16	accepted 752:3	777:24 802:24	892:11,25	794:19 839:16
886:17,20	859:3	803:2	895:21,23	839:23 852:6,9
899:9,9,18,21	accepting	acid 728:21	896:12,18	913:18 914:2
902:19 903:25	859:24 884:11	730:5	897:8 898:2,14	914:10 915:4
<b>ABEL's</b> 881:12	accompanying	acknowledges	898:16,21	919:4
904:2	876:10	754:2	906:2 908:2	adopted 727:21
ABEL-like	accomplish	acronym 701:2	911:20 912:1	adverse 692:17
877:3 902:19	727:14	<b>Act</b> 703:14	919:24	advise 845:23
<b>ability</b> 790:2	account 873:15	722:12 723:23	additive 868:18	advising 803:25
805:16 856:7	885:20	795:9 834:7	address 709:12	affect 886:5
862:10 863:13	accounting	acted 895:10	774:16,20,20	affidavit 908:3
863:16 864:18	879:12 889:4	action 799:8	884:18 885:19	909:5 911:21
864:23 865:6	890:18 901:13	810:3 816:24	906:8	917:13,15
875:10,14,16	<b>accounts</b> 886:11	836:23 837:24	addressed	affidavits 915:7
877:7,14,21,22	887:17,22	838:1,7 860:16	761:14 905:22	915:7
879:2 880:25	888:5,17,20	actions 786:12	adjust 811:13	afford 904:5
881:4 885:14	889:6,7,19	actively 713:5	adjustable	afforded 694:3
885:23,24	890:3 900:5,9	acts 722:13	807:23 808:11	694:15
886:5,25 888:2	accurate 700:18	799:20	809:4,10,19,22	Africa 700:25
890:14 897:3	700:25 702:19	actual 732:8	810:2	after-tax 873:2
899:11 903:20	704:12,18	734:16,18	adjustment	aged 889:7
<b>able</b> 837:8	705:3 707:25	838:22 839:1,6	807:18 809:17	agency 688:1,18
858:18 859:23	709:11 710:23	839:8,10	809:23 810:15	695:14 697:2
860:6 876:17	712:18 714:10	840:23 841:10	888:16	734:5 743:4
901:2 916:20	714:14 715:6	841:13 872:9	adjustments	774:25 801:5
above-entitled	715:10 717:22	874:15 885:10	807:25 882:15	810:5 814:16
842:5 920:14	718:13,14	888:4,14	883:2 887:16	814:25 816:13
<b>absence</b> 770:23	720:1,14	890:18 896:8,9	administrative	820:2,14,15
770:24 889:23	726:12,13	897:19	688:1,14	831:12,15
absolutely	732:20 733:8	add 714:5	807:19,21	832:21 833:1
707:20 735:4	734:3 740:9,10	740:23 784:15	808:9 809:11	833:19,19
856:22	740:20 741:6	785:3 873:18	810:9,10	835:15,20,21
absorbance	741:17 743:19	892:24	813:23 840:11	836:6,12,14
730:10	744:25 745:1	added 716:7	865:14 904:19	837:25 840:11
absorption	748:16 750:11	730:7 847:21	904:22 905:14	862:13,15
730:11	750:23 751:21	850:7,17	921:13	866:13 909:13
absorptivity	757:21 764:19	873:24 884:4	admissibility	911:25 912:2
730:13	767:24 768:5	addendum	918:11	914:19,23,24
accelerated	769:22 770:3	917:5	admissible	921:12
accelerated				<b>-</b>

				Page 2
Agency's 834:17	748:7 775:23	Amelie 689:4	727:18 859:2	apologizing
835:3	776:15 778:6	698:15	881:7,15	884:24
agents 753:19	799:11 819:19	amended 808:21	906:13	apparently
aggregate	833:11 834:18	850:17 882:22	anchor 857:25	719:16
782:10,10,12	841:4 856:14	882:25	and/or 895:21	appeal 785:10
782:13 859:17	858:5,19,20	amendment	896:18	appear 772:25
aggressive 898:5	880:4 889:14	917:5	Ane 817:1	779:4 857:15
ago 707:10,10	902:12	amendments	announced	874:4 900:7
721:7 850:3	air 702:9,15,19	860:9	715:25	910:1,9
agree 705:18	702:24 703:11	American	announcement	APPEARAN
708:2 720:10	702:24 703:11	720:10 779:7	745:21	688:15
723:23 724:18	704:12 720:12	877:10,24	<b>annual</b> 735:14	appeared
727:16,22,23	721:4 723:22	<b>amount</b> 725:11	741:25 818:18	755:24 824:2
729:23 735:2	727:9,11 771:3	772:4 782:8,9	823:23 824:1,4	871:19,25
743:21 744:25	795:8,11	786:23 788:25	823:23 824:1,4	872:8 876:2,5
751:12 753:10	796:12,17	844:10 855:14	856:24,25,25	876:7
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · ·	
755:25 770:15 772:21 773:10	834:4,7,8 858:8	858:14 884:3 884:16,19	857:9 858:1 annually 742:2	<b>appears</b> 704:14 734:13 798:25
779:5 799:1		892:9 893:10	<b>annuany</b> 742:2 <b>answer</b> 740:6	828:24 866:20
	alert 750:7			
802:23 821:1	796:6,15	896:10 897:7	781:22 788:22	870:16 887:17
822:20 829:2	<b>Alibaba</b> 783:2	897:14 903:10	791:25 824:22	890:8 909:20
830:4,25 833:5	790:5	903:12 904:6	851:1 868:6	910:11,14
836:17,24	alkali 730:5	amounts 859:16	893:12 896:3	914:17
848:14 861:20	allegations	870:22,25	answered	Appendix
865:16 882:4	710:23	871:4 874:20	707:21 790:19	889:17
910:18 912:7	alleged 735:5	analyses 877:21	876:17	applicability
agreed 780:17	803:2 813:18	885:23	answering	881:13
814:17 831:3	853:21 855:24	analysis 763:3	707:23 803:11	applicable
912:15 913:3	alleging 882:18	844:12 864:16	answers 694:24	837:11 880:15
agreement	<b>allow</b> 692:17	864:24 865:15	763:22 764:11	application
744:22 745:3,6	695:7 787:12	865:19 866:2	<b>anybody</b> 697:10	733:9,14,18,20
745:8 749:11	806:13 826:14	866:23 867:15	698:2 827:17	734:1 740:1,20
752:23 776:5	862:3	867:22 868:7	841:23 910:19	768:17 807:22
777:6 778:7,8	allowable 811:9	871:17 872:5	910:23 913:16	812:16 829:24
807:19,22	<b>allowed</b> 754:11	877:2,14,23,24	915:11	830:3 831:5
808:10 809:11	807:24,25	880:1,2,23,24	anybody's	833:6,7,20,20
810:9,10 812:9	870:22 871:5	882:19 891:14	907:23	833:21,22,23
813:6,24	874:20 906:6	893:15 895:8	anymore 697:1	854:12 858:4
814:16,22,25	<b>allows</b> 773:18	895:13 896:16	718:22 760:13	applications
815:8,14,25	860:9 918:8	899:9,11,17,18	862:16 889:5	742:1 808:10
816:10 820:16	almonds 855:2	902:19,20	<b>Anyway</b> 757:18	808:17,19
821:20 823:24	alphabet 732:25	906:16	<b>apart</b> 873:8	809:3,5,12,13
826:25 848:12	altering 868:15	analyst 897:20	apologies	813:7 828:12
852:25 855:15	alternative	analysts 867:2	794:15	829:12 830:5
899:8	880:20 896:15	analytical 878:5	apologize	831:20 894:24
<b>ahead</b> 694:4	898:2 899:20	880:16 890:17	707:20 720:23	895:25 897:10
700:2 703:19	alternatives	analyze 879:25	747:18 757:13	906:14
704:6 716:19	868:18	analyzed 864:19	869:13	applied 811:20
724:21 725:24	altogether	885:3	apologized	839:12 866:3
733:17 743:6	871:15 882:15	analyzing	752:11	869:23
			I	I

				Page 3
<b>applies</b> 799:13	773:21 775:9	<b>aside</b> 717:11	738:21,22	auditors 876:9
apply 692:16	795:14 796:12	874:4 881:22	739:19 765:20	August 752:25
755:10 812:2,4	800:17 805:9	asked 700:5	766:7 767:4	905:6
812:12 836:10	867:22 894:10	707:20 714:19	768:4 781:2	authenticate
836:11 838:3	areas 727:9	715:4 716:13	853:22	910:19,23
839:7 873:1	773:10,20	737:24 749:14	assume 693:8	913:17
894:11	775:1 879:13	752:2,12	758:13 773:9	authenticated
appreciate	<b>arguably</b> 780:14	773:17 777:25	851:1	911:25 912:15
743:15 784:2	<b>argue</b> 804:14	790:19 793:16	assumed 715:11	915:4
approach	918:11	824:19 848:14	846:3	authenticates
742:17 866:24	<b>arguing</b> 918:14	875:16 894:7	assuming	908:4
	0 0	917:14	733:25 741:9	
867:6 868:13	argument			authenticating
869:4 871:11	774:21 801:4	<b>asking</b> 694:17	804:12 835:18	911:3 917:21
871:21 873:21	804:7 828:10	714:18 715:21	assumption	authored 859:1
878:5 887:24	838:12	750:18 754:13	846:4	authority
892:21 894:9	argumentative	763:20 766:3	Assurance	719:16 723:11
896:24 897:20	715:1 758:25	782:15 786:5	688:19	734:4 909:6
898:5,6,8,11	772:7 799:10	786:24 787:10	assurances	917:15
904:20	802:12	789:2,16,17	720:6	authors 702:1
approached	arguments	790:16 797:2	<b>atomic</b> 730:10	<b>auto</b> 722:8
875:15	801:15 919:18	801:20 803:22	attachment	automatically
appropriate	arrest 725:1	805:4,5 824:15	737:13 754:7	855:23
693:5 812:11	article 701:11	825:19 827:17	attachments	available 692:15
833:10 836:24	701:25 726:14	835:23	754:12,14	693:5 694:9
838:8 881:15	726:17,19	aspect 900:10	attacked 879:21	771:18 801:21
894:5,6	articles 700:17	aspects 880:23	attempt 900:1	837:22,25
approval 740:22	700:21 726:8	assessed 813:11	906:10	869:10 871:23
740:23	846:20	814:6,12	attempted	894:8,13
approved 741:5	articulate	825:10,11	773:16 800:8	910:22
757:20 768:16	704:17	835:17 837:20	attempting	<b>Avenue</b> 688:8
816:12 820:14	ASA 699:11,15	assessment	760:21,24	688:19 709:12
825:14 831:12	708:20 711:6	789:19	782:7 902:10	averaging
831:18 833:1,6	719:13 735:16	assessments	attempts 760:17	722:18,20
833:6,7,19	736:9,13,17,24	803:7	attend 882:16	avoided 866:25
837:1,3 857:17	738:10 749:10	asset 883:25	attention 717:20	avoiding 868:9
approving 834:2	753:11,21	assets 881:2,6	720:12,15	<b>aware</b> 698:4
834:5	764:21,24,25	884:19 885:2,5	856:17	704:21 708:20
approximately	765:7 808:18	885:16 886:22	attorney 749:21	708:22 738:9
702:12 708:10	809:13 810:3	886:23	749:23 848:4,9	755:1,17 798:7
712:4 885:2	812:9 813:6	<b>assist</b> 862:11	850:4 914:24	814:16 829:1
approximation	815:8 820:18	assistance	attorneys	833:25 834:8
865:23 881:8	823:24 824:3	707:18 747:1	859:10 914:23	845:16 848:7
904:2	824:19 825:1,5	assisted 848:5	915:15	877:14
<b>April</b> 745:7	827:6 848:1	associate 721:16	ATV 843:13	awareness
aqua 730:9	855:12 856:21	723:22 799:19	847:13	803:23
arbitrarily	857:2,18	associated	ATVs 734:15	
894:14,15	ascribing	703:14 711:1	773:8 844:21	B
arduous 772:20	743:14	716:9 717:20	844:24 845:8	<b>B</b> 688:24 690:1
773:1	Asia 800:2 844:1	721:24 726:11	<b>audience</b> 878:24	742:9,23 743:1
<b>area</b> 726:3	Asian 759:19	733:4,10 736:4	<b>audit</b> 900:1	743:5 744:18
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

				Page 4
745:20 780:9,9	751:23 753:9	893:9 915:21	817:25 819:3,9	696:2,5,7,10
<b>B/C</b> 746:14	768:3 770:22	<b>belief</b> 704:15	821:16 824:25	696:16,19
bachelor's	790:10 807:18	739:18 748:24	832:25 834:6	697:2,10,12,16
799:23	809:18,23	850:23	belongs 739:12	697:22 698:2,6
<b>back</b> 696:6	837:16 840:23	<b>believe</b> 691:25	780:18	698:11,13,18
702:13 708:21	854:21 863:25	693:3,10	BEN 870:6	698:22,24
713:10 717:3	864:2 868:21	699:24 705:8	878:17 879:4	700:2 703:4,19
718:4 724:14	872:21 873:23	708:13,15	beneficial	704:6 706:19
726:24 731:13	872:21 873:23	709:4,10,23	879:17	713:17,20
733:18,22	885:20,21,22	710:3 711:5,15	<b>benefit</b> 691:22	715:17,20
740:8 744:7	· · ·	713:17 717:23	720:24 848:13	721:19 722:25
	886:3,11,12,21			
746:25 764:22	887:16 888:1	719:2,23	858:1 863:1,6	723:16 724:5
800:11,14	895:8 903:21	722:17 728:10	863:10 864:17	724:21,25
802:19 804:2	903:23 909:7	745:7 749:8	864:19,22	725:4,24
806:14 808:6	910:7 911:21	754:19 759:12	865:6,13,19	737:10 741:14
817:11,11	916:18	760:10 761:9	866:2,14 868:9	744:2 745:22
819:5 820:22	<b>basically</b> 704:11	761:10 762:1	869:6 870:15	746:2,6 752:11
821:25 822:2	716:14 770:7	765:19 773:18	872:5 874:24	752:16,21
823:25 824:13	801:2 824:25	785:6,22 786:2	875:15 880:1	753:8,13,16,19
826:19 841:21	830:11 837:6	790:7,8,16,24	891:5,14 897:6	753:21 754:1,4
843:3 857:21	862:8	791:19 797:14	897:24 898:10	755:5 756:10
862:3 867:18	<b>basis</b> 691:21	798:15 808:19	898:13 904:16	756:12 757:15
868:17 869:9	693:18 731:15	810:16 811:3	<b>best</b> 700:9	758:20 759:11
881:9 883:23	795:10 837:17	811:23 812:17	718:14 719:23	759:24 762:10
886:1,3 891:5	853:5 880:18	812:21 814:11	721:1,7 745:4	762:13,16,20
906:24	891:25 892:1	815:15,15,18	753:3 813:8	764:4 766:23
background	Bates 711:25	816:14,17,23	815:22 830:20	767:1,17
843:10 864:1	720:3 728:19	816:25 820:4	851:6 856:7,13	769:15 770:11
<b>backlog</b> 825:15	732:12 737:4	820:17,18	859:10 893:19	771:6 772:24
backlogs 827:4	741:7 742:19	821:14,17	<b>better</b> 713:14	773:14,19
backwards	754:17 793:6	822:7,18	723:4 760:11	774:5,13,23
893:4	811:5,11	825:21 830:19	769:23	775:20,22
<b>bad</b> 721:23,24	827:12 829:7	845:1 847:13	<b>beyond</b> 869:2	776:15,18,21
763:12,13	883:13	847:15 849:21	892:9	776:23 777:9
856:22	<b>Beach</b> 708:16	850:13 853:5	<b>bid</b> 895:9	777:15,18
<b>badness</b> 721:17	716:15 717:21	854:11,17	<b>big</b> 858:25 871:8	778:5 780:3,5
<b>bag</b> 725:12	718:12,19	874:12 879:15	877:18 884:15	780:7,11,19,23
Bailey 736:22	719:3	881:14 882:5	890:16 901:9	781:15 783:9
<b>balance</b> 722:12	beans 725:10,16	883:3 906:3	bigger 888:1	783:21 784:24
876:14 883:2	bear 908:9	908:20,21	<b>bills</b> 888:24	785:1,4,11,14
887:20	<b>beg</b> 736:21	909:10,24	<b>binder</b> 864:7	786:5,8,18,21
<b>banking</b> 722:18	began 912:3	911:18 912:2	883:11 908:8	786:25 787:6
722:21,22	beginning 718:9	915:20 916:17	910:15	787:13,17,23
<b>banner</b> 699:17	718:22 779:8	919:6	<b>binders</b> 864:6	787:25 788:3,6
bare 892:22	854:25 857:21	believed 749:23	<b>Biro</b> 688:13	788:11,14,22
894:3 898:11	begins 734:21	<b>bell</b> 766:21,24	691:3,7,12,17	789:9,17
barely 874:10	760:20	bells 758:16,22	692:4 693:1,8	790:20 791:9
base 877:22	behalf 719:13	belonged 741:1	693:12,18,22	793:3,5 794:8
based 694:24	760:22 788:8	belonging	694:6,12,18	794:11,13,19
740:21 751:22	846:3 880:20	769:10 817:14	695:11,20	795:18 797:4
		l		

