



P.O. Box 1554 • Hammond • Louisiana 70404 (Toll Free) 866.870.7233 • 985.542.8685 • (Fax) 985.419.0799 office@amersonwhite.com • www.amersonwhite.com

| 1<br>18TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT<br>PARISH OF ST. MARY<br>STATE OF LOUISIANA<br>NO: 78953 DIVISION "A" | 2<br>1 APPEARANCES:<br>2<br>3 REPRESENTING PLAINTIFFS:                  |
|---|---|
| PARISH OF ST. MARY<br>STATE OF LOUISIANA  | 2   |
| STATE OF LOUISIANA  |   |
| STATE OF LOUISIANA  | 3 KEPKESENTING PLAINTIFFS:  |
| NO: 78953 DIVISION "A"  | 4 JONES SWANSON HUDDELL & DASCHBACH LLC                                 |
| NO: 78953 DIVISION "A"  | BY: KEVIN HUDDELL, ESQUIRE  |
|   | 5 BY: JOHN ARNOLD, ESQUIRE  |
|   | 601 Poydras Street  |
| AUGUST J. LEVERT, JR. FAMILY LLC, ET AL.  | 6 Suite 2655<br>New Orleans, Louisiana 70130                            |
| VERSUS  | 7 Email: Khuddell@jonesswanson  |
| BP AMERICA PRODUCTION COMPANY   | 8   |
| * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *   | 9 REPRESENTING DEFENDANTS:  |
|   | 10 LISKOW & LEWIS<br>BY: JOHN S. TROUTMAN, ESQUIRE                      |
|   | 11 BY: DENICE REDD-ROBINETTE, ESQUIRE                                   |
|   | BY: JAMIE D. RHYMES, ESQUIRE  |
|   | 12 BY: COURT C. VANTASSELL, ESQUIRE                                     |
|   | 822 Harding Street<br>13 Lafayette, Louisiana 70507                     |
|   | Email: jtroutman@liskow.com   |
|   | 14  |
| VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF  | 15  |
| DR. BERNARD KUEPER  | 16<br>17  |
| TAKEN VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE   | 18  |
|   | 19  |
| ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 2022, AT 9:00 A.M.   | 20<br>21  |
|   | 21 22   |
|   | 23  |
|   | 24 VIDEOED BY: BILL MYERS, CLVS   |
|   | 25 REPORTED BY: ANNA COATES, CCR, RPR                                   |
| 3   | 4   |
| 1 INDEX   | 1 STIPULATION   |
| 2 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE  | 2   |
| 3 Mr. Huddell   | 3 IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among                              |
| 4   | 4 counsel for the parties hereto that the deposition                    |
| 5 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE63  | 5 of the aforementioned witness may be taken for all                    |
| 6   | <ul> <li>6 purposes permitted within the Louisiana Code of</li> </ul>   |
| 7   | <ul> <li>7 Civil Procedure, in accordance with law, pursuant</li> </ul> |
| 8   | 8 to notice:  |
| 9   | 9   |
| 10  | 10 That the formalities of reading, signing,                            |
| 11  | 11 sealing, certification and filing are specifically                   |
| 12 EXHIBIT INDEX  | 12 NOT waived;  |
| 13 NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE   | 13  |
| 14 EXHIBIT 1 Tab 9, Kueper Résumé   | 14 That all objections, save objections as to                           |
| 14         EXHIBIT 1         Tab 9, Rueper Resulte  | 15 the form of the question and responsiveness of the                   |
| 10         EXHIBIT 2         Tab 7, Appendix E  | 16 answer, are reserved until such time as this                         |
| 17 EXHIBIT 4 Tab 13, RECAP Document   | 17 deposition, or any part hereof, is used or sought                    |
| 18 EXHIBIT 5 Kueper Invoices  | 18 to be used in evidence.  |
| 19 EXIMPLITY Kueper Involces  | 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 1                                |
| 20  | 20 *****  |
| 20  | 20 21   |
| 22  | 21<br>22 ANNA COKER COATES, RPR, CCR, Certified Court                   |
| 22  | 23 Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana,                          |
| 23  | 24 officiated in administering the oath to the                          |
|   | 25 witness.   |
| 25  |   |

Pages 1 to 4



|  | 5   |  | 6   |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1  | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the   | 1  | A. Yes. Bernard Kueper, K-U-E-P, as in  |
| 2  | videotaped deposition of Bernard Kueper.  | 2  | Paul, E-R.  |
| 3  | This deposition is being held via Zoom on   | 3  | Q. Where do you reside?   |
| 4  | November 22nd, 2022, at the time indicated on   | 4  | A. I live in Kingston Ontario, Canada.  |
| 5  | the video screen, which is 9:02 a.m.  | 5  | Q. Where are you physically today?  |
| 6  | Would counsel please introduce  | 6  | A. In my home office in Kingston.   |
| 7  | themselves.   | 7  | Q. Okay. How are you currently employed?  |
| 8  | MR. HUDDELL: Kevin Huddell and John   | 8  | A. I'm a professor emeritus at Queen's  |
| 9  | Arnold on behalf of the Plaintiffs.   | 9  | University here in Kingston. And I also have a  |
| 10   | MR. TROUTMAN: John Troutman, Jamie  | 10   | consulting company, B. Kueper & Associates,   |
| 11   | Rhymes, Court VanTassell, and Denice  | 11   | Limited.  |
| 12   | Redd-Robinette on behalf of BP America  | 12   |   |
| 13   | Production Company.   | 13   | Q. What is your role with respect to that   |
| 14   | (WHEREUPON,   | 14   | company?  |
| 15   |   |  | A. I own the company  |
|  | DR. BERNARD KUEPER,   | 15   | Q. Do you have any  |
| 16   | AFTER HAVING BEEN FIRST DULY SWORN BY THE   | 16   | A consulting practice.  |
| 17   | ABOVE-MENTIONED COURT REPORTER, DID TESTIFY AS  | 17   | Q. Do you have any co-owners of the   |
| 18   | FOLLOWS)  | 18   | company?  |
| 19   | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   | 19   | A. No.  |
| 20   | Q. Good morning, Dr. Kueper. How are you  | 20   | MR. HUDDELL: Bill, I'd like to pull up  |
| 21   | today?  | 21   | his résumé, which is Tab 9. We'll mark this   |
| 22   | A. I'm well. And yourself?  | 22   | as Exhibit 1.   |
| 23   | Q. Doing fine.  | 23   | (EXHIBIT 1 IDENTIFIED)  |
| 24   | Could you please state your full name for the   | 24   | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   |
| 25   | record?   | 25   | Q. Dr. Kueper, does this appear to be your  |
|  | 7   |  | 8   |
|  |   |  | 0   |
| 1  | most recent résumé?   | 1  |   |
| 1  | most recent résumé?   | 1  | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at  |
| 2  | A. It does, yes.  | 2  | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at a break.   |
| 2<br>3   | <ul><li>A. It does, yes.</li><li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a</li></ul>   | 2<br>3   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | <ul><li>A. It does, yes.</li><li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li></ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4  | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul><li>A. It does, yes.</li><li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li><li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of</li></ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | <ul><li>A. It does, yes.</li><li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li><li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it</li></ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul><li>A. It does, yes.</li><li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li><li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission. MR. HUDDELL: Oh, okay.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.<br