707 10 700 4	004 11 10 01	760 10 10 14	017.00	012 7 015 12
797:10 798:4	904:11,18,21	762:10,12,14	917:22	913:7 915:12
798:14 799:4	904:24 905:3,9	762:17 841:20	<b>busy</b> 869:12	918:18
799:11 800:23	905:16,19,22	841:23 919:10	<b>buzz</b> 893:20	called 699:24
801:4,12,16,22	906:18,21,25	919:13	<b>bylaws</b> 846:20	716:15 800:19
802:13 803:12	907:3,7,10,20	breaking 873:8	<u> </u>	854:19 861:3
803:15 804:7	907:25 908:5	breakout 789:7		884:1
804:11 805:6	908:10,15,24	<b>bridge</b> 729:6,9	C 689:1 733:6	calling 914:23
805:11,21,24	909:2,6,13,17	brief 693:25	737:13 742:7	calls 704:3 724:2
806:1,4,8,15	909:22 910:4,8	762:19 777:16	743:1,8 744:18	770:9 773:11
806:17,24	910:12,18	785:10 804:8	745:20 817:4	777:7 780:4
807:2,7,9,12	911:9,11 912:5	804:14 806:10	818:4	819:17 835:4
808:23 809:1	912:11 913:1	807:11 828:11	<b>C06</b> 827:12	898:24
819:18 821:11	913:16 914:9	881:25 901:19	CAA-HQ-201	Camp 709:12
822:23 824:7	914:14,21,24	917:14	688:4 921:3	<b>campus</b> 729:11
825:7,17 826:1	915:3,9,15,17	briefing 693:17	<b>cabinet</b> 795:13	729:14
827:16 828:16	915:23 916:1,7	694:2 918:9,12	calculated	Canada 759:7
833:11 834:17	916:12,15	919:23	710:22 730:12	759:12
835:6 838:9,11	917:9,20 918:1	briefly 875:19	781:24 782:21	Canadians
838:16,19	918:10,16,21	875:20,20	788:20 805:17	759:8
839:18,21,23	918:25 919:7	briefs 801:15	806:2	<b>Cao</b> 692:12,14
840:8,17,21,25	919:10,15,17	919:20	calculating	697:25 708:3
841:2,4,17,19	920:4,7,11	bring 918:9	806:5 870:5	709:21,24
843:3,7,10,18	<b>birth</b> 796:21,24	bringing 873:6	calculation	710:8,14
843:20,25	<b>bit</b> 760:8,9	broad 774:1	776:12 782:25	731:19 748:19
844:3,6,9,13	808:4,24	broken 724:18	783:5,10,11,15	749:17 797:15
844:20,23	814:20 828:4	781:9 889:6,7	788:18 807:15	846:2 848:8,12
845:7,21 846:6	828:17 848:7	Brooks 719:13	841:9,13 856:5	849:6,23
846:13,18	bites 828:15	719:14	864:21 887:2	<b>Cao's</b> 692:20
847:1,5,8,12	black 883:5	brought 773:15	897:4 902:19	693:23 695:13
847:16,19	<b>blame</b> 779:24	774:16,19	903:7	792:2 851:21
848:1,9,12,18	blaming 800:24	901:16	calculations	851:23
848:24 849:2	<b>BMPs</b> 893:19	Bruce 853:8	710:22 771:19	capable 834:24
851:11,14,21	<b>bold</b> 883:15	BTAOX.250A	781:12,13	car 722:11
852:1,5,8,16	bones 892:23	739:24	789:19 840:23	780:16 845:12
852:18 853:7	894:3 898:11	building 688:7	861:17,19,25	<b>Cara</b> 689:4
853:11,14	<b>boo-boo</b> 744:18	724:16 745:23	862:14 873:2	698:15
854:3 860:18	<b>book</b> 747:2	871:11 872:17	873:13,25	carburetors
860:22 861:5	880:21 887:6,6	892:20	878:16,19	807:24 808:14
861:14,20,23	888:1	<b>built</b> 715:13	891:21 903:9	care 887:6
862:5,13,23	<b>Boston</b> 777:3	737:20 768:24	906:12	carried 889:4
863:5,9,14,16	bottles 725:2	769:25	calculator	Carroll 694:5
863:20 864:7	<b>bottom</b> 866:20	business 774:8,9	781:23	865:1 879:6,10
864:11 865:5	871:7 881:4	774:11 799:24	calendar 734:21	882:11 887:1
866:11,13,16	892:22	846:12 885:6	876:19,20,25	887:14 890:3
872:13 874:25	<b>bound</b> 884:15	885:14 886:6,6	California	901:16
875:3,8 879:14	<b>box</b> 724:14	886:10,13,25	717:21	Carroll's 880:6
879:22 880:4	Boy 777:13,22	900:4 908:3	call 692:14	880:6 881:24
883:5,7 890:24	Branch 702:10	909:7 911:21	740:16 851:15	889:12 900:6
895:18 899:1	break 715:18	915:7 917:13	854:8 860:19	900:24
901:21 902:12	724:25 762:6	917:15,17,19	860:20 864:20	Carrollton
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			

				Page 6
709:11,13	729:18 730:1	causation	741:25 742:2	811:2 818:2
713:4 715:5	744:9 745:15	853:24 855:8	743:2 798:9	820:5 909:16
carry 803:3	746:16 747:19	855:25	829:24 833:25	909:17
carry- 733:25	747:22 750:10	cause 840:20	834:1,20	checking 829:5
carry-over	750:13,19,25	cause 840.20 caveats 903:24	837:10 838:23	checklists 748:9
733:11 740:14	751:3,6,10,18	<b>CBI</b> 827:15	certified 697:24	754:19
740:20 741:6	751:19,20,24	CEE 757:20	737:19 795:8	checkup 856:25
740:20 741:0	752:7,24	758:4,6 830:23	805:7 917:21	856:25
833:20	753:10,12,16	831:1,8 912:14	certify 921:9	chemistry 731:9
carry-overs	754:15,20	913:4,9	certifying	Chen 798:15
740:12,13	758:10 763:5	ceiling 745:24	740:17,18	Chief 688:14
carrying 897:9	763:16 780:13	<b>Center</b> 701:10	743:4	China 708:21
cars 845:18	814:20,23	<b>certain</b> 695:4	<b>cetera</b> 799:20	726:6 727:1,5
cart 859:7	815:1 816:13	708:23 709:1,7	867:11,24,25	727:6 731:19
case 699:23	817:13,18,21	710:7 712:19	896:13 898:15	734:3 752:8
770:22 777:11	821:20 845:19	717:4,11	<b>CFR</b> 854:22	776:2 779:12
777:22 778:2,2	858:3,9 859:4	722:12 723:25	904:16,24	787:21 788:19
779:1 780:15	860:1	724:25 736:4	905:5,17	789:18 791:2,5
780:20,22	catalysts 725:20	764:8,12	<b>CFRs</b> 905:15,21	797:25 798:21
803:12,17	726:2,4,6,15	772:11 791:15	906:13,16	844:3,15,17
805:23 811:16	727:1,5,6,18	807:23,24,25	907:15	856:9,11
812:6,11,12	845:8,10	808:11 870:11	<b>chain</b> 826:18	867:25
836:4 837:15	854:25 855:12	870:15 906:20	challenge	Chinese 727:25
837:24 839:10	855:13,16,16	certainly 711:13	787:20 906:4,6	728:9,17
840:16 846:7	855:17 858:11	764:11 865:10	906:10	744:10 748:18
850:5 854:1,11	catalytic 726:18	867:23 880:25	challenged	752:25 753:5,9
863:23 865:12	727:12 814:18	881:5,18	693:7	754:20 772:19
865:17 866:4,7	819:7 820:13	885:12 886:1,5	chandeliers	776:4 779:13
866:24 868:11	820:25 822:17	889:2 895:12	746:1,2	791:5 798:10
868:22 869:11	826:4 827:8,23	900:6	change 741:24	798:15 800:4,9
869:16 872:10	828:6,23 829:3	certificate	743:7 881:5	800:18 801:6,6
878:8 881:13	829:22 830:1,3	768:15,17	changed 742:25	801:17,22
885:18 888:9	830:4,11,12,18	785:22 812:10	881:1	802:2,8,23
889:1 890:12	831:4 832:23	818:10,10,12	Changes 887:4	804:4,16,16,23
892:19 897:22	845:13,14,15	818:14 819:24	changing 867:1	804:24 844:13
902:1915:17	866:25 867:13	837:11 843:23	873:25	846:9,15,16,22
915:18 916:2	867:13 868:24	854:12,13,14	characterizati	853:19 856:12
921:4,11	870:1 871:12	857:13 895:25	767:16 772:23	858:10,16,17
cases 865:24	872:9,11,17	898:23 909:8	837:18 861:18	858:17 871:23
866:6 885:3	874:1,6,16	921:1	characterizing	871:25 872:24
892:14 893:13	892:12 896:1,9	certificates	774:22	873:10 875:21
895:5	896:11,22	755:10 776:19	characters	875:23 876:3
<b>cash</b> 876:14	897:10,11,13	834:2 843:23	742:8	877:8,17 890:5
878:11 881:7,8	897:19 898:4	854:21 857:17	charged 748:17	890:9 893:9
881:14 883:18	898:12	869:20 870:2,9	chart 766:1,2,5	901:25 903:15
885:17 886:19	catch 705:6	874:2 894:23	766:10,13	903:15 904:3
886:24 888:4	categories 889:8	895:24	773:16 782:16	Chinese-owned
890:15 904:1,2	category 811:14	certification	<b>charts</b> 736:1	798:6
catalyst 708:18	886:19	714:7 735:14	chase 902:14	Chinglish
727:15 728:7	caught 717:20	735:14 740:21	<b>check</b> 717:4	759:21
	8			

chocolate 725:7	759:15 760:1	875:2 879:15	classification	896:8,12,20
725:12	762:8,12,21,22	890:23 898:24	862:9	897:1,18
<b>choice</b> 714:16	763:1 764:7	902:9 904:9,14	classified 791:4	collaborative
803:1 904:3	766:24 767:2,3	904:20,23,25	classroom	719:10
<b>choose</b> 720:25	767:18,19	905:4,12,18,20	706:17	collateral 886:8
choosing 800:25	768:1,2 769:18	905:24 906:19	<b>Cle</b> 755:9	colleagues
<b>chose</b> 768:3	770:13 771:8,9	907:2 913:25	843:22 859:14	865:18
771:22,25	772:10 773:2	914:7,22 915:1	<b>clean</b> 703:13	collected 712:14
801:8 804:4,5	773:13,15,23	915:12,16,19	723:22 771:2	817:18,22
813:19	774:7,15 775:2	915:25 916:3	795:8 834:7	821:4
<b>chosen</b> 712:17	775:5,21,24	916:25 917:11	907:1	collection
Christopher	776:1,10,14,16	917:23 918:4	<b>clear</b> 718:5	883:20
744:8 848:3	776:20,22,24	918:13,19,20	739:9,13	colloquial
849:18	777:2,11,17,20	918:24 919:6,9	745:19 763:21	802:16
chronological	777:21 778:4,9	920:3,5,10	765:17 782:6,7	<b>color</b> 794:3
747:10,11	780:2,6,8,17	circumstance	785:10 789:7	<b>column</b> 873:20
<b>Chu</b> 688:22,23	780:21,24	838:3	791:16 793:9	<b>columns</b> 869:15
691:6,9 692:2	781:1,4,11,18	circumstances	805:8 849:12	872:8 873:17
692:23 693:3	783:7,12,13,20	853:21 906:9	866:5	873:18 889:18
693:10,13,21	784:1,25 785:5	906:12	Clearing 872:1	combined
693:25 694:3	785:13,16	citations 693:17	<b>clearly</b> 855:19	788:21
694:14,21	786:7,10,20,23	877:16	856:21 859:9	<b>come</b> 694:19
696:3,6,18,25	787:2,8,15,19	<b>cite</b> 693:16	<b>clears</b> 855:7	725:1 731:5
698:4,23,25	787:24 788:1,5	777:16 882:21	<b>client</b> 859:9	806:14 832:5
699:4,23 700:3	788:7,16,24	cites 790:24	915:22 916:5	834:14 841:21
703:5,21 704:5	789:15 790:21	city 709:16	<b>client's</b> 898:7	849:2 855:3
704:9,10	791:10 793:4,6	775:8	clients 860:12	884:7 887:20
706:22 713:19	793:8 794:7,9	<b>civil</b> 692:15	877:22	890:15 892:8
713:21,22	794:15 795:1	786:11 803:7	<b>close</b> 827:16	893:10 896:17
715:2,3 716:18	795:20,23	906:17	920:3,5,8,10	906:13 908:10
716:20 721:21	797:5,13 798:5	<b>claim</b> 770:5	<b>closed</b> 920:6,6	912:14,16
721:22 723:3,5	798:17 799:5	784:19 878:4	closing 919:18	<b>comes</b> 887:1,11
723:17 724:4,6	799:14 800:22	Claimant's	<b>clued</b> 727:10	887:16
724:22 725:5	800:24 801:7	914:9	<b>coal</b> 855:5	comfortable
725:23,25	801:14,19,24	claiming 787:18	coat 855:8	743:13 850:2
727:4 736:21	801:25 802:15	845:24 882:11	<b>COC</b> 733:8	908:12
736:25 737:12	803:11,14,18	clarification	734:25 807:22	<b>coming</b> 717:19
738:1,3,7,8	804:9,15 805:3	908:7	808:10 809:12	867:8 881:8
741:12,20	805:8,22,25	clarify 720:6	812:15,16	886:12,17
742:17,22	806:3,9,16,19	783:14 785:9	813:7 818:10	892:15,17
744:3 746:1,8	806:23,25	788:15	819:12 828:12	896:20
746:9 750:15	807:5,8 813:9	<b>class</b> 733:9,10	830:3,5 833:1	commend 699:5
750:17 751:4,5	848:24 849:1,5	736:2,9 738:21	833:19,20	comment
752:18,22	851:9 853:15	738:22,23,24	854:21 872:12	879:16 885:16
753:23 754:3,5	853:16 854:9	739:1,8,10,12	897:10 906:14	commodity
754:6 755:11	860:18,20	740:3 741:1	COCs 866:9	869:10
755:12 756:13	861:7,11,16	869:24 872:25	867:1,4,9,12	<b>common</b> 716:10
756:16 757:6,7	862:1,3,7,18	classes 729:14	868:14,16,25	716:11 726:23
757:16,19	863:7,8,12,19	736:5 869:16	871:13 874:7	827:3 834:13
758:21 759:1,3	863:21 864:12	870:8	892:13 893:2	834:19 862:12
			 	I

				Page o
commonly	881:15 883:24	850:17,21	compositions	877:4 879:3
876:8	884:9,10 885:4	854:21	868:23,24	<b>confirm</b> 719:24
communicate	885:7,10	Complaint's	870:2,8 872:12	746:12 753:25
800:8 801:1	886:13 887:8,9	817:4	874:6 896:11	confirming
834:21	887:12,14,20	complaints	898:4	756:25
communicated	888:2,4,12,15	760:25 761:5	compound	conformity
899:4	888:21,23	761:15,19	803:10	854:13 855:23
communication	889:10 895:6,8	<b>complete</b> 694:15	comprehensive	869:20 870:3,9
821:25 848:16	895:10 900:8	694:25 695:9	869:4 876:1	874:2 894:23
899:7	900:14 903:9	747:19 750:13	877:9 892:21	895:24,25
communicatio	903:12,13,15	750:14 751:2	895:3 898:5	898:23
802:9 849:10	903:18,21	751:10,24	<b>computer</b> 880:8	<b>confused</b> 780:23
858:7	904:5,6 915:10	887:20 901:12	880:9	785:8 788:11
companies	915:11 917:17	919:14	concentrations	788:12 917:9
722:4,11,11	917:24 918:2,3	completely	869:19 892:23	<b>confusing</b> 710:7
755:17 772:4	917.24 918.2,5 918:6	705:17 728:22	893:2	connection
772:19 776:2,4	company's	731:1 827:7	<b>concept</b> 740:14	846:22
778:22,24,25	793:19 885:14	858:10 871:18	concept 740:14	
779:2,10,10,13	887:7,22 888:7	completeness	883:23 884:3	consensus 853:12
7/9:2,10,10,13	888:9 900:3	754:11	883:23 884:3	
				consequences 724:1
790:7 793:17	<b>compare</b> 702:25	<b>compliance</b> 688:19 707:18	898:18	
798:7 800:5	<b>compared</b> 712:2 803:15		concern 837:13	<b>consider</b> 743:8
801:6 802:8,23		726:7,16	concerned	751:16 774:10
803:6 804:4,17	comparing	727:12 735:16	763:24,24	823:12 824:20
816:7 843:12	778:2 828:11	749:4 754:23	837:2	826:12 841:11
843:20,21	compensation	761:2,3 776:19	concerns 732:7	866:1 894:4,21
844:1,14,14	884:10	809:18 814:3	744:12 761:15	898:16
845:23 846:10	compiled 766:5	815:2,6,9	761:19	considerably
846:23 853:20	<b>Complainant</b>	872:17 874:5	<b>concise</b> 849:13	889:20
856:18 858:10	688:16 689:3	892:4,15	conclude 901:2	consideration
868:5 885:4	691:22 853:13	893:18 894:3	concluded	694:2 907:13
887:23 888:11	Complainant's	898:22 899:5	920:14	918:12
888:13 903:7	690:2 695:17	910:17	concludes 890:3	considerations
903:15	697:7 794:22	compliant	concluding	774:10 856:8
company 720:9	840:3 852:10	874:15	890:7	considered
720:10 758:9	853:4 883:8	complicated	conclusion	810:13 865:22
759:7,14,16	910:10 912:24	878:18	724:3 770:10	883:18 885:17
773:20 779:8	913:5,8	comply 755:7	774:14 777:7	898:18
783:1 788:19	Complainants	898:17	780:4 797:3	considers
789:4,18,20	912:17	component	801:14 898:24	841:13 858:23
790:6,13,14	complaint 712:2	863:1,6,10,16	901:17	consistency
792:8 796:4,7	712:4 714:1	868:7 893:15	condition	725:14
796:24,25	776:6 778:10	896:22 897:5,5	888:14	Constitution
797:6,7 809:25	778:13,25	components	<b>conduct</b> 815:1	688:8
812:22 834:24	802:17,20,21	863:13 864:16	conducted	consultant
835:20 836:5	803:18,20	876:6 888:10	753:13 820:14	743:7 895:9
836:13 855:15	808:18,20,21	composition	836:22	consultants
856:12,12,18	808:22 812:20	871:13 872:18	conference	859:10 891:13
877:10,18,25	813:3,21 820:3	874:1 885:15	702:2,3	894:8
878:12 881:9	832:15,20	889:6 897:19	confidence	consulting
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

862:25 880:3 895:22 893:5 895:22 893:5 895:22 893:5 895:12 893:15 910:2 910:4 827:23 828:6 914:1 827:23 829:3 817:1 827:1 804:4 820:13 827:23 829:3 916:24 827:23 829:3 916:24 827:23 829:3 916:24 827:23 829:3 916:24 827:23 829:3 916:24 827:23 829:3 916:24 827:23 829:3 916:24 827:23 830:3,4 916:24 827:23 830:3,4 916:24 827:23 830:1,12 806:12 807:17 825:					Page 9
892:25 893:5         conversations         713:8 714:22         898:21         831:18 835:11           895:12 2896:13         708:2,15         716:7,15         costtess 897:23         837:16 850:19           896:19 898:15         converter         717:14 718:19         costtess 897:23         837:16 850:19           910:2         726:18 727:12         719:8,14,18         867:10         870:15 873:9.9           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         734:12 740:4         892:16,17         788:15 786:16           916:4         828:23 829:3         742:10 743:2         893:18,24         789:4,18 790:5           contact 716:1         829:23 833:3,4         751:17 61:13         898:2         790:9,13 792:8           containe 692:21         830:18 831:4         766:19 768:18         courpe 773:22         couple 729:6,10           contain 692:11         871:13 872:17         782:20 785:2         862:4 890:22         r58:16 849:1           context 70:59         845:13,15         812:891:81,4         76:20         901:21 91:20         001:21 91:20           context 70:59         845:13,15         811:7 83:14         817:23,25         713:23 714:19	862.25 880.3	913.10	709.10 710.1	896.7 898.3 20	786.6 19 788.4
895:22 896:13         708:2,15         716:7,15         costless 897:23         837:16 850:19           896:19 898:15         converter         717:14 718:19         costlessly         851:4 860:16           910:2         726:18 727:12         717:14 718:19         costlessly         851:4 860:16           90:3         70:15 873:92         722:23 728:25         costs 867:25         County 688:4           80:44 820:13         827:23 828:6         734:12 740-44         892:161.7         785:15 786:16           916:4         823:23 829:3         742:10 743:2         893:18,24         799:4,13 792:8           contain 692:21         830:18 831:4         766:17 676.18         couching 763:23         813:5,15 921:5           contained         832:23 845:14         772:18 773:7         course 773:12         course 696:2           730:12 868:15         converters         799:16 800:9         910:20 902:10         course 696:2           731:12 854:5         830:11,12         808:12 809:22         course 696:2         course 696:2           731:12 854:5         830:11,12         808:12 809:22         cour 765:21         699:26 507:21           797:12 90:12         866:25 867:13         813:17,22         court 68:12         69:26 507:21           797:12 90:12					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
896:19         898:15         converter         717:14 718:19         costlessly         851:4 869:16           910:2         726:18 727:12         719:8,14,18         867:10         870:15 873:99           contal 489:4         821:7 827:8         722:32 728:25         costlessly         870:14 873:23           804:4 820:13         827:23 828:6         734:12 740:44         892:16,17         785:15 786:16           916:4         822:32 823:         742:10 743:2         893:18,24         789:4,18 700:5           contain 692:21         830:18 831:4         706:19 768:18         couching 763:23         813:51,5 921:5           contain 692:21         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         901:20 901:21 915:24         court 688:12           730:12 868:15         converters         799:16 80:9         91:6:20         901:21 915:24           context st 78:14         867:13 850:1         811:72.2         court 688:12         court 688:12           731:12 88:15         80:11,12         808:12 809:2         court 768:14         698:23 709:20           context st 78:14         867:13 850:1         812:182:24         816:22 82:171         713:27:14:19					
910:2         726:18 727:12         719:8,14,18         867:10         870:15 873:9,9           Cont 21 01:4         819:7 820:25         722:23 728:25         costs 867:25         Counto 688:4           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         789:19,74         789:19,74           contacted 716:1         829:23 830:3,4         716:1761:13         898:2         709:9,13 792:8         813:5,15 921:5           contained         832:23 845:14         772:18 773:7         counsel 773:12         course 696:2         736:16 849:1           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         901:12 19:524           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         767:1 768:14         693:20 799:20           context 765:9         845:13,15         812:9 813:8,14         766:23 87:13         813:17,22         71:176:14         693:20 799:21           rontext 765:9         845:13,15 <td< td=""><td></td><td>,</td><td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td><td></td><td></td></td<>		,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Cont'd 849:4         819:7 820:25         722:23 728:25         cots 867:25         County 688:4           contact 710:4         822:17 827:8         729:13 731:7         870:14 873:23         785:15 786:16           916:4         822:23 829:3         742:10 743:2         893:18,24         789:4,18 790:5           contaic 622:1         830:18 831:4         766:19 768:18         counsing 763:23         813:5,15 921:5           contained         832:23 845:14         772:18 773:7         counsel 773:12         counsel 733:23         813:5,15 921:5           content 708:14         874:6         786:20 787:15         901:20 902:10         course 696:2           contested         726:15 830:1         807:17.20,25         counsel 854:10         court 668:12           context 765:9         845:13,15         812:9 913:8,14         766:23,25         696:25 697:21           773:12 901:12         866:25 867:13         813:17.22         767:1768:14         693:26 695:5           context 878:14         867:13 868:24         81:44 815:2         81:64 81:14         712:23 714:19           762:28 846:12         874:1,16         835:12 847:10         819:4,9 820:11         715:15 73:1           787:12 901:12         866:1,9 849:19,20         820:19,20.24         733:25 73:1				•	
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         822:23 829:3         742:10 743:2         893:18,24         789:4,18 790:5           contacted 716:1         829:23 830:3,4         751:1 761:13         888:2         790:9,13 792:8           contain 692:21         830:18 831:4         766:19 768:18         couching 763:23         813:515 921:50           contain 692:21         830:13 872:17         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           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         767:1 768:14         698:23 709:20           context 765:9         845:13,15         812:17,822         816:24 817:14         712:7,23           rominue 730:3         870:1 872:9,11         831:17 832:4         817:23,25         713:23 714:19           762:8 846:12         874:1,16         835:12 847:10         819:12,02,24         732:25 733:1           870:18 85					
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           contain 692:21         830:18 831:4         766:19 768:18         courching 763:23         813:5,15 921:5           contain 692:21         830:18 831:4         766:19 768:18         courching 763:23         813:5,15 921:5           contain 708:14         874:6         786:20 787:15         901:20 901:20         course 696:2           730:12 868:15         converters         799:16 800:9         916:20         901:21 915:24           context 765:9         845:13,15         813:17,22         court 76:12         698:6 695:5           context 765:9         845:13,15         813:17,22         767:1 768:14         698:23 709:20           context 878:14         870:1 872:9,11         831:17 83:224         816:24 817:14         712:7,23           continue 730:3         870:1 872:9,11         831:17 83:22         816:24 817:14         712:7,23           continue 730:3         870:1 872:9,11         831:17 83:22         816:24 817:14         712:7,23           continue 730:3         870:1 872:9,13         850:12 847:10         819:49,49 820:11         715:15 726:21					·
916:4828:23742:10743:2893:18,24789:4,18790:5contact of 116:1829:23830:3,4751:1751:1898:2790:9,13792:8contain 692:21830:18831:4766:19768:18couching 763:23813:5,15921:5contain 692:110871:13872:17782:20785:2862:4890:22758:16849:1content 708:14874:6786:20787:15901:20901:21915:24content 708:15830:11,12808:12809:22course 696:2730:12936:6695:5context 65:9845:13,15812:9813:8,14766:32,55696:25697:21797:12901:12866:25867:13813:17,22767:1768:14698:23709:20contexts 878:14867:13813:17,82816:24817:14712:7,23contine 730:3870:18872:9,11831:17831:28819:49820:11715:15762:8846:12874:1,16850:15820:25821:3,4738:20739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7820:19,20,24732:2573:13886:5,25896:11,23850:15856:13820:25831:16,22775:16894:15897:10899:17801:24831:16,22775:1674:16894:15897:10,11,33860:7831:16,22775:1676:17890:21coperation993:20831:16,22775:1778:1776:23 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>· · ·</td></t<>					· · ·
contacted 716:1         829:23 830:3,4         751:1 761:13         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           s45:10 921:10         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         course 696:2           context 765:9         845:13,15         812:9 813:8,14         766:23,25         696:25 697:21           797:12 901:12         866:24 867:13         813:17,22         767:1 768:14         698:23 709:23           contaxt 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 83:24         816:24 817:14         712:7,23           continued         897:10,11,13         860:7 861:22         820:11         715:15 726:21           878:15         898:12         896:17 993:18         824:25 82:51         754:16 761:24           800:2				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
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         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           contexted         726:15 830:1         807:17,20,25         count 75:21         693:6 695:5           context 765:9         845:13,15         813:17,22         767:1 768:14         698:23 709:20           context 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         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         897:10,11,13         860:7 861:22         821:3,4         784:16 761:24           874:1,16         897:10         839:12         830:19,22         777:13 782:7,8           897:10,11,13         860:7 861:22					,
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         800:11,12         808:12 809:22         course 685:2         961:20 91:21         916:20           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         813:17,82:24         817:23,27         713:23 714:19           roftime 730:3         870:1 872:9,11         831:17 832:24         817:23,27         713:23 714:19           762:8 846:12         874:1,16         835:12 847:10         819:4,9 820:11         715:15 726:21           s78:7 885:14         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         821:17,16         746:18 751:15           894:15         897:19 898:4         862:17 891:14         822:25 837:14         732:25 733:1      <		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
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         901:21 915:24           contested         726:15 830:1         807:17,20,25         councet 8854:10         court 688:12           731:15 854:5         830:11,12         808:12 809:22         count 765:21         696:25 697:21           797:12 901:12         866:25 867:13         813:17,22         767:1 768:14         698:23 709:20           contexts 78:14         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 85/25         896:11,23         850:15 856:1         820:25 821:3,4         738:25 733:1           894:15         897:10 11,13         860:7 861:22         821:17,16         746:18 751:15           894:15         897:19 898:4         862:17 891:14         822:25 823:13,4         738:25 733:1           Continued         897:19 898:4         862:17 891:14         822:12 826:17         754:16 761:24           80:21<				0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
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         813:9 81:28 812:4         766:23,25         696:25 697:21           797:12 901:12         866:25 867:13         813:17,822         816:24 817:14         712:7,23           continue 730:3         870:18 872:911         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         850:15 856:11         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           Continuously					- · ·
730:12 868:15converters799:16 800:9916:20901:21 915:24contested726:15 830:11807:17,20,25counsels 854:10court 688:12731:15 854:5830:11,12808:12 809:22count 765:21693:6 695:5context 765:9845:13,15812:9 813:8,14766:23,25696:25 697:21797:12 901:12866:25 867:13813:17,22767:1 768:14698:23 709:20contexts 878:14867:13 868:24814:4 815:2816:24 817:14712:7,23continue 730:3870:1 872:9,11831:17 832:24817:23,25713:23 714:19762:8 846:12874:1,16835:12 847:10819:4,9 820:11715:15 726:21878:7 885:14892:12 896:1,9849:19,20820:19,20,24732:25 733:1886:5,25896:11,23850:15 856:1820:25 821:3,4738:20 739:23continued897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuously754:21 856:7corrective 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22786:17 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contradicted917:2187:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspond833:5,6,7789:16,17701:12907:19 19:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11701:12907:19 190:22co					
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           context 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           765:25         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           897:10 898:4         862:17 891:14         822:10 823:18         752:3754:11           Continuing         898:12         899:17 90:318         824:25 825:1         754:16 761:24           800:24         cooperation         903:22 912:10         825:10 830:14         768:17 78:10           contracts 70:16         909:11         corrective 810:3         832:21,22,55         785:17 78:17 89:2,7           743:7         783:2 851:17					
731:15830:11,12808:12count 765:21693:6693:6695:5context 765:9845:13,15812:9813:8,14766:23,25696:25697:21797:12901:12866:25867:13813:17,22767:1768:14698:23709:20contexts 878:14867:13868:24814:4815:2816:24817:14712:7,23continue 730:3870:1872:9,11831:17832:24817:23,25713:23714:19762:8846:12874:1,16835:12847:10819:4,9820:11715:15726:21878:7885:14892:12896:19,9849:19,20820:19,20,24732:25733:1866:5,25896:11,23850:15856:1820:25821:4,16746:18746:18894:15897:10,11,13860:7861:12821:7,16746:18752:3754:11Continued897:10,11,13860:7861:12821:0823:14768:19774:10continuously754:21856:7corrected 810:2830:14,22778:17776:17781:78:78890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17787:17786:2786:11contractorcopies 697:12,17correcty 717:25832:25833:2,5787:21789:2,7743:7783:2851:17756:25873:8801:15806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondingcounter 774:5851:19854:15898:7 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
context 765:9845:13,15812:9 813:8,14766:23,25696:25 697:21797:12 901:12866:25 867:13813:17,22767:1 768:14698:23 709:20contexts 878:14867:13 868:24814:4 815:2816:24 817:14712:7,23continue 730:3870:1 872:9,11831:17 832:24817:23,25713:23 714:19762:8 846:12874:1,16835:12 847:10819:4,9 820:11715:15 726:21878:7 885:14892:12 896:1,9849:19,20820:19,20,24732:25 733:1886:5,25896:11,23850:15 856:1820:25 821:3,4738:20 739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7 861:22821:7,16746:18 751:15894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 61:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradt 768:19907:17,20correspond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19907:17,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7cop 697:17,20correspond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrib 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24897:19907:1 919:22co			, ,		
797:12866:25867:13813:17,22767:1768:14698:23709:20contexts 878:14867:13868:24814:4815:2816:24817:14712:7,23continue 730:3870:1872:9,11831:17832:24817:23,25713:23714:19762:8846:12874:1,16835:12847:10819:4,9820:11715:15726:21878:7885:14892:12896:1,23850:15820:19,20,24732:25733:1886:5,25896:11,23850:15856:1820:25821:3,4738:20739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7861:122821:7,16746:18751:15894:15897:19898:12899:17803:14822:10825:10830:14768:19774:10continuously754:21856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13782:7,8890:21copied 697:12,17corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17corrective 717:25832:25787:17789:16,17contractorropies 697:17,20correspond853:5857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondingcountries861:13862:11contral 94:21gori 19:22correspondingcountries861:13862:11sontrals 866:7corp 728:22873:10876:208		· · ·			
contexts 878:14867:13 868:24814:4 815:2816:24 817:14712:7,23continue 730:3870:1 872:9,11831:17 832:24817:23,25713:23 714:19762:8 846:12874:1,16835:12 847:10819:4,9 820:11715:15 726:21878:7 885:14892:12 896:1,9849:19,20820:19,02,4732:25 733:1886:5,25896:11,23850:15 856:1820:25 821:3,4738:20 739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7 861:22821:7,16746:18 751:15894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contract 7r09ies 697:12,17correspond853:5 857:17792:12,32743:7733:2 851:17756:25811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17rontradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18898:7cope 697:17,20correspond853:5 857:17797:21,23control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20873:8801:15 806:16control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24701:12907:1919:22corresponds845:2,2879:18,1919controls 866:7core 70:31 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>,</td><td>,</td><td></td></t<>			,	,	
continue 730:3870:1 872:9,11831:17 832:24817:23,25713:23 714:19762:8 846:12874:1,16835:12 847:10819:4,9 820:11715:15 726:21878:7 885:14892:12 896:1,9849:19,20820:19,20,24732:25 733:1886:5,25896:11,23850:15 856:1820:25 821:3,4738:20 739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7 861:22821:7,16746:18 751:15894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10contract 70:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correspond853:5 857:17799:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18898:7copy 697:17,20correspond853:5 857:17797:21,23contradicted917:12876:25873:8801:15 806:16control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24701:12907:1919:22corresponds845:2,2879:18,191control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13879:22,24,25 <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td>			,		
762:8 846:12874:1,16835:12 847:10819:4,9 820:11715:15 726:21878:7 885:14892:12 896:1,9849:19,20820:19,20,24732:25 733:1886:5,25896:11,23850:15 856:1820:25 821:3,4738:20 739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7 861:22821:7,16746:18 751:15894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10contract 870:16909:11corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 694:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contraing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23contributing907:1919:22correspondingcountres861:13 862:11898:7core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:12corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19control 894:21corporate735:12,13counting 811:16854:15 858:23controls 866:7corporate735:12,13 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>,</td></t<>					,
878:7 885:14892:12 896:1,9849:19,20820:19,20,24732:25 733:1886:5,25896:11,23850:15 856:1820:25 821:3,4738:20 739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7 861:22821:7,16746:18 751:15894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10continuously754:21 856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13correspondingcountries861:13 862:11877:3880:2core 855:15856:9917:14 918:7877:3880:2858:12 867:4843:14 846:19905:5 9				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
886:5,25896:11,23850:15 856:1820:25 821:3,4738:20 739:23continued897:10,11,13860:7 861:22821:7,16746:18 751:15894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10835:10 830:14768:19 774:10continuously754:21 856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8800:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contractorcopies 697:12,17corrective 810:3832:22,22,5786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correspond833:5,6,7789:16,17743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contraticted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17777:21,23contraty 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13correspondingcountries845:19905:5 906:11877:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4846:29 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12803:24 889:4846:22 921:17872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:1		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· ·	
continued897:10,11,13860:7 861:22821:7,16746:18 751:15894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10continuously754:21 856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17corrective 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counter 774:5851:19 854:10control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21845:14 846:19905:5 906:11877:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	, ,	
894:15897:19 898:4862:17 891:14822:10 823:18752:3 754:11Continuing 806:24898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10continuously 890:21754:21 856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correcty 717:25833:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted 858:23917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18contributing 904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counter 774:5851:19 854:10control 894:21 control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7 corporatecorporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently 847:33860:2858:12856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12866:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12867:4906:12803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7766:22 767:10Courtes 766:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7<	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Continuing 806:24898:12899:17 903:18824:25 825:1754:16 761:24806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10continuously754:21 856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondencecountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13880:2858:12 867:4country 769:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18<		· · ·		<i>,</i>	
806:24cooperation903:22 912:10825:10 830:14768:19 774:10continuously754:21 856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13courtesponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11871:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>					
continuously754:21 856:7corrected 810:2830:19,22777:13 782:7,8890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contributing904:17,90876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondencecountre 774:5851:19 854:10contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11877:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20	0				
890:21copied 894:7860:8831:16,22785:17 786:10contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondencecounting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtes 695:7		-			
contract 870:16909:11corrective 810:3832:21,22,25786:11 787:10contractorcopies 697:12,17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondencecounter 774:5851:19 854:10contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11877:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtes 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courteom	•			,	,
contractor 743:7copies 697:12,17 783:2 851:17correctly 717:25832:25 833:2,5787:21 789:2,7743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondencecounter 774:5851:19 854:10contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom		-		,	
743:7783:2 851:17756:25 811:11833:5,6,7789:16,17contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondencecounter 774:5851:19 854:10contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16somethy846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12sol:12courtespond:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtesp 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtesp 695:7		copies 697:12,17			
contradicted917:21893:20 903:14834:7 835:16790:10 792:18858:23coprecipitationcorrespond853:5 857:17797:21,23contrary 768:19730:7,9876:25873:8801:15 806:16898:7copy 697:17,20correspondencecounter 774:5851:19 854:10contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11877:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtsrop	743:7			,	,
contrary 768:19 898:7730:7.9 copy 697:17,20 904:17 905:1876:25 correspondence 744:7 915:19873:8 counter 774:5 counting 811:16 s64:15 858:23801:15 806:16 851:19 854:10r01:12 r01:12907:1 919:22 907:1 919:22corresponding corresponding 876:13corresponding r44:7 915:19 corresponding843:13,18 843:13,18864:2 878:24 879:18,19,19control 894:21 s96:24 897:9core 728:22 876:13873:10 876:20 corresponds843:13,18 845:2,2864:2 878:24 879:18,19,19controls 866:7 conveniently 872:24 873:13corporate 879:22,24,25735:12,13 880:2country 779:11 858:12 867:4905:5 906:11 917:14 918:7 918:14s03:24 889:4 803:24 889:4846:22 921:17 846:22 921:17869:24 870:7 869:24 870:7766:22 767:10 768:12 769:15 806:12Court's 736:21 806:12r00:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtesp 695:7 courtson	contradicted				· · ·
contrary 768:19 898:7730:7,9 copy 697:17,20 904:17 905:1876:25 correspondence 744:7 915:19873:8 counter 774:5 counting 811:16801:15 806:16 851:19 854:10contributing 701:12907:1 919:22 907:1 919:22corresponding corresponding 873:10 876:20sounter 774:5 counting 811:16854:15 858:23 861:13 862:11control 894:21 896:24 897:9core 728:22 876:13873:10 876:20 corresponds843:13,18 845:2,2864:2 878:24 879:18,19,19controls 866:7 conveniently 872:24 873:13corporate 846:19 879:11 879:22,24,25735:12,13 cost 855:15 858:12 867:4country 779:11 904:15,16803:24 889:4 803:24 889:4corporation 846:22 921:17869:24 870:7 869:24 870:7766:22 767:10 768:12 769:15Court's 736:21 806:12ronversation 700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	858:23	coprecipitation	correspond	853:5 857:17	797:21,23
898:7copy 697:17,20correspondencecounter 774:5851:19 854:10contributing904:17 905:1744:7 915:19counting 811:16854:15 858:23701:12907:1 919:22correspondingcountries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	contrary 768:19		-	873:8	801:15 806:16
contributing 701:12904:17 905:1 907:1 919:22744:7 915:19 corresponding 873:10 876:20counting 811:16 countries854:15 858:23 861:13 862:11control 894:21 896:24 897:9core 728:22 876:13873:10 876:20 corresponds843:13,18 845:2,2864:2 878:24 879:18,19,19controls 866:7 convenientlycorporate 846:19 879:11735:12,13 873:21country 779:11 843:14 846:19904:15,16 905:5 906:11872:24 873:13 887:3879:22,24,25 880:2cost 855:15 858:12 867:4856:9 856:9917:14 918:7 918:14convention 803:24 889:4 700:12 708:1correct 701:2,18 703:7 706:1,13872:9,11,20,20 892:10 894:3766:22 767:10 781:22 785:1Courtesy 695:7 courtes	· ·	copy 697:17,20	correspondence	counter 774:5	851:19 854:10
701:12907:1 919:22corresponding 873:10 876:20countries861:13 862:11control 894:21core 728:22873:10 876:20843:13,18864:2 878:24896:24 897:9876:13corresponds845:2,2879:18,19,19controls 866:7corporate735:12,13843:14 846:19904:15,16conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	contributing		-	counting 811:16	854:15 858:23
896:24 897:9 controls 866:7 conveniently876:13 corporatecorresponds 735:12,13845:2,2 country 779:11879:18,19,19 904:15,16872:24 873:13 877:3846:19 879:11 879:22,24,25873:21 cost 855:15843:14 846:19 856:9905:5 906:11 917:14 918:7887:3 887:3880:2 858:12 867:4856:9 856:9917:14 918:7 918:14convention 803:24 889:4 700:12 708:1corporation 846:22 921:17869:24 870:7 872:9,11,20,20766:22 767:10 768:12 769:15Court's 736:21 806:12conversation 700:12 708:1correct 701:2,18 703:7 706:1,13872:9,11,20,20 892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	0	907:1 919:22	corresponding	0	861:13 862:11
controls 866:7 convenientlycorporate735:12,13country 779:11904:15,16872:24 873:13846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11877:224 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	control 894:21	<b>core</b> 728:22	1 0	843:13,18	864:2 878:24
controls 866:7 convenientlycorporate 846:19 879:11735:12,13 873:21country 779:11 843:14 846:19904:15,16 905:5 906:11872:24 873:13 887:3879:22,24,25 880:2cost 855:15 858:12 867:4843:14 846:19 856:9905:5 906:11 917:14 918:7convention 803:24 889:4corporation 846:22 921:17869:24 870:7 872:9,11,20,20766:22 767:10 768:12 769:15Court's 736:21 806:12conversation 700:12 708:1correct 701:2,18 703:7 706:1,13872:9,11,20,20 892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	896:24 897:9	876:13	corresponds	845:2,2	879:18,19,19
conveniently846:19 879:11873:21843:14 846:19905:5 906:11872:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom		corporate	-	<i>,</i>	
872:24 873:13879:22,24,25cost 855:15856:9917:14 918:7887:3880:2858:12 867:4counts 765:14918:14conventioncorporation867:19 869:2,3766:22 767:10Court's 736:21803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	conveniently	-	873:21	•	905:5 906:11
convention 803:24 889:4corporation 846:22 921:17867:19 869:2,3 869:24 870:7766:22 767:10 768:12 769:15Court's 736:21 806:12conversation 700:12 708:1correct 701:2,18 703:7 706:1,13872:9,11,20,20 892:10 894:3770:17 771:19 781:22 785:1courtesy 695:7 courtroom	v	879:22,24,25	<b>cost</b> 855:15	856:9	917:14 918:7
803:24 889:4846:22 921:17869:24 870:7768:12 769:15806:12conversationcorrect 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7700:12 708:1703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	887:3	880:2	858:12 867:4	<b>counts</b> 765:14	918:14
conversation 700:12 708:1correct 701:2,18872:9,11,20,20770:17 771:19courtesy 695:7703:7 706:1,13892:10 894:3781:22 785:1courtroom	convention	corporation	867:19 869:2,3	766:22 767:10	<b>Court's</b> 736:21
700:12 708:1         703:7 706:1,13         892:10 894:3         781:22 785:1         courtroom	803:24 889:4	846:22 921:17	869:24 870:7	768:12 769:15	806:12
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	872:9,11,20,20	770:17 771:19	courtesy 695:7
709:2,3 792:24 707:20 709:7,8 895:2,4,12 785:11,14 691:13 724:8	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
		l	l	l	l

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
<b>cover</b> 876:7	882:3 901:1,15	863:22,25	decisions 834:21	697:4,23,24
878:10	<b>cut</b> 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	<b>cutting</b> 902:14	date 701:22	901:8	851:23 859:13
824:1 845:9	<b>CX</b> 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
<b>cram</b> 869:14	<b>CX-192</b> 883:3	732:14,15	882:2 901:1	880:7,19 881:2
created 881:17	883:12	750:11,19	<b>defense</b> 860:16	889:13 901:4
credit 878:4	<b>CX-2</b> 911:13	817:3 824:11	defined 764:16	902:6,11 919:2
credited 871:5	<b>CX-28</b> 839:23	921:6,15	764:20	919:3
<b>credits</b> 722:12	<b>CX-77</b> 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
<b>cross</b> 689:2	<b>CX092</b> 820:8	824:3	738:2	697:13 698:8
694:20 806:22	<b>CX10</b> 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	<b>CX19</b> 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	<b>DC</b> 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	<b>CX67</b> 824:6,7,8	823:4,13	demands 760:21	described
<b>crush</b> 729:18	<b>CX72</b> 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
<b>CTA</b> 822:10	CX77 817:5	dealer 847:4,5	denied 854:4	732:1 736:9
<b>CTAOC</b> 817:14		dealers 847:3,9	department	739:1 827:23
818:4	D	dealing 748:17	702:21 723:11	864:16,24
СТАОС.049	<b>D.C</b> 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	<b>Daction</b> 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	<b>Dallas</b> 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	<b>decide</b> 704:21	depicted 741:11	860:7,8
905:6,18 908:7	<b>dame</b> 842:6	786:11 894:4	<b>depo</b> 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
<b>Customs</b> 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
				l

Г

				Page II
894:22 906:15	869:11,15,16	882:1,9 900:25	<b>Dixon</b> 695:22	<b>doubt</b> 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	<b>DLJ</b> 770:7	<b>Dr</b> 694:5 865:1
737:21 765:3	873:4,8,10	discuss 787:22	<b>docket</b> 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 689:2 862:4	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	<b>Discipline</b> 755:2	distinction	768:9 791:5	$\frac{\mathbf{E}}{\mathbf{E}}$
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	<b>disturb</b> 757:11	906:5 908:16	765:2 813:10
705:17 710:11	discovered	disturbing	<b>DOJ</b> 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	<b>dollars</b> 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	<b>Donald</b> 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
	1	1		I

[				Page 12
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	820:23 823:23	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		engineer 728:24	898:1 900:7
872:5 874:23	858:12	employs 759:8 endeavor	729:2,20 815:1	
		773:10	· ·	entirety 897:4 entities 787:21
875:15 880:1	email 744:7,17		815:3,5,10,13	
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	<b>entitled</b> 883:16
economist	826:5 893:7	688:19 701:9	892:2,3,17	<b>entity</b> 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
<b>ED</b> 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
<b>effect</b> 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	<b>Enforcement's</b>	896:25 900:14	<b>EPA</b> 688:7
egregious 767:8	807:14	721:4	<b>English</b> 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	<b>ensure</b> 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
,				

				Page 13
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
<b>EPA's</b> 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
879.5 880.10	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	822:23 823:18	863:10 865:19
893:14	evelyday 703.1 evidence 691:25	781:13	840:3 864:13	877:7 879:9,11
	692:10,13	examined	882:20 885:1	
equipped 845:19	695:18 696:15	698:17 861:4	907:18,21	879:16,18,18 912:14
	696:24 697:9		,	
equity 885:22		example 748:5 836:10 837:6	908:4,8,16,17	<b>expertise</b> 862:6
886:21,22	741:10,10		909:4,22	862:8,22 864:1
887:2,15 890:5 ERG 817:21	771:15 773:19	838:2 855:1 895:5	910:10,13,15	879:13
	773:20,25		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	<b>exceed</b> 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
<b>Esquire</b> 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	<b>explore</b> 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
	I	1		l

				Page 14
extension	<b>facts</b> 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	<b>five</b> 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	<b>failure</b> 809:19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		873:9 885:21
		829:24,25 848:7 850:6	876:5,6 877:4	
extensions 826:9	814:7,9,17,22		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	<b>fairly</b> 868:13	878:8 880:18	888:8,9,10,14	<b>flipped</b> 763:11
731:8 800:6	<b>Fairness</b> 773:18	914:12	889:5 898:7	<b>flipping</b> 746:25
900:9 907:13	fall 748:4	farm 748:25	899:19,21	866:20 867:18
extract 784:10	<b>falling</b> 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	<b>familiar</b> 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	<b>federal</b> 692:15	<b>find</b> 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
<b></b>	756:18,21	<b>feel</b> 699:10	762:9 789:17	fluctuate 857:16
$\frac{\mathbf{F}}{\mathbf{F} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{F} F$	803:6 854:16	711:5 828:14	794:11 800:16	focus 720:12,15
<b>F</b> 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	<b>findings</b> 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
	02112	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	<i>21</i>	075.1 900.15
L				

				Page 15
forgetting	822:10 823:18	<b>G</b> 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
731:6 759:17	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	743:6 744:21	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
	898:1,14	885:23 902:14	768:1 769:11	857:16 858:17
<b>formally</b> 720:25 805:19	,	916:18		
	four-year		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	<b>Freeway</b> 688:24	getting 698:8	857:21 858:5	916:15,18
821:25 822:19	<b>front</b> 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	<b>Gold</b> 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
<b>forums</b> 700:24	full 856:7	<b>gist</b> 880:16	800:22 804:2	815:19 824:14
<b>forward</b> 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
<b>found</b> 708:16	fully 806:20	751:10 825:8	going 691:23	<b>good</b> 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	<b>fun</b> 757:16	905:1 906:25	695:5,13,24	698:25 699:1,2
866:9 875:25	functions	<b>given</b> 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	<b>funds</b> 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
<b>four</b> 714:16	872:23	877:3,25 897:2	741:4 750:15	766:16 768:9
737:15,17	<b>further</b> 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	<b>go</b> 694:4 700:2	789:5 790:17	<b>gotten</b> 694:20
820:19,20,24	<b>future</b> 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
	l			l

gram 871:12,12	<b>H</b> 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	778:1 783:18
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	<b>hold</b> 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
<b>guys</b> 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
<u> </u>	822:12 832:8	helping 707:12	697:11,19	879:15 901:19

				Page 17
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	<b>Ignoring</b> 772:1	include 716:14	indication
905:4,8,12,20	ideas 714:13	<b>illegal</b> 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	786:1 794:22	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	<b>initial</b> 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
I	779:18	782:11 882:12	902:6 903:6	838:7
<b>i.e</b> 738:5	ignore 768:4	inappropriate	indicates 889:23	initiation 836:23
IAC 878:22	771:22,25	712:17	indicating	837:23,25
	Í			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

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	<b>Jackie</b> 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	<b>January</b> 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	<b>JCXI</b> 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	<b>Jersey</b> 757:17	769:15 770:11
762:23	716:14 718:6	787:25 788:1	<b>job</b> 699:6 703:9	771:6 772:24
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	<b>Johnny</b> 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	<b>Johnson</b> 688:24	776:23 777:9
801:17 848:17	885:12	869:11 872:10	<b>join</b> 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	<b>invoice</b> 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	<b>joint</b> 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
			Judge 688:14	
<b>internal</b> 895:6,8	involved 700:14	issuing 834:2	0	788:11,14,22
internal 895:6,8 internally 868:3	<b>involved</b> 700:14 708:11 710:25	issuing 834:2 italicized 873:16	691:3,7,12,17	788:11,14,22 789:9,17

790:20 791:9	879:22 880:4	<b>Justice</b> 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	$\frac{K}{1 - 720.24}$	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	722:1 726:24
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	<b>known</b> 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	<b>knows</b> 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	<b>July</b> 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	<b>June</b> 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	<b>Junyun</b> 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
		l		

	1 . 1070 10	1 1704 2	775 1 ( 17	P (04.10
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	<b>lieu</b> 884:11	775:23
778:1 780:1,4	768:16 803:6	780:4 786:13	light 845:11,17	lived 775:9
781:8 783:18	804:5 840:18	787:10,11	<b>limited</b> 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	782:1 785:19	887:15 889:18	921:7
806:20 807:3,6	latched 856:19	907:25	892:22 902:10	<b>long</b> 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	<b>look</b> 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
$\frac{\mathbf{L}}{\mathbf{L}}$	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	<b>learn</b> 755:3,6	<b>levels</b> 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
			l	

r				Page 21
748:10 777:18		779:25 780:8	830:9 831:4	913:13
815:23 829:2	<u> </u>	780:14,16	860:3,4 862:19	meaning 705:17
866:5 869:21	<b>M-A-L</b> 721:14	786:1 803:21	867:12 868:15	712:20 745:3
870:23 887:22	<b>ma'am</b> 697:15	812:19 813:7	892:12 896:8,9	767:11 858:16
	715:23 719:1		,	
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	<b>mail</b> 901:10	773:21 780:9,9	895:25 896:25	785:6,7 857:20
764:25 769:17	<b>main</b> 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	<b>major</b> 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	<b>matter</b> 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	<b>mark</b> 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	<b>maximum</b> 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	<b>Matao</b> 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
<b>low-hour</b> 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	812:13 818:13	797:15 846:2	866:11 879:24	<b>met</b> 688:11
lunch 841:21	885:8	848:8 849:6,23	882:22 888:1	710:11 771:11
luxury 734:15		851:21	888:22,23	771:11 872:11
Lyndon 688:24	manufacturers 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
	///.24 //0:0			
L				

[				Page 22
871:11,12	<b>minor</b> 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	<b>motion</b> 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	<b>national</b> 701:9
868:15,23	917:2	878:17,18,23	844:20,24	802:8 804:17
869:3,11,19,23	<b>minutes</b> 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	<b>nature</b> 893:18
870.12,22,23	723:15	882:16 886:20	847:13	necessarily
				706:24 727:23
874:8,20 892:9	mischaracterize	899:18,21 903:25	<b>move</b> 691:24	
892:23 893:2	880:11		725:4 728:15	796:8 801:13
896:11 898:3	Mischaracteri 771:4	modeling 893:21	737:11 752:13	822:22 892:5
method 712:7			752:14,14	905:24
725:18 727:15	misinterpreta	<b>models</b> 711:17 857:12	753:7 754:4	<b>necessary</b> 727:14 773:9
727:21 728:6	740:7		756:14 765:13	
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	<b>need</b> 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	774:8 781:21
714:19,21	887:17 900:7	modified 881:20	<b>multiple</b> 855:11	791:21,24,25
715:9,16	<b>mission</b> 837:2	moment 745:23	888:22 894:11	818:2 823:13
727:18 729:25	<b>mistake</b> 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
<b>Mexico</b> 845:2,4	mistaken 916:25	886:14,15,17	multiplier	884:5 898:17
mid-January	mix 720:5 730:6	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
<b>middle</b> 776:16	mixed 717:12	889:9 890:4	<u> </u>	needed 893:14
861:9	730:8	910:17 913:14	<b>N</b> 689:1,1 843:1	895:23
Mike 744:8	mixing 858:2	month 702:16	843:1,1	needs 744:18
748:21 749:4	<b>mobile</b> 702:10	702:18 752:24	<b>N.W</b> 688:19	881:19
749:11 753:4	703:24 845:9	876:25	921:18	negative 870:14
849:18,25	model 732:20,21	monthly 873:11	nailed 802:10	negligence
miles 729:7,10	733:3,7 734:12	873:16	name 701:12	705:5,6,8,10
military 755:1	734:18,20	months 735:20	702:5 709:11	705:10,11,17
million 776:7,8	735:5,10,12,13	743:12 817:22	726:11,19	705:18,20,21
889:22 903:8	735:16,17,23	819:23 822:21	755:24 758:16	705:25 752:19
903:10,14,19	736:8,18 737:2	857:7 873:15	760:13 766:10	752:19 765:14
millions 885:8 887:11	737:3,5,16,18	876:19,24	766:13 792:3	824:21,24
	737:21 738:11	919:25	793:18,19	<b>negligent</b> 753:6
mind 705:22	738:13,22	<b>moot</b> 874:17	812:21 859:2	763:3,4 821:14
717:10 824:6	739:19 740:4	<b>morning</b> 691:3,5	861:8,9,10	823:17,17
884:8 906:12	763:5,25 764:5	691:6,10,16	<b>named</b> 766:14	825:4
mine 732:2	764:13,14,15	698:24,25 600:1 2 807:0	792:18 793:11	<b>negotiate</b> 749:14
742:17	764:20 765:2	699:1,2 807:9	//2.10///3.11	848:2
	1	1	1	1

				Page 23
negotiated	<b>non-cash</b> 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	<b>October</b> 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	<b>objection</b> 694:6	921:6,15
<b>NEIC</b> 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	<b>OEM</b> 734:3
<b>NEIS</b> 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 702:3	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 720:5	784:20 791:7	862:21 908:17
805:16,19	Nos 697:7	734:4,10	794:5,13	915:20
858:15 859:20	<b>note</b> 813:17	746:24 782:14	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 709:14,16	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
857:19 858:2,3	921:10	889:3 897:21	812:24,25	916:5 921:12
newer 813:21	<b>notice</b> 688:11	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	834:21
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	<b>offset</b> 870:13,22
830:6,8 831:15	noticed 759:19	<b>O</b> 689:1 843:1,1	693:16 839:20	874:20
831:18,22,24	760:2	843:1	839:21	<b>oh</b> 693:12
832:2,12,17,25	notices 743:5	o'clock 841:20	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	<b>object</b> 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	781:8,13 783:7	observed 731:9	827:12 829:16
nit-pick 865:20	696:8 711:24	789:6 824:17	<b>obtain</b> 883:18	843:21 851:4
noble 730:7,11	726:25 732:24	828:8 837:14	<b>obvious</b> 888:20	852:11 864:10
<b>non-</b> 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	<b>okay</b> 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
		l	I	I

695:11 696:5	782:1,3,6,20	915:5 916:3	organic 725:16	<b>owns</b> 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	<b>p.m</b> 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
737:8 738:19	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	790:1 799:15	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	<b>Palermo</b> 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	<b>opposed</b> 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	<b>pancake</b> 855:1,2
780:24 781:15	913:23 914:21	ordered 836:14	790:23 791:2	pancakes 855:3
		l	I	

				Page 25
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	parcy 5 052.10 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	pee 784:15	Pennsylvania	906:16
883:17	845:18	penalized	688:19	<b>phase</b> 804:10
paragraphs	pause 695:23	825:16	<b>people</b> 710:11	<b>phonetic</b> 912:14
738:10	698:12 711:14	penally 838:5	743:24 778:22	photos 744:11
parameter	714:4 736:20	penalties 777:25	778:24 791:5	744:12,13
809:4,10 810:2	737:14 752:10	786:12 802:24	799:20 800:25	748:10,11,12
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	758:11 761:21	803:3 806:5	800:25 901:7	· · ·
<b>parameters</b> 807:24 808:12	766:20 767:25	813:18 906:17	913:19	phrase 726:9 759:21 865:23
	769:14 794:12			
809:19,22		penalty 705:14	<b>Pep</b> 777:13,22	<b>phrases</b> 704:14
881:21	811:4,6 817:6	706:1 710:22	percent 717:17	phrasing 769:23
paraphrase	818:24 820:9	744:22 745:6	726:6,15,25	physically
755:22	824:9 827:13	752:17 767:4	752:20 768:8	867:14
part 727:14	828:2,5 829:6	767:21 772:13	791:20 792:3	pick 712:19,25
744:16 765:1	832:11 833:15	772:15,17	793:14 807:16	713:2,5,7
778:7,8,10,13	833:17 835:8	776:12 781:9	811:9,10,13,18	<b>piece</b> 867:3
783:12 810:9	836:3,18	781:12,25	811:20 812:2,4	897:21
812:8 813:6,21	851:20 864:9	782:1,21,25	812:12 814:2	piecemeal
814:24 828:11	874:24 883:9	783:5,15 788:8	814:10,12	898:11
828:24 829:9	884:23 891:11	788:18,20	844:18 847:21	<b>pieces</b> 893:14,16
855:25 879:25	891:19 895:17	789:10,11,19	perfect 760:3	893:16
880:2 882:19	901:22 907:24	803:7 805:15	849:15,16	piling 888:25
886:2 891:13	909:9,18	805:17 806:1	859:16 878:3	pistachio 855:2
903:7,21	916:24 917:8	807:15 810:9	perform 703:15	place 699:24
908:18,24	917:10	810:14,22,25	771:19 896:5	709:11 718:22
913:10 917:16	pay 774:3	814:1,7,10,16	performed	746:3 796:22
partial 876:21	777:25 790:2	814:22,24	735:6,9 859:5	855:5 856:10
876:22	814:2 845:24	815:14,25	864:24 865:16	placed 770:21
partially 890:9	846:3 863:13	816:9 821:8	865:19 866:1	862:20 902:7
participated	863:16 864:18	825:2,3,4,11	873:14 877:15	places 700:24
711:6 780:11	864:23 865:6	831:23 832:5,6	880:20 898:20	844:24
particles 855:6	875:10,14,17	832:7,10	<b>period</b> 694:2	<b>plan</b> 735:16
particular 770:2	877:8,14,21,22	835:19,23	749:9 876:18	754:23 761:3
833:10 853:25	879:2 880:25	836:1,2,10	876:25 884:11	810:3 815:9
906:13,16	881:4 883:16	837:21 838:2	894:18,20	816:12,15
913:9	883:18 885:18	839:5 840:10	permission	820:14 825:21
		I	l	I

				Page 20
830:23 837:1,1	703:15 704:1,8	694:2 804:8	730:19	print 889:15
837:3	704:16,20,21	post-importat	precisely 874:10	prior 740:21,23
plates 775:16,17	725:1	823:20	predecessor	796:7 809:15
775:18	policies 699:20	potential 722:3	812:22	809:17,24
platform 772:15	699:25 700:4	803:25 838:22	prefer 875:6	811:13,17,24
platinum 730:8	policy 705:14	839:1,6,9,10	preferable	837:25 873:7
730:11	706:1 767:21	840:23 841:10	869:14	889:4
play 906:13	772:5,8,15,17	841:14 913:2	preliminary	priority 901:10
pleading 916:1	774:10 810:14	potentially	691:7	probably 726:7
please 691:3	810:23 811:1	857:6	preparation	726:16 730:21
695:7 697:18	814:10 835:19	powder 730:21	701:20 715:25	746:3,22 770:2
698:23 712:22	835:23 836:1,2	730:25 731:3	prepare 916:21	794:4 796:17
713:11 715:18	836:11 837:21	powdered	prepared	800:15 822:6
715:20 720:1	838:2,5 839:5	730:23	806:12 879:11	822:14 843:22
721:1 728:13	860:10 861:17	power 738:5	present 848:6	883:8
728:14,18	861:19,24	PowerPoint	860:17 870:5	probative
730:4 733:18	862:14 863:2,6	790:25	871:3 873:2	836:22 837:2
736:17 737:13	863:11,13,17	practice 818:6	905:18	916:19
737:17 738:1,3	866:5	834:13,17,19	presentation	problem 710:21
747:14 748:7	poorly 856:21	880:3	906:19	743:12 771:2
752:5 758:12	pop 893:6	practices 893:19	presentations	797:25 806:6,9
762:20 765:23	<b>Port</b> 708:16	prattling 865:9	878:22	807:2 849:17
771:7 778:4	719:3	pre- 821:20	presented 702:5	861:19
779:16,24	portion 693:24	916:10	presenting	problems
795:6 808:4	795:7 826:16	pre-approved	879:4	795:14 848:16
817:5 823:4,6	873:24 886:4	820:14	President	887:25
829:14 836:20	904:7 908:21	pre-dating	748:19	procedure
841:2,22	<b>portions</b> 694:1	854:5	presidents	692:16,24
854:10 860:22	ports 847:2	pre-hearing	743:25	693:11
861:5,8 863:20	position 732:25	862:20 908:18	presume 905:11	procedures
864:1	733:5 791:13	908:19,22,25	pretty 762:8	899:5
plight 772:19	868:21 881:16	913:5	878:4,11	proceed 863:19
773:1	positively	pre-importation	889:19	863:20 865:3
point 694:18	870:23	823:21,22	prevent 706:11	875:4
708:17 718:9	possibility 889:2	precedent	892:19	proceeded 718:6
721:19 723:1	possible 707:2	805:13,14	prevented	proceeding
740:7 743:10	709:20,25	preceding 735:1	706:10	723:15
743:11 744:21	717:3 772:4,13	precious 730:2	previous 807:21	proceedings
748:23 777:12	817:20 835:2,3	730:16,17,22	808:9 810:18	921:9
778:5,6 784:24	851:2 869:5	731:5 830:15	810:18,19,20	process 726:1
786:9,10	870:23 880:13	858:12 859:16	812:1 868:23	741:25,25
824:18 840:17	possibly 720:13	859:18 868:15	869:25 871:21	744:14 758:14
849:14 860:2	743:23 744:9	869:3,11,19,23	872:16 886:22	854:6 855:4,4
867:2 874:17	775:3 809:12	871:4 873:25	previously	859:15,18
878:1 879:8	827:7 857:6	892:9,23 893:1	698:16 730:13	procured
884:14 888:11	858:1	precipitate	794:21 886:14	872:20
906:23	post 821:19	731:2,3,5	896:5	produce 734:4
points 723:2	post- 777:15	precipitated	prices 869:10,23	734:16 786:15
881:25	919:19	730:18	pricing 766:7	819:22 886:16
police 703:2,6	post-hearing	precipitating	primary 845:16	produced
- /				<sup>-</sup>
L				

				Page 27
713:25 725:20	Protection	700:5 772:14	894:5,14	763:9 876:22
726:2 734:18	688:1,18 801:5	790:2 797:20	<b>question</b> 693:6	888:18 893:16
774:18 779:18	921:12	815:4 905:10	694:24 698:19	903:11
783:2 786:16	prove 914:22	purposefully	701:24 707:21	<b>quotes</b> 877:20
819:4,9 820:11	918:6	854:23	707:23 713:10	<b>quotes</b> 077.20
Producing	provide 707:19	purposely	714:11,15,17	R
726:4	750:10 878:7	854:20	714:25 717:7	<b>R</b> 843:1
product 771:3	provided 715:13	purposes 700:5	724:4 740:5	R10 761:25
844:17,19,20	732:24 750:12	800:10 805:23	741:15 751:6	racial 798:1
844:21	750:13,19	855:24 888:7	752:12 754:1	radar 720:16,17
production	751:2 800:7	pursuant 688:11	755:22 770:19	720:19 721:5
714:7 715:12	816:15 824:21	723:10 803:24	771:7 775:4	721:10 727:10
715:17 830:2	835:14 836:14	804:11 810:2	776:15 780:2	755:25
894:22	837:21,22	814:1 815:14	781:23 788:14	raise 693:25
productive	851:23 872:24	820:19 825:1,5	789:16 791:8	907:4
885:11	876:1,12	826:24 830:23	795:17,19	raised 693:17
products 721:9	877:15 911:25	836:6,25	797:9 798:3	708:18
725:16 773:6	912:2 913:4	838:13,13	799:3 801:16	ran 706:15
professional	914:19 916:13	913:14	801:21 802:1	random 716:10
728:23 729:1	916:21	pursued 895:7	802:12,18	716:10,11
815:1,3,17,20	provides 835:20	<b>put</b> 695:11	803:10 819:25	randomly 716:6
815:21 820:15	891:20	730:22 766:10	826:1 827:17	716:7
826:24	providing 836:5	769:16 777:15	828:20,22	randomness
profitable 773:9	894:2	782:8 785:18	834:16 836:8	716:10
program 722:10	provisions 738:9	828:4 829:8,14	837:5 838:16	range 774:2
722:18,21	<b>proxy</b> 867:17	853:25 901:9	851:1 862:7	893:24
735:14 802:9	868:8 873:22	901:11 903:12	884:7 900:2	ranked 844:4
894:21 895:3	891:12,16	903:24 915:15	903:3	rate 873:1
895:12 897:9	893:11 894:5	918:22	questioned	rates 871:24
progress 818:18	895:1 896:14	putting 774:9	900:9	904:4
818:20 824:10	897:15 898:14	914:24	questioning	ratio 880:24
prominently	<b>public</b> 847:10,14		716:17 824:18	ratios 858:14
881:10	893:6 917:20	$\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{\mathbf{Q}}$	825:13 839:15	859:17
prompt 888:24	publication	Qiong 792:19	questions	re 766:2
proper 692:24	888:6	793:14,18	698:20 731:17	reach 882:7
693:10 727:15	publicly 869:10	qualification	781:4 785:9	<b>reached</b> 901:17
855:9	871:22 885:9	864:17	806:12,13,21	reaching 731:8
proportion	887:8,10,13	<b>qualified</b> 773:16	806:25 828:13	reaction 888:20
900:20	<b>pull</b> 761:17	773:17 806:5	840:6,7 843:8	<b>reactions</b> 866:1
proposal 691:22	<b>pulling</b> 766:6	861:13,21	848:19,21,21	888:20
895:3,8	punishing 770:8	865:19 <b>qualify</b> 861:14	848:23,25	read 691:20
proposals 895:6	purchased	862:13 863:5,9	849:3 875:1	693:11,19 728:14 731:11
propose 693:14	893:14	quality 894:21	876:16 884:13	731:13 737:15
proposed	purchases 882:1	896:24 897:9	902:25 904:8,9	737:17,24
807:15 814:1,6	<b>purely</b> 850:8	quarantine	<b>quick</b> 745:18	738:12 740:3
821:8 825:3,3	purport 735:22	716:22,25	783:17 829:5	765:1 773:3
825:11 831:23	purportedly	717:8,10	840:7	794:16 795:3,6
832:6,9 841:9 883:16 10	748:14	quarter 891:16	<b>quite</b> 705:6	823:2,2,6
883:16,19 904:6	<b>purpose</b> 692:19 694:22 695:1	891:24 892:3	715:17 743:17 743:24 761:19	836:19 864:25
904.0	094:22 093:1	071.27 072.3	/45.24 /01:19	050.17 004.25
L	1	1	1	1

				Page 28
readily 894:8,13	815:13 816:3	851:7 894:17	792:22 854:15	764:20 765:6
reading 730:3	816:16 817:2,3	recommended	854:19 857:1	854:20 898:23
738:1,3 753:24	818:17 820:23	816:5	referenced	regulatory
764:17 795:2	818.17 820.23	reconvene 842:5	854:14	699:24,25
855:12	821:0,9 822:12 824:5 834:12	record 692:5,22	references	703:1 723:6,12
ready 860:17	836:16 845:4	693:2,11,15,20	854:22	723:19 838:25
919:14	846:24 847:16	697:14 698:7,9	referred 692:6	840:20,24
real 754:7 800:4	902:8,18 913:9	701:8 719:19	695:15 696:12	841:6,11,15
829:5 889:5	recalled 847:22	735:22 745:19	696:21 697:5	854:1
reality 888:15	receivable	746:5 750:22	840:1 911:4,14	related 743:13
really 705:24	886:11 887:17	778:4 784:19	912:19 914:3	748:13 752:17
706:3 763:14	887:22 888:6	785:9 788:8	referring 701:6	809:4,25
763:23 773:24	889:6 900:9	794:20 828:10	702:20 706:20	886:25 907:5,8
838:9,11	receivables	839:23 843:3	702:20 700:20	relating 769:1
855:13 859:12	885:21 900:5,5	852:3,9 853:10	747:5,8,12,13	relationships
870:20 871:2,8	receive 751:6,19	855:20,25	748:21 766:4	900:13
872:6 874:21	751:20,23,24	861:8 862:20	770:15,25	relative 798:19
877:6 886:8,19	763:23 823:14	884:22 890:12	778:21 825:23	871:8
889:9 890:7	846:13,15,18	890:21 901:13	913:25 917:25	relatively
900:12 908:10	871:18 876:5	911:24 914:10	refers 758:22	867:17 875:20
913:20 915:10	received 690:2,9	914:17 915:7	771:1	881:25 883:22
919:18	692:9 695:18	916:16,18	<b>refine</b> 897:3	884:2,16
reason 694:21	696:15,24	917:19	refined 867:23	894:20 900:24
717:5 825:9	697:8 731:14	records 784:10	refining 895:13	relevance
847:12,15	748:9 751:11	791:16 796:4	reflection 900:3	699:22 703:18
875:12 885:4,9	751:22 753:12	901:15,25	refresh 708:25	716:16 722:24
reasonable	754:2 764:8	902:7 908:3	711:9 751:9	724:20 725:22
865:23 878:9	794:23 840:4	909:5,7 911:21	792:25	731:16 759:10
887:23	850:21 851:7	915:7 917:17	regard 846:22	776:9 778:2
reasons 774:7	871:24 872:22	917:20,22	882:12 912:25	781:8 784:22
847:20	910:21 911:8	918:6,11	913:1	786:4 789:8
rebuttal 919:15	914:23 915:25	recreational	regarding	798:13 800:21
recall 708:4,13	receives 743:5	845:18 901:6	708:15,17	824:18,24
709:3,12	receiving 846:24	RECROSS	744:9 836:12	837:15,19
710:14 711:4	900:17	689:2	846:19 865:12	910:7,16 912:3
714:24 726:20	recertifications	redirect 689:2	877:7 891:12	912:24 913:12
728:12 749:2	740:11	841:21 843:4	899:4	914:18 916:18
749:16,17	recertified	reduce 825:3	regards 853:3	relevancy
750:21 760:4	768:16	835:21 873:20	regenerated	898:25
763:7,10,16,19	recertifying	reduced 745:8	886:24	relevant 771:24
765:5 766:12	740:15,16	832:5,7	regia 730:9	772:1,3 880:15
767:6 768:12	recess 762:16,19	redundant	regional 798:1	907:14 910:18
770:4 778:19	842:3	746:13	registered 796:3	reliable 899:25
779:23 792:4,5	recessed 842:5	reevaluate	registration	relied 880:10
792:6,12,13,13	reclassify 837:7	824:20	791:2	relitigate 824:19
792:15,21	recollection	refer 739:5	regulation	remained
793:1,23 794:1	718:14 719:23	770:16	705:25 706:1	867:14
798:24 800:3	721:7 745:4	reference 717:9	765:8	remaining 742:8
804:18 809:9	749:20 813:8	749:11 753:8	regulations	remediate 814:8
812:3 815:4,10	815:23 830:20	765:17 768:9	703:14 723:22	814:9 847:21
L				

remediated	740:1 857:13	reports 714:7	917:22	688:6,21
847:23 851:8	repeat 714:11	744:10 745:15	required 735:17	692:13 714:2
remedy 810:20	745:10 778:12	746:16 750:25	742:1 814:25	715:13 753:17
811:25	800:13 808:7	751:7,11,13	820:17,18	763:4 786:3,12
remember	810:24 815:12	753:12,16,25	821:20 825:1,5	791:14 797:16
699:11 700:6,7	819:25 837:5	754:2,8,20	838:13	799:16 800:7
700:8,11	902:15	763:5,16	requirement	801:18 816:2
701:11,12,22	rephrase 715:2	764:10,13,14	804:13 805:18	817:4 835:10
701:25 702:16	760:16 771:7	814:23 820:23	860:4	845:22 846:7
702:17 705:9	814:8	824:11 864:25	requirements	853:19 854:17
707:6,9,12,14	replace 802:20	879:5,10,10	755:7 779:21	862:20 871:19
707:15 710:17	replicates	880:7 881:24	804:12 897:13	877:15 918:25
710:21 711:7	903:25	882:1 889:12	requires 705:25	919:1,1,2,3,9
712:3,14	reply 760:21	900:7 906:2,6	735:14 804:3	<b>Respondents'</b>
714:10 716:21	report 691:21	911:12,13,20	858:2	714:6 908:7
716:22 717:16	691:25 728:20	912:1 913:4	requiring	913:2 919:5
717:17 718:16	731:14,15	represent	855:17	responding
718:22 721:8	735:19 741:11	692:20 785:20	requisite 879:13	761:4
722:13 726:7,9	747:22 750:10	877:1,5 888:3	research 779:17	response 714:3
726:17 728:4	750:19 761:3	890:14	781:5 783:2	753:21 773:13
731:18,21	764:8,12	representation	789:25 790:5	774:5 801:1
733:16 736:13	816:18,20,21	775:20 776:24	790:11 796:2	823:7 907:23
744:23 749:18	817:1,23	representatives	869:9	responsibility
752:3 756:5,7	818:18,19,20	850:21	resell 901:7	748:18 853:20
756:9,10,11,12	820:25 821:18	represented	residence	responsible
758:10 761:23	822:5,7,10	877:5 886:20	797:22	776:6 777:5
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	<b>reporter</b> 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
- CHC (( 41 / 55.1	/	- qui 0 002.15	1. Spondents	071.0
L				

				2
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
	revenue 773:22	783:17 786:23	<b>ruled</b> 907:10	828:23
751:3,13,20,24	773:24	787:6 791:21	rules 692:15	saying 694:16
	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
, ,	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
	revolves 854:11	805:25 806:25	ruling 752:12	744:17 745:2
	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
	<b>Rick</b> 921:17	817:17 818:20	878:1 880:9	778:17 783:14
,	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	<b>RX</b> 908:19	793:23 801:9
858:23,24	703:9 705:25	842:2 848:19	<b>RX-18</b> 912:11	801:10 805:22
865:22 866:20	706:2 707:10	849:7,15,15	<b>RX-6</b> 908:20	824:4 850:2
868:14,20	709:14 710:18	850:14,20	<b>RX-7</b> 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	<b>s</b> 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	<b>safe</b> 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	<b>RMA</b> 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	<b>Room</b> 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	<b>rows</b> 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

r				Page 31
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	v	854:14,24
	784:8 785:6,6	· · · · ·	Seventy-one 750:1	855:22 856:1,5
896:21 898:1 898:13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	745:5,17		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
scene 717:24	785:6,13,16,17	746:17 748:19	severally 903:16	856:6,11,19,21
	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	<b>seek</b> 787:20	separate 796:25	sheet 698:1,3	<b>showly</b> 855:7
science 729:2	840:10	803:21 813:18	883:2 887:20	<b>shown</b> 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	<b>shows</b> 735:11
scope 761:6	seen 695:5	separated	<b>Shefftz</b> 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 755:8 773:24	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 855:7 856:8
search 738:16	718:12	826:9,11,12	879:16,22	<b>side</b> 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	<b>sign</b> 699:17
<b>secure</b> 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	<b>short</b> 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	<b>shorten</b> 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	<b>show</b> 736:10	787:11
742:14,15,16	871:2 900:6,22	seven 721:7	742:17 791:21	significantly
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

				Page 32
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	<b>so-</b> 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	<b>so-called</b> 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	<b>solution</b> 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	855.5,25	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	sound 719.21 sounded 881:3		771:3 859:5
878.13 879.17	<b>soon</b> 860:6		<b>specifics</b> 749:17 812:3	860:5 867:20
894:2 906:16		<b>sounds</b> 720:20 720:22 726:22		
	sorry 705:25		<b>specified</b> 813:6 815:4 872:20	standards
situations	709:15,18	729:25 796:5		771:11,16
881:18	710:15 713:1 713:21,24	817:17,20	897:1	795:8 837:4
<b>six</b> 713:5,6 735:20 743:12	· · ·	833:14	spectrometer 730:11	859:20
	714:5,11	<b>source</b> 702:10		stands 701:9
817:22 819:23	720:21 722:15	703:24 845:9	<b>speculate</b> 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	771:6 775:12	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
	l			I

				Page 33
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	<b>student</b> 743:16	816:6	supposed	
876:8	students 800:18	suggestion	774:19 803:9	Т
stating 772:9	studied 720:23	856:17	sure 691:11	<b>T</b> 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
<b>Stein</b> 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	<b>take</b> 694:1
stipulate 788:9	754:12 761:25	supervision	866:15 870:19	698:18 740:18
916:8	776:18 814:18	867:11 873:23	871:2 874:13	756:4,8 762:17
stipulated	814:23 816:18	892:11,25	874:14 876:22	766:17 777:13
744:22 745:2,5	824:15 826:16	893:9 896:13	891:7,25	797:18 800:1
814:15,17,22	835:2 858:4	898:15	894:20 895:24	825:2 827:7
814:24 815:14	submitted	supplement	901:5 905:24	855:8 859:25
815:25 816:9	697:13 698:1,2	916:10	906:24 909:11	867:2 869:4
820:16 826:25	700:24 701:23	supplemental	912:7 914:1	870:24 885:25
913:5,22	702:2,3 714:7	906:2,6	surprise 801:1	891:5 892:21
stipulations	746:16 761:24	supplemented	865:25	894:14 897:20
913:19	774:16 790:11	881:19	surprising 695:9	898:4 904:15
stock 885:9	790:22 816:20	supplier 871:14	surrounding	904:18,21
887:10	817:1,8,23	900:15	800:17	905:2,5,14,16
stood 900:12,23	818:19 820:15	suppliers 888:21	SUSAN 688:13	906:12 907:13
stop 745:18	820:24 825:12	888:24 889:10	sustained 703:4	917:2 918:12
856:23 891:23	836:25 837:4	890:1,2,5,9	721:19 722:25	919:10
892:22	846:5 906:2	897:12,12	744:2 757:15	taken 854:20
stopped 857:11	911:13 915:24	supply 853:24	758:20 767:17	855:5 902:7
straightforward	submitting	support 732:11	777:9 780:3	takes 743:21
877:12 880:12	743:6 858:22	774:13 871:17	790:20 791:9	822:16,20
0,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, 1210 020.22	,,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	~

010.05	002 12 15	0.40, 10, 0.50, 1	702 05 702 1	
919:25	893:13,15	849:19 850:1	792:25 793:1	ten 714:1 741:21
talk 707:18	917:1,3,3,4	850:21 853:22	846:6,9,14,15	763:8,13
708:24 709:1	talks 738:11,13	856:12 858:8	870:5 877:11	765:15,21
712:24 723:8	748:8 795:14	859:21 877:10	879:23,24	767:1,10
723:12 725:20	824:10 856:23	878:10 882:1	882:2,12 884:2	768:12,14
726:1 732:10	889:13	882:13 886:3	887:13,15,18	769:6,16
741:12 744:4	tangible 893:17	887:13 888:17	899:16,19,22	770:17 771:20
761:7 762:1	<b>Taotao</b> 688:3,3	889:25 890:4,6	899:24 900:1	772:20 780:9
764:13 765:14	708:12 715:5	890:8,15 892:6	900:19,23	785:14 812:5
766:16 769:1,3	717:20 720:9	898:22 899:4,7	901:1 904:2	830:6,8,14,19
781:6 782:1	721:4,6,8	899:16,24	taxable 881:9	831:16,18,22
785:19 821:15	743:18 744:5	902:3 910:17	882:13	831:24 832:2
865:6 875:19	748:19 755:25	910:21 921:4,4	taxation 775:20	832:12,17
885:24	761:2,15 763:2	<b>Taotao's</b> 766:9	776:24	833:7 835:12
talked 707:17,21	763:6 766:15	880:21 910:20	<b>tea</b> 777:3	835:16 837:17
709:21 722:16	768:5 771:3,11	tapes 921:10	teacher 707:6	850:19 851:5
726:14,17	771:15 773:3	<b>Tariq</b> 688:23	teachers 706:25	855:2 873:9
743:15 746:15	776:2 777:5,5	806:11,24	teams 836:21	892:7
754:7,10 767:7	779:7,16,20	807:9,10,13	<b>Tech</b> 729:4,5	tended 700:14
768:11 890:20	781:3,5,6,7	808:6,8,23,25	technically	tends 695:1
917:2,4	782:8,9,18,18	809:2 812:24	862:15	term 705:22
talking 700:21	782:22,23,23	813:1 818:25	telephone 709:2	738:11 764:20
705:16 707:9	782:24 783:1,3	819:2,20	television 893:7	798:19 799:12
707:11,24	783:5,6,8,8,15	821:13 822:25	tell 702:7 704:2	799:19
710:17 712:15	783:23,23	823:1 824:8,12	708:10 713:23	terms 693:6
718:20,23	784:7,19	824:19,23	715:9 721:1	705:22 707:14
722:13 723:6,8	785:12,12,15	825:9,24 826:3	728:6,11,14	707:16 715:18
723:19 726:5,6	785:17,18,22	826:7,21,22	730:2 732:3,10	730:19 766:21
730:25 731:2	786:15 787:13	827:14,19	732:25 734:11	789:6 828:15
733:25 738:24	787:13,14	828:13,17,19	735:8 742:3,19	836:9 861:24
740:12 741:13	788:2,19,20,20	828:21 833:12	743:6,10 744:5	862:22
741:21 742:23	789:2,12,12,13	833:13,16,18	745:20 746:18	<b>Terry</b> 710:15
745:9 747:23	789:20,25	834:23 835:7,9	751:15,15	760:5
747:25 748:2	790:1,8,8,14	837:13,19	754:13 772:12	test 728:16,20
750:4 754:17	792:7 796:2,21	838:10,15,18	781:2,11	729:17 731:16
755:13 757:8,9	810:5,8,8	838:24 839:15	784:13 803:5,8	732:7,13,14,15
758:7 759:4	812:8,10,13,14	839:19 840:6,9	843:22 844:17	734:12,24
761:20 763:15	812:16,18,19	840:15,18,22	856:22 857:20	735:5,9,22,22
764:12 765:8,9	813:2,5,11,11	841:8,16,18	857:25 862:23	735:23 744:9
769:7,8,9	813:13,20	853:1,2 882:22	864:2 872:6	745:15 746:16
770:18,20	814:1,25 815:3	882:25 883:3	878:9 880:18	747:20,22
776:11 778:16	815:15 816:5	883:11 907:17	882:20	750:13 751:3
780:19,20,21	820:2,17	908:1,17 909:1	telling 700:8	751:18,20,24
781:5,5 782:2	821:14 823:16	909:4,10	708:23 709:20	753:12,16
802:7 803:12	824:25 825:16	910:16 911:10	738:20 739:22	754:8,15,20
803:16 813:10	826:16,24	911:12,19	786:24 790:10	758:10 768:18
814:15 823:17	827:6 844:4	912:13 913:13	797:21 804:1	768:20,22,23
851:4 857:4,6	846:1,2,8	913:24 914:13	902:18	769:24 770:6
877:18 886:9	847:3 848:5,8	915:6	tells 733:1	770:14 814:18
886:17 887:8	848:17 849:10	tax 792:9,10,15	791:17	814:20,23
				l

816:12,15,21880:19882:16775:21,21732:6733:20917:1818:18820:13889:13891:6784:13789:24739:5740:6fbouxand820:23822:16899:13901:524793:20761:61.61,7743:7744:61.7743:7744:61.7827:19testing 708:18801:24802:6744:24745:11806:15806:13806:14820:19testing 708:18801:24802:7774:18780:17782:18787:9831:15,16.19768:11,15829:25841:22753:12753:22783:72830:52830:14835:14,18,20816:13829:25841:22785:7789:21830:52830:52830:52837:2831:13.65789:22,23844:18845:23855:23835:20,24838:13858:5860:18863:19797:11,71985:81.16,16858:21865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:12865:11868:12,20869:11,90859:11,16,16858:12869:14855:11,16,16858:12867:13874:38876:13874:38876:13877:17874:38876:13877:17874:38876:13877:17877:17877:17877:17874:38876:13877:17874:38876:13877:17877:17877:17877:17877:17877:17877:17877:17877:17877:178					Page 35
818.18         820:13         889:13         901:5         790:4         792:7         741:16.16,17         796:19           823:23         826:4         902:15,24         793:20         741:26         744:21         741:16           827:28         829:19         testing 708:18         801:24         802:6         744:24         745:11         808:13         808:14           820:19,20:23         727:15,25         805:4806:310         746:6749:11         806:15         806:15           830:16,23         728:79,753:10         807:81,22         828:19         782:783:22         793:16         806:15           831:14,18,20         816:13         820:12         828:13         791:17,19         830:5,25         831:7           836:5,6,7,14         821:20         835:14,34:3         791:3794:6         844:18         845:23           837:1,13,17         836:25         860:10         875:9904:12         803:16         868:12,20           911:12,12.20         869:21         896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16         811:10         868:11,20           911:12,12.20         869:21         896:15         821:11         815:10         868:12,20         812:11         816:13           852:24	816.12 15 21	880.10 882.16	775.21.21	732.6 733.20	017.1
820:23         829:13         901:5         790:4         792:7         741:16,16,17         796:19           823:823         826:4         902:15,24         793:20         796:16         743:7         744:617         thousands           827:8         829:19,20,23         727:15,25         805:4         801:24         802:13         807:8,12         174:17         807:13         three 702:12           831:7,9,11,11         757:247         768:4         821:12         823:7         774:18         780:17         782:17         782:18         787:18         793:16         806:16           835:14,18,20         816:13         820:12         851:91         835:6         789:22,23         844:18         845:22         837:1,1,3,17         836:25         851:01         855:11         855:20,24         838:13         858:5         860:18         863:19         797:1,7,19         855:11,16,16         858:21         869:11         858:21         869:11,99         859:11,16,16         858:21         869:11,99         859:11,82,12         844:18         845:22         873:15         870:12         804:14         845:12,12         844:18         859:12,20         851:21         806:14         869:11,99         912:1913:4,14         889:11,20         866:11			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
823:23         826:4         902:15.24         793:20 796:16         743:7 744:6,17         thousands           827:19.023         727:15.25         805:4 806:3,10         746:6 749:1         806:15         806:15           830:16,23         728:7,9 753:10         807:8,12 819:6         754:1 763:13         three 702:12           831:7,9,11,11         757:24 768:4         821:12 823:7         774:18 780:17         782:18 787:9           831:5,16,19         768:11,15         828:18,19         782:27 783:22         793:16 806:10           835:14,18,20         816:13 820:13         829:25 841:22         785:7 789:21         830:5,25 837:2           836:5,6,7,14         821:20 836:22         851:9,11 853:6         789:22,23         844:18 845:23           835:20,24         838:13 858:5         860:18 863:19         977:1,17,19         855:11,16,16           836:32,48         871:12,4         907:16 919:17         806:17 807:3         868:12,20           911:12,12,00         869:21 896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16 811:10         869:11,19           912:1 913:4,14         898:16         thanked 756:5         812:11 815:21         870:16 873:15           830:2 2 831:1         70:23 815:1         thanked 756:5         812:14 825:2         873:19,202					
829:19,20,23         727:15,25         805:4 806:3,10         746:6 749:1         860:15           830:16,23         728:79 753:10         807:8,12 819:6         754:1 763:13         three 702:12           831:7,9,11,11         75:24 768:4         821:12 823:7         774:18 780:17         782:18 787:9           831:15,16,19         768:11,15         828:18,19         782:5 783:22         793:16 806:10           835:14,18,20         816:13 820:13         829:25 841:22         785:7 789:21         844:18 845:22           836:7,14         821:20 836:22         851:91 1853:6         789:22,23         844:18 845:22           836:3,89         858:25 866:10         875:9 904:12         803:1,2 805:16         888:11,16,16           856:3 858:3,9         858:25 866:10         875:9 904:12         806:17 807:3         868:12,20           911:2,12,20         869:21 896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16         888:12,20           911:2,12,20         869:24 707:15         Theak 698:11         822:14 825:2         873:17,20           754:24 764:10         751:20 752:7         851:12 87:24         824:14         885:19,21           819:8 823:21         770:6,19,20         theory 818:6         890:20 894:17         879:17           819:8 823:21         770:5,		,			
830:16,23         728:7,9 753:10         807:8,12 819:6         754:1 763:13         three 702:12           831:7,9,11,11         757:24 768:4         821:12 823:7         774:18 780:17         782:18 78:9           831:15,16,19         768:11,15         828:18,19         782:27 783:22         793:16 806:10           835:14,18,20         816:13 820:13         829:25 841:22         785:7 789:21         830:5,25 831:7           836:5,6,7,14         821:20 836:22         851:9,11 853:6         789:22,23         844:18 845:22           837:1,1,3,17         836:52 866:10         875:9 904:12         803:1,2 805:16         858:21 864:20           858:23,24         867:11,24         907:16 919:17         806:17 807:3         866:12,0           911:2,12,20         869:21 896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16 811:10         869:11,19           912:1 913:4,14         898:16         thanked 756:5         812:11 815:21         870:16 873:15           870:10         testified 691:20         752:24 770:15         Thee's 821:21         844:4 849:14         885:19,21           817:19,21         752:24 770:15         Thee's 821:21         844:4 849:14         885:19,21           817:19,21         752:24 770:15         Thee's 821:21         844:4 849:14         885:19,21		0			
831:7,9,11,11757:24 768:4821:12 823:7774:18 780:17782:18 787:9831:15,16,19768:11,15828:18,19782:5 783:22793:16 806:10835:14,18,20816:13 820:12 8241:22785:7 789:21830:5,25 831:7836:5,6,7,14821:20 836:22851:9,11 853:6789:22,23844:18 845:22837:1,1,3,17836:25 837:2853:14 854:3791:3 794:6845:23 855:3855:20,24838:13 858:5860:18 863:19797:1,17.19855:11.16,16856:3 858:3,9858:25 866:10875:9 904:12803:1,2 805:16858:21 864:20858:23,24867:11,24907:16 919:17806:17 807:3868:12,20911:12,12,20869:21 896:25920:2,3,8,12809:16 811:10869:11,19912:1 913:4,14898:16thanke 756:5812:11 815:21870:16 873:15817:19,21752:24 770:15Thee's 821:21844:4 849:14885:19,21819:8 823:21770:6,19,20theirs 914:7852:13,14892:10 897:6830:22 831:1770:23 815:1theory 818:6890:20 894:17755:14855:16,18835:21 836:4741:22 742:16903:11 906:5throw 695:6870:1833:2 859:4theory 818:6890:20 894:17755:14testified 691:20806:14 870:10threof 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1698:17 718:15872:19 874:4716:573:6907:10 909:19696:3771:1807:14ta32:29 832:17714:573:6907:10 909:19696:3771:1807:14706:27735:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
831:15.16,19         768:11,15         828:18,19         782:5 783:22         793:16 806:10           835:14,18,20         816:13 820:13         829:25 841:22         785:7 789:21         830:5,25 831:7           836:5,6,7,14         821:20 836:22         853:14 854:3         791:3 794:6         845:23 845:3           837:1,1,3,17         836:25 837:2         853:14 854:3         791:3 794:6         845:23 855:3           855:20,24         838:13 858:5         860:18 863:19         797:1,17.19         855:11,16,16           856:3 858:3,9         858:25 866:10         875:9 904:12         803:1,2 805:16         858:21 864:20           911:12,12,20         869:21 896:25         920:2,3,8,12         806:16 811:10         869:11,19           912:1 913:4,14         898:16         thanked 756:5         812:11 815:21         870:16 873:15           testef 76:17,21         tets 77:16,19,20         theirs 914:7         852:13,14         874:3 876:13           817:19,21         752:24 770:15         Thee's 821:21         844:4 849:14         885:19,21           845:22         831:1 836:6         780:15         877:17 879:17         threw 750:8           870:1         838:2 859:4         theory 818:6         890:20 894:17         855:14           855:19,58 99:15	,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
835:14,18,20         816:13         820:13         829:25         841:22         785:7         789:21         830:5,25         831:17           836:5,6,7,14         821:20         836:12         851:9,11         835:6         789:22,23         844:18         845:23         855:21         860:18         856:12         805:12         805:17         805:17         805:17         805:17         805:17         805:17         805:17         807:17         870:16         857:17         870:17         870:17         870:17         870:17         870:17         870:17         870:17         870:17         870:17         882:18         890:16         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29         100:29					
836:5,6,7,14         821:20 836:22         851:9,11 853:6         789:22,23         844:18 845:22           837:1,1,3,17         836:25 837:2         853:14 854:3         791:1,719         855:23           855:20,24         838:13 858:5         860:18 863:19         797:1,1719         855:11,16,16           856:3 858:3,9         858:25 866:10         875:9 904:12         803:1,2 805:16         858:21 864:20           858:23,24         867:11,24         907:16 919:17         806:17 807:3         868:12,20           911:12,12,20         898:16         thanked 756:5         812:11 815:21         870:16 873:15           tested 735:17,21         tests 732:4,7         thanke 698:11         822:14 825:2         873:17,20           836:23 831:1         770:23 815:1         theoretically         844:4 849:14         874:3 876:13           817:19,21         752:47 70:16         Thee's 821:21         844:4 849:14         892:10 897:6           830:22 831:1         770:23 815:1         theoretically         862:8 874:23         898:1,13 910:1           855:16,18         835:11 836:6         780:15         877:17 879:17         898:1,20,21         714:5 737:6         907:10 909:19         696:3           698:17 718:15         877:17 997:1,12         898:19,20,21         714:5 737		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
837:1,1,3,17         836:25 837:2         853:14 854:3         791:3 794:6         845:23 855:3           855:20,24         838:13 858:5         860:18 863:19         797:1,17,19         855:11,16,16           856:3 858:3,9         858:25 866:10         875:9 904:12         803:1,2 805:16         858:12,20           911:12,12,20         869:21 896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16 811:10         869:11,19           912:1 913:4,14         898:16         thanke 698:11         822:14 825:2         873:17,20           754:24 764:10         751:20 752:7         851:12 872:4         822:11 825:2         873:17,20           830:22 831:1         770:16,19,20         theirs 914:7         852:13,14         892:10 897:6           830:22 831:1         770:23 815:1         theory 818:6         890:20 894:17         755:14           855:16,18         835:11 836:6         780:15         877:17 879:17         throw 750:8           870:1         838:2 859:4         theory 818:6         890:20 894:17         755:14           870:18         837:19 874:7         thigg 703:12         903:11 906:5         throw 872:1           870:1         860:14 870:10         thercof 871:12         896:3 901:4         throw 895:6           752:1 755:9         898:19,20,21					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
855:20.24         838:13 858:5         860:18 863:19         797:1,17,19         855:11,16,16           856:3 858:3,9         858:25 866:10         875:9 904:12         803:1,2 805:16         858:21 864:20           858:23,24         867:11,24         907:16 919:17         806:17 807:3         868:12,20           911:12,12,20         869:21 896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16 811:10         869:11,19           912:1 913:4,14         898:16         thanked 756:5         812:11 815:21         870:16 873:15           754:24 764:10         751:20 752:7         851:12 872:4         827:17 830:14         898:13 876:13           817:19,21         752:24 770:15         Thee's 821:21         844:4 49:14         885:19,21           819:8 823:21         770:61,9,20         theirs 914:7         852:13,14         898:1,3 910:1           855:16,18         835:11 836:6         780:15         877:17 879:17         three 750:8           870:1         838:2 859:4         theory 818:6         890:20 894:17         755:14         throw 750:8           870:1         838:19,20,21         714:5 737:6         907:10 909:19         696:3         throw 870:1           855:16,18         871:7         871:17         872:19 874:7         thing 691:18,24         919:13			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	
856:3         858:25         866:10         875:9         904:12         803:1,2         805:16         858:21         864:120           911:12,12,20         869:21         896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16         811:10         869:11,19           911:12,12,20         899:16         thanked 756:5         812:11         815:12         870:16         873:15           tested 735:17,21         tests 732:4,7         thanked 756:5         812:11         815:12         874:3876:13           817:19,21         752:24         770:16,19,20         theirs 914:7         852:13,14         892:10         897:6           830:22         831:1         770:23         815:1         theoretically         862:8         874:23         898:1,13         910:1           855:16,18         835:11         836:6         780:15         877:17         879:17         threw 750:8           870:1         838:2         859:4         theoretically         862:3         901:4         throw 750:8           870:1         833:2         857:4         817:12         806:3         901:4         throw 750:8           870:1         838:2         898:19,20,21         714:5         737:6         907:10         909:19         696:3					
858:23,24         867:11,24         907:16 919:17         806:17 807:3         868:12,20           911:12,12,20         869:21 896:25         920:2,3,8,12         809:16 811:10         869:11,19           912:1 913:4,14         898:16         thanked 756:5         812:11 815:21         870:16 873:15           tested 735:17,21         test 732:4,7         thanks 698:11         822:14 825:2         873:17,20           754:24 764:10         751:20 752:7         851:12 872:4         827:17 830:14         874:3 876:13           817:19,21         752:24 770:15         Thee's 821:21         844:4 849:14         885:19,21           819:8 823:21         770:16,19,20         thererically         862:8 874:23         898:1,13 910:1           855:16,18         835:11 836:6         780:15         877:17 879:17         throw 750:8           870:1         838:2 859:4         theory 818:6         890:20 894:17         755:14           testified 691:20         860:14 870:10         thereof 871:12         896:3 901:4         throw 695:6           752:1 755:9         898:19,20,21         714:5 737:6         907:10 909:19         696:3           711:1 807:14         Texas 688:24         741:22 742:16         910:2 912:23         throwing 705:2           895:1 899:15	-			· · ·	· · ·
911:12,12,20869:21 896:25920:2,3,8,12809:16 811:10869:11,19912:1 913:4,14898:16thanked 756:5812:11 815:21870:16 873:15tested 735:17,21tests 732:4,7thanks 698:11822:14 825:2873:17,20754:24 764:10751:20 752:7851:12 872:4827:17 830:14874:3 876:13817:19,21752:24 770:15Thee's 821:21844:4 849:14885:19,21819:8 823:21770:16,19,20theirs 914:7852:13,14892:10 897:6830:22 831:1770:23 815:1theoretically862:8 874:23898:11,3 910:1855:16,18835:11 83:66780:15877:17 879:17threw 750:8870:1838:2 859:4theory 818:6890:20 894:17755:14testified 691:20860:14 870:10thereof 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1698:17 718:15872:19 874:7thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:2 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9third 811:12thwart 695:1915:16699:7 700:23777:5,18Third-eighttime 692:1479:972:9,13860:11 865:11Third-seighttime 692:1479:972:9,13860:11 865	-			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
912:1913:4,14898:16thanked 756:5812:11 815:21870:16 873:15tested 735:17,21tests 732:4,7thanks 698:11822:14 825:2873:17,20754:24 764:10751:20 752:7851:12 872:4827:17 830:14874:3 876:13817:19,21752:24 770:15Thee's 821:21844:4 849:14892:10 897:6830:22 831:1770:16,19,20theirs 914:7852:13,14892:10 897:6830:22 831:1770:23 815:1theoretically862:8 874:23898:1,13 910:1855:16,18835:11 836:6780:15877:17 879:17threw 750:8870:1838:2 859:4theore 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1testified 691:20860:14 870:10there of 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1testified 691:20860:14 870:10thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:5 737:6907:10 909:19696:3771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3thing 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19thank 695:19720:5 743:22thinking 756:5ts82:10912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6698:21 702:11912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6118:42915:1	,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
tested 735:17,21tests 732:4,7thanks 698:11822:14 825:2873:17,20754:24 764:10751:20 752:7851:12 872:4827:17 830:14874:3 876:13817:19,21752:24 770:15Thee's 821:21844:4 849:14885:19,21819:8 823:21770:16,19,20theirs 914:7852:13,14892:10 897:6830:22 831:1770:23 815:1theoretically862:8 874:23898:1,13 910:1855:16,18835:11 836:6780:15877:17 879:17threw 750:8870:1838:2 859:4theoretically860:3 091:4755:14testified 691:20860:14 870:10thereof 871:12896:3 901:4throw 895:6698:17 718:15872:19 874:7thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:5 737:6907:10 909:10696:3771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinks 825:10thuexat 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10912:16 915:13697:19 698:22777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14173:12 878:147					,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-				
817:19,21752:24 770:15Thee's 821:21844:4 849:14885:19,21819:8 823:21770:16,19,20theirs 914:7852:13,14892:10 897:6830:22 831:1770:23 815:1theoretically862:8 874:23898:1,13 910:1855:16,18835:11 836:6780:15877:17 879:17threw 750:8870:1838:2 859:4theory 81:6890:20 894:17755:14testified 691:20860:14 870:10thereof 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1698:17 718:15872:19 874:7thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:5 737:6907:10 909:19696:3771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,19197:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24917:7 919:5,12850:2912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thak 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:379:973:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:1273		-			· · ·
819:8823:21770:16,19,20theirs 914:7852:13,14892:10897:6830:22831:1770:23815:1theoretically862:8874:23898:1,13910:1855:16,18835:11836:6780:15877:17879:17threw 750:8870:1838:2859:4theory 818:6890:20894:17755:14testified 691:20860:14870:10thereof 871:12896:3901:4throw 695:6698:17718:15872:19874:7thing 703:12903:11906:5throw 695:6752:1755:9898:19,20,21714:5737:6907:10909:19696:3771:1807:14Texas 688:24741:22742:16910:2912:23throwing 705:2861:4891:12709:9,11,22858:14865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5899:15715:6,24871:10917:7919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19797:22695:4700:15thinking 756:5878:21729:17805:19thak 695:19720:5743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1915:17699:770:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:1,0715:8782:14741:27.77:8844:8,2779:9721:9,33860:11855:11744:8848:4715:5.716:3787:9732:19735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13701:20737:27<					
830:22 831:1770:23 815:1theoretically862:8 874:23898:1,13 910:1855:16,18835:11 836:6780:15877:17 879:17threw 750:8870:1838:2 859:4theory 818:6890:20 894:17755:14testified 691:20860:14 870:10thereof 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1698:17 718:15872:19 874:7thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:5 737:6907:10 909:19696:3771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9think 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8786:11 876:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:379:9729:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24 </td <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td>	,				,
855:16,18 870:1835:11 836:6 838:2 859:4780:15 theory 818:6877:17 879:17 890:20 894:17threw 750:8 755:14testified 691:20860:14 870:10 802:17 718:15theory 818:6 872:19 874:7890:20 894:17 thing 703:12755:14 threat 872:1698:17 718:15872:19 874:7 872:19 874:7thing 703:12 714:5 737:6907:10 909:19 910:2 912:23696:3 throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21 709:11,22714:5 737:6 858:14 865:20914:10,16 917:9 919:5,12thrust 849:25 850:2801:24 915:1709:9,11,22 757:11 796:3858:14 865:20 863:1 875:19917:7 919:5,12 thing 691:18,24 919:13850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3 757:11 796:3things 691:18,24 706:16 714:9919:13 thinking 756:5 thinks 825:10thumb 866:3,17 thursday 688:9 third 811:12729:17 805:14 912:16 915:13697:19 698:22 697:19 698:22747:25 748:2 747:25 748:2844:5,6 tighten 865:10 thirty-eight the 698:11 865:11 743:12 878:14 713:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9 720:24800:25 804:37 741:865:11 744:8 848:4715:5 716:3 715:5 716:3testimony 707:15 712:12739:22 742:18 739:22 742:18 893:22 893:13700:17 709:24 744:8 848:4 715:5 716:3721:17 709:24 745:15 743:17 744:8 848:471:13 718:4 747:4 749:24 749:19 735:25876:9,17 849:18,22718:5,21 748:17 749:19 746:17 749:9 749:19 752:15 766:771:5756:13,14 744:17 94:17 756:8 762:6,11 749:19 752:15 766:771:5756:13,14 744:17 94:17 756:8 762:6,11 749:19 751:26 746:17 749:970		· · ·		,	
870:1838:2 859:4theory 818:6890:20 894:17755:14testified 691:20860:14 870:10thereof 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1698:17 718:15872:19 874:7thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:5 737.6907:10 909:19696:3771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19797:22695:4 700:15thinking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thirds 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:49800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 893:13744:8 848:4715:5 716:3707:15 715:6754:3 755:21913:21<			•		
testified 691:20860:14 870:10thereof 871:12896:3 901:4throat 872:1698:17 718:15872:19 874:7thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:5 737:6907:10 909:19696:3771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9third 811:12thursday 688:9912:16 915:13697:10 698:22777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 695:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:374:12 779:12739:22 742:18893:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:474:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10	-				
698:17 718:15872:19 874:7thing 703:12903:11 906:5throw 695:6752:1 755:9898:19,20,21714:5 737:6907:10 909:19696:3771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19797:22695:4 700:15thirking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thirk 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21756:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 6					
752:1755:9898:19,20,21714:5737:6907:10909:19696:3771:1807:14Texas688:24741:22742:16910:2912:23throwing705:2861:4891:12709:9,11,22858:14865:20914:10,16thrust849:25895:5899:15715:6,24871:10917:7919:5,12850:2thrust849:25901:24915:1757:11796:3things691:18,24919:13thumb866:3,17testify694:10,19797:22695:4700:15thinking756:5878:21729:17805:14th<871:4					
771:1 807:14Texas 688:24741:22 742:16910:2 912:23throwing 705:2861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19797:22695:4 700:15thinking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinks 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9722:9,33860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13though 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12759:1 761:14 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
861:4 891:12709:9,11,22858:14 865:20914:10,16thrust 849:25895:5 899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19797:22695:4 700:15thinking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinks 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14 <td< td=""><td></td><td>· · ·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>		· · ·			
895:5899:15715:6,24871:10917:7 919:5,12850:2901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19797:22695:4 700:15thinking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinks 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24					0
901:24 915:1757:11 796:3things 691:18,24919:13thumb 866:3,17testify 694:10,19797:22695:4 700:15thinking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinks 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:227				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
testify 694:10,19797:22695:4 700:15thinking 756:5878:21729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinks 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8				,	
729:17 805:14th 871:4706:16 714:9thinks 825:10Thursday 688:9863:1 875:19thank 695:19720:5 743:22third 811:12thwart 695:1912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8			0		· · · · ·
863:1 875:19 912:16 915:13thank 695:19 697:19 698:22720:5 743:22 747:25 748:2third 811:12 844:5,6thwart 695:1 tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8	•			0	
912:16 915:13697:19 698:22747:25 748:2844:5,6tighten 865:10915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eight696:8698:21 702:11testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8					v
915:17699:7 700:23777:5,18Thirty-eighttime 692:14testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8					
testifying713:7,10 715:8782:14 799:19696:8698:21 702:11773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8				,	
773:12 878:14716:12 720:4,9800:25 804:3Thompson702:17 709:24879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
879:9727:9,13860:11 865:11744:8 848:4715:5 716:3testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8					
testimony732:19 735:25876:9,17849:18,22718:5,21694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8				-	
694:13 701:20737:22 738:7888:22 893:13thought 707:21727:18,20707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
707:15 712:12739:22 742:18893:22 895:1711:22 717:6735:15 743:17712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8	v		,		· ·
712:13 718:4747:4 749:24899:14 902:22718:11 745:1746:17 749:9720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8				5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
720:1 755:16754:3 755:21913:21750:3 766:24749:19 752:15768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8					
768:7 771:5756:6,13,14think 693:1774:1 794:17756:8 762:6,11797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8					
797:15 830:12757:6,10 758:4695:2 701:16802:4 805:10789:8 794:9836:1 837:15759:1 761:14702:17 703:23868:6 869:13796:7,17,21837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8					
836:1837:15759:1761:14702:17703:23868:6869:13796:7,17,21837:17841:23762:14,18704:19707:17870:21871:10802:25803:20864:25875:22766:24767:2707:17711:3878:1894:9824:2826:8					
837:17 841:23762:14,18704:19 707:17870:21 871:10802:25 803:20864:25 875:22766:24 767:2707:17 711:3878:1 894:9824:2 826:8	797:15 830:12	757:6,10 758:4	695:2 701:16	802:4 805:10	789:8 794:9
864:25 875:22         766:24 767:2         707:17 711:3         878:1 894:9         824:2 826:8	836:1 837:15	759:1 761:14	702:17 703:23	868:6 869:13	796:7,17,21
	837:17 841:23	762:14,18	704:19 707:17	870:21 871:10	802:25 803:20
879:20         880:7         767:23         772:19         716:22         730:22         897:18         903:18         834:1,5         839:20	864:25 875:22	766:24 767:2	707:17 711:3	878:1 894:9	824:2 826:8
	879:20 880:7	767:23 772:19	716:22 730:22	897:18 903:18	834:1,5 839:20
		l	l	l	l

-	845:1,4 884:20 topic 917:14	812:18,21	900:24	732:1 736:16
-	topic 91/:14	000 00 001 14	1 720 5	740 11 741 15
		828:22 831:14	type 738:5	740:11 741:15
,	total 693:23	881:5 890:13	844:17,19,21	757:1 768:25
861:11 873:16	711:24 766:9	try 698:7 723:3	845:14 878:12	770:18 771:6
873:24 875:5	781:21 784:8	744:4 749:4	878:13 900:21	773:24 784:24
875:12 877:13	786:5,21	753:3 773:4	917:16 918:6	786:4 791:4
879:25 884:11	813:10 844:13	781:6 807:11	types 703:25	802:1 804:6
888:25 889:14	844:18 857:10	827:25 856:9	773:5 795:14	806:21 848:14
890:23 892:3	873:4	878:23 917:6	843:14 844:20	849:24 865:15
	totality 906:11	trying 718:5	908:9	866:8 869:17
	totally 736:5	739:5 743:10	typical 865:23	871:18 876:4
898:23 902:11	785:7 854:18	752:13,14	888:9	881:24 890:7
904:14 905:18	859:12	783:8 825:13	typically 733:2	908:13 915:16
	traded 887:9,10	859:11 866:22	838:21 878:14	915:19,23
913:21 919:23	887:13	880:11,12	879:3 881:11	916:3 918:4,15
	trading 722:18	887:19 892:8	typographical	understanding
Timeliness	722:21	895:16	743:9,14	697:25 710:21
	transcript	<b>turn</b> 736:17		723:13,18
timely 814:18	692:12,18,21	764:22 882:5	$\frac{\mathbf{U}}{\mathbf{U} \mathbf{G}}$	730:24 734:14
times 691:13	693:15 879:7	895:15	<b>U.S</b> 688:1,18	734:20 761:1
748:16 827:7	880:13 881:3	turning 883:12	801:4 834:14	774:1 784:3
907:12	919:20,22	twelve 919:25	847:2 871:23	785:8 790:15
	transcripts	<b>two</b> 691:18	877:11 904:2,3	800:4 810:13
tired 907:12	696:1 851:17	705:22 710:11	921:12	829:13 847:6
917:11 <b>t</b>	transferred	728:14 732:4	<b>uh</b> 719:3 775:14	847:11 849:24
<b>title</b> 766:10	847:3	737:5,9 745:14	814:20 817:4	850:6,20
921:4 t	translated	746:20 747:7	851:6	862:10 868:22
today 691:23	848:13	761:9 763:24	<b>Uh</b> 767:13	872:21 882:17
695:8 700:1 t	translation	779:10,24	Uh-huh 752:21	894:16 895:22
718:7 720:2	744:11	780:16 781:4	769:21 802:22	906:1 912:24
723:10 787:22 <b>t</b>	translations	782:16 796:19	840:17,21	913:8
856:10 875:22	748:9	804:16 828:15	ultimately	understands
899:15 t	translators	830:19,21	885:25 886:17	899:20,21
told 711:22	749:19	846:16 851:17	<b>um</b> 760:7 851:1	understood
714:22 752:14 <b>t</b>	transmission	853:19,23	<b>unable</b> 882:7	740:5 877:16
775:15 828:12	738:5	864:16 868:12	uncertainty	undertake
846:2 t	travel 719:5,6	868:20 869:6,7	709:7	899:23
tolerances	900:19	871:21 872:8	uncertified	unfortunately
859:24 t	treat 796:24	873:4,10	808:14 830:22	867:15 871:16
tomorrow	797:6	874:17,19	831:3 832:22	876:2
841:24 <b>t</b>	treatment	875:20,21	836:13	<b>unit</b> 860:2,2
tool 880:16	805:15	877:7 880:7,23	undergrad	872:20,20
top 710:15 t	tricking 758:6	885:20 887:16	720:24	United 721:9
733:12 765:22 t	tricky 763:22	887:25 888:5	understand	734:5 843:12
767:6 779:23 t	tried 894:7	896:21 897:6	691:22 692:13	844:19 847:24
781:16 784:17 <b>t</b>	trip 775:7	898:1,13	693:10,13	868:1 876:8
	trouble 804:2	903:14 909:24	694:21 701:24	universe 896:15
822:12 825:20	888:23 889:25	909:25 911:7	703:6 713:14	universities
	trucks 845:13	911:19	714:15 715:15	800:19
	true 768:20,21	two-page 881:25	731:4,11,13,25	unnecessarily

				Page 37
860:14	722:12 755:15	881:10 900:16	812:12 813:20	violation 748:6
unrelated 885:5	760:12 767:8	vary 725:17	812:12 813:20	799:20 800:23
unreliable	767:20 768:16	vehicle 732:9,20	813:21,24 814:3 817:25	807:21 808:9
916:19	772:16 799:6	732:22 733:7	818:5 819:3,8	808:13 809:15
up-and-coming	799:12,19	734:12,14,25	820:11 821:7	809:17,18
856:10	803:1 856:18	735:10,23	821:15,16	810:6,18,18
upwardly-bia	865:23 878:15	737:3,16,18	824:25 830:2,8	811:13,14,15
898:6	888:6,7 895:4	738:4 740:21	830:22 831:7	811:17,24,25
<b>USA</b> 688:3	899:19 902:11	740:24,25	830:22,25	811:17,24,25
708:12 715:5	904:5 918:5	769:7 780:12	832:22,25	812.1 820.5
717:20 720:9	uses 879:3	810:3 812:15	835:2,16	832:19 834:7
721:4,6,8	<b>USPS</b> 901:10	817:14 818:13	836:10 837:9	violations
743:18 744:5	<b>usual</b> 870:4	818:13 821:3	838:1 843:13	703:25 708:16
	873:2	818.15 821.5		
748:20 755:25 761:2 763:2,6	873:2 usually 731:2	821:19 823:20 823:20	844:7 845:11 845:18 847:1,7	770:8 771:16 803:2,3 809:4
	768:17 865:13	823:21,22 825:6 829:19	847:8,13,22	809:10,25
768:5 771:3,11	919:25 920:5	825:6 829:19 829:19,20,23	, ,	/
771:15 777:5		, ,	850:7,15,18,19	810:2,19,20 832:14 838:20
779:7 782:18	utility 836:22,25	831:1 845:12	850:24 853:22	
782:23,24	837:2	855:9 857:19	855:11,14,20	838:21,21,22
783:3,6,8,23	<b>utilize</b> 791:17	885:11 894:22	855:23 856:1	838:23,25
785:12,15,18 785:22 787:14	801:8	<b>vehicles</b> 711:1	857:10,18 859:21 872:10	840:19 841:6
	utilized 714:9,14	711:10,24		853:22 866:24
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	V	712:23 713:5,6	<b>vendor</b> 769:10	violator 837:8
812:8,10,13,14	<b>vague</b> 703:3	713:7,12,13,24	verdict 853:18	837:23
813:11,13	714:25 727:3	713:25,25	853:23	violator's
814:1 815:15	755:4 758:19	714:2,20	<b>version</b> 794:3	810:19
816:5 826:24	764:3 795:16	715:13,20,21	878:6 889:15	violators 722:3
846:1,2,8	797:8	716:5 717:11	904:23 905:6	<b>Virginia</b> 728:24
847:3 848:5,8	vaguely 756:11	717:12 718:24	<b>versus</b> 774:11	729:4,5,8,15
848:17 849:10	771:13 877:18	734:15,16,17	797:6 871:23	visit 709:9
849:19 850:1	valuation	737:19 740:15	874:15,22	visited 715:5
850:21 853:22	887:12	748:10 754:24	882:2 890:18	vitae 805:19
856:12 858:8	value 718:3	754:25 765:20	898:1 904:3	vocal 821:14
859:21 877:10	730:13 766:9	766:7,8,17	<b>viability</b> 774:11	<b>voir</b> 689:1 862:4
878:10 882:1	836:22,24	767:4 768:23	view 870:24	<b>volume</b> 721:9,12
887:13 888:18	830.22,24 837:2 844:8,9	769:1,8,9,24	<b>VIN</b> 716:4	721:23 883:5,8
889:25 890:4,8	844:10,12	770:2 779:20	732:24 733:1,2	volumes 883:7
890:15 892:6	870:5 873:2	780:18 781:2	734:4,10,11	voluntarily
898:22 899:4	870:3 873:2 880:21 882:2	781:22,25	735:12 741:11	835:11,14,20
921:4	884:15 887:6,7	784:3,6,13	741:12 829:15	836:5,13
USA's 766:15	888:1 901:8	785:21,25	<b>VINs</b> 763:17,19	837:23
899:7,16,24	916:19	786:22 787:2	<b>violate</b> 722:11	
<b>usage</b> 717:10	variation 864:21	788:4,18 789:3	770:7 835:1	<b>W-A-N-G</b> 710:5
759:22 760:6	871:20	807:23 808:2	916:4	wait 752:12,15
<b>use</b> 692:17,24	varies 822:18	808:11,14,15	violated 724:1	857:11 912:7
693:4 713:15	845:3,6	808:16,22	859:21	waiting 883:14
713:16 716:25	various 869:3	809:21,21	<b>violates</b> 806:17	walked 699:17
721:24 722:3	valious 007.3	810:1 812:5,11	violating 771:2	waincu 077.1/
	1		1	I

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	<b>wash</b> 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
805.21 805.8	916:1	828:12,16	705:24 824:21	851:9,12,13,15
820.3 820.2 827:11 829:8	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
	705:21 712:6	865:3 868:17	688:23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
891:5,22,23 892:22 895:15	703.21 712.0	886:9 887:3,8	willing 696:6	866:12,15,18 872:14 875:11
902:16,22,23	731:23,25	893:13,15	Windows 878:6	879:6,10,24
1	752:25 757:1	902:13 906:5	wisdom 855:12	880:5 882:24
904:18,21 905:16 906:25	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
			<b>ECO 11 14 10</b>	
warehouse 713:5 715:24	826:21 842:3 852:16 865:6	744:6 747:2 766:5 773:20	762:11,14,18 764:5 769:17	893:4,4 907:22

<b>Wolf's</b> 818:20	887:4,7,9,14	828:25 832:20	727:25 729:16	<b>10:42</b> 762:13
				<b>10:42</b> 702.15 <b>100</b> 791:20
wonder 900:12	888:1 894:16	843:19 846:4	732:6 733:16	
word 704:11,13	<b>wouldn't</b> 733:12 734:7 740:16	847:23 851:6	735:5,19 744:7	793:14 843:17
704:14 705:2,4		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	<b>100%</b> 849:16
712:18 713:14	796:8 819:22	702:1 708:10	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	<b>105,000</b> 897:24
717:8,10,13,16	writer 700:9,10	732:21 733:1,3	773:3,15	<b>109,000</b> 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	7	715:20 716:13
wording 775:18	799:7	737:2,5,21	$\frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\mathbf{Z}$	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	<b>zero</b> 870:18	10th 733:2,4
721:16 722:2	785:16 787:15	739:20,23	900:8	11 735:13
723:4 732:2,3	856:22 890:1	740:4 741:24	<b>Zhejiang</b> 812:16	883:12
737:5,9 777:3	wrong 711:23	749:7 763:5,23	812:18,19	<b>11:00</b> 762:16
780:8 803:19	720:25 722:13	763:25 764:5,8	813:2	<b>1152</b> 688:7
872:21 876:7	735:4 739:23	764:12,13,14	0	<b>12</b> 709:22
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	852:10,18
897:16 900:18	815:22 856:6	798:21 809:12	000356 829:15	876:19,23,25
work 696:5,25	894:19 903:18	817:22 820:10	<b>006</b> 827:11	<b>1200</b> 688:19
704:8 709:17	wronged 860:13	821:4 845:3,3	1	<b>1201</b> 688:8
709:19 722:7	wrongs 743:22	845:5 855:21	<b>1</b> 690:10,11	<b>121,000</b> 885:2
726:2 744:13	wrote 700:17	857:10,15,24	692:1,4,8	<b>122</b> 852:20
753:3 826:15	877:13	858:3,3,24	693:9 823:5	<b>1220</b> 921:18
853:9 856:9		859:23 860:3	841:20 852:10	<b>13</b> 709:22 740:9
879:21,23,25	X	876:19,20,20	852:18,24	<b>14</b> 852:10
892:6,14	<b>X</b> 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	<b>140</b> 852:21
777:22 784:11	Xiangyuan	<b>year's</b> 857:16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<b>148</b> 852:21
806:11 865:15	688:4 789:4,18	877:1	<b>1,290</b> 766:21	<b>15</b> 780:10 866:3
885:3	790:6,13 792:8	years 702:12	1,375,676.45	869:9 911:13
working 702:8,9	921:5	708:19,21	789:14 813:16	<b>155</b> 852:21
760:10,13,17		721:7 735:16	<b>1.6</b> 776:7 <b>1:05</b> 842:4	156A 852:21
760:20 875:16	Y	772:21 857:4,7		<b>159</b> 852:21
892:3 894:2	<b>Y</b> 804:1	858:2 868:10	<b>10</b> 690:11	15th 826:17
worksheets	yeah 696:3	889:4 894:16	829:11,22	<b>16</b> 869:12 906:3
748:13	729:8 749:16	Yep 891:9	852:10,18	<b>160,000</b> 745:9
workshops	754:22 759:6	yesterday	907:18,21	814:17
755:9	762:14 776:4	691:20 700:6	908:8,16,17	<b>161</b> 852:21
worn 827:18	785:23 789:11	705:2 707:7,11	909:22 910:13	<b>163</b> 852:21
worse 796:11	793:6 801:24	709:10 710:4	910:15 911:1,6	<b>167</b> 852:21
worst 700:9	811:11,16	716:25 717:14	919:4	<b>168</b> 852:21
746:3	817:20 819:18	717:16 718:5	<b>10,000</b> 800:11	<b>169</b> 852:21
worth 877:1	821:17 823:19	718:15 719:22	800:14	17 852:18
L				

870:17 906:3	812:16 813:7	889:20 899:6	<b>219,000</b> 874:11	855:17
<b>171</b> 852:22	857:5	905:7,21	<b>219,000</b> 874.11 <b>22</b> 852:10,19	<b>360,000</b> 745:8
<b>171</b> 832:22 <b>18</b> 690:12	<b>2009s</b> 711:20	903:7,21 907:22	<b>220,000</b> 874:22	<b>38</b> 690:15 696:9
871:22 907:18	<b>20098</b> / 11:20 <b>2010</b> 702:7	<b>2013</b> 709:23	<b>220,000</b> 874:22 <b>220,731</b> 874:10	
911:10,17	708:16,20,24	715:24 817:19	<b>220,731</b> 874:10 <b>221,000</b> 874:9	696:11,14 794:3 852:24
912:6	708:10,20,24	819:8,15 820:4	,	919:2
<b>183</b> 852:22	719:12,21	820:6,10 821:5	<b>225,472.50</b> 788:9,25	<b>39</b> 690:16
<b>183</b> 852:22	720:3,13	820.0,10 821.3	225,473.50	696:20,23
<b>189</b> 852:22	744:23 752:23		813:10	852:24 919:3
<b>19</b> 688:10 690:3		833:20,22,24	<b>23</b> 690:13 905:6	<b>391</b> 767:1
794:23 842:6	800:11,14 803:19 807:18	889:20,22 <b>2014</b> 708:19	907:18 912:13	<b>392-9888</b> 688:25
852:10,19	803:19 807:18	727:20 830:23	912:22 913:17	<b>392-9000</b> 000:23
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		832:21 833:6	<b>23,000</b> 855:22	4
872:3,14 921:6 921:15	809:12,13 811:14 812:9		· ·	<b>4</b> 883:11 905:11
<b>190A</b> 852:22	811:14 812.9	833:20,21 859:3 889:20	856:1,4 <b>24</b> 820:6,10	<b>4:06</b> 920:13
<b>190A</b> 852:22 <b>191</b> 852:22	848:17 857:3,4	889:23	<b>25</b> 852:11,19	<b>40</b> 904:16 905:5
<b>191</b> 852:22 <b>192</b> 852:22	<b>2011</b> 708:19	<b>2015</b> 803:20	907:22	905:17
<b>192</b> 852:22 <b>194</b> 852:22	726:24 727:6	833:7,21 850:7	<b>2586</b> 883:13	<b>42</b> 852:19
<b>194</b> 832.22 <b>194,000</b> 874:22	727:12 735:9	885:2 889:18	<b>26</b> 690:14	4455 688:24
<b>194,000</b> 874.22 <b>197</b> 793:6,6	739:25 741:5	889:21	907:18 913:23	<b>45</b> 828:14
852:22	741:18,22	<b>2016</b> 766:15	907.18 913.23 914:6,9,13	<b>46</b> 910:9
<b>1981</b> 854:15	743:18 749:7	850:7	915:5,12	<b>479</b> 811:5
904:15,23	822:13 857:7,8	<b>2017</b> 688:10	<b>260,000</b> 810:5	<b>480</b> 811:12
904.13,23	857:11,12	734:17 842:6	<b>2610</b> 793:7	<b>4A</b> 870:7
<b>1st</b> 823:13	<b>2012</b> 717:21,23		<b>27</b> 907:19 908:4	
	718:20 719:2	905:6,19 921:6 921:15	27907:19908:4 909:4	5
825:22,25	731:14 732:19	<b>2018</b> 734:19	<b>28</b> 690:4 719:21	<b>50</b> 768:8 811:21
826:10,11,12 826:15	732:21 733:7	<b>2018</b> 7 54.19 <b>202</b> 688:20	720:3 840:3,7	843:17 901:10
820.15	733:15 734:12	<b>202</b> 088.20 <b>203</b> 852:23	852:11,19	<b>52</b> 852:19
2	734:25 735:5	<b>203</b> 832.23 <b>20460</b> 688:20	0.52.11,19	<b>55</b> 855:1
<b>2</b> 690:11 841:21	735:10,23	<b>20400</b> 088.20 <b>205</b> 852:23	3	<b>550</b> 728:19
891:20 911:1	740:8 741:18	<b>205</b> 852.25 <b>206</b> 921:18	<b>3</b> 752:6 883:11	732:12 741:8
919:4	741:19,22	<b>200</b> 921.18 <b>209</b> 852:23	905:11	742:20
<b>2.3</b> 889:22	741.19,22	<b>209</b> 852.25 <b>21</b> 866:21	<b>3,768</b> 712:1	564-5805/4133
<b>2:02</b> 842:5 843:2	743:2 745:6,7	868:17 873:5,6	<b>3.2</b> 903:8,10,14	688:20
<b>20</b> 752:19	747:6,7 748:24	895:18,20	903:19	<b>5815</b> 829:17,20
807:16 812:4	749:1 752:6	<b>21,275</b> 821:11	<b>3.3</b> 776:6	·
812:12 814:2	763:5,17,19	821:15	<b>30</b> 814:10,12	6
20/20 867:7	793:15 814:16	<b>213</b> 781:20,21	847:21 852:11	<b>6</b> 827:21 829:22
<b>2000</b> 709:21	814:19,21,22	852:23	852:19 919:21	872:3,15
20007-09.21	814.19,21,22	<b>215</b> 751:16	<b>300-plus</b> 767:4	<b>6.5</b> 767:11,22
921:18	817:12,16,18	763:15 852:23	<b>31</b> 852:11,19	770:6
2006 702:14	818:4,5 821:4	911:18	<b>31st</b> 876:24	<b>60</b> 768:8
2007 702:15	822:14 823:5	<b>216</b> 690:5	<b>32</b> 692:17	<b>6006</b> 827:12
708:3 796:4,23	822:14 823.3	695:14,17	<b>320,000</b> 840:10	<b>61</b> 852:19
<b>2009</b> 708:11	826:4,8 854:18	852:23	<b>33</b> 852:24	<b>64</b> 852:19
710:23,25	854:20 855:10	<b>217</b> 690:6 697:4	914:12 919:1	<b>66</b> 847:24
711:1,10	855:21 856:3	697:8 852:23	<b>332</b> 829:7	850:13 851:8
720:13 766:15	855:12,13,14	<b>218</b> 690:7 697:4	<b>35</b> 811:9,18,20	<b>67</b> 711:15
809:12,13	858:20 889:18	697:8 852:23	812:2 852:19	852:20
, -	020.20 007.10	071.0 032.23		

(0.952.20	00 004.15 005.0			
<b>69</b> 852:20	<b>90</b> 824:15 825:8			
<b>692</b> 690:10,10	<b>911</b> 690:11,11			
<b>695</b> 690:5,5	690:12			
<b>696</b> 690:15,15	<b>912</b> 690:13			
690:16,16	<b>914</b> 690:14			
<b>697</b> 690:6,6,7,7	<b>92</b> 852:20			
<b>699</b> 689:4	<b>95</b> 852:20			
7	<b>972</b> 688:25			
7 873:6	<b>98</b> 852:20			
<b>70</b> 747:15,17				
750:2,4,4,6,9				
811:10,13				
70,000 786:22				
<b>700,000</b> 879:2				
884:4 <b>71</b> 747:14 14 16				
71 747:14,14,16				
747:18 750:4,6				
<b>73</b> 747:9,11				
74 852:20				
<b>75244</b> 688:24				
<b>76</b> 825:18				
852:20				
<b>76,000</b> 884:3				
<b>77</b> 910:10 <b>70</b> 852:20				
<b>79</b> 852:20 <b>794</b> 690:3				
794 090:5				
8				
8 910:9				
<b>80</b> 726:6,15,25				
<b>81</b> 852:20				
<b>822</b> 720:3				
<b>823</b> 711:25				
<b>828</b> 737:4				
<b>840</b> 690:4				
<b>851</b> 754:17				
86.427-7A 905:5				
86.437-78				
904:16 905:17				
<b>861</b> 689:5				
<b>891</b> 689:5				
<b>896</b> 825:18				
826:14				
9				
<b>9</b> 828:3 829:11				
829:22				
<b>9:02</b> 688:12				
691:2				
L	-	-	-	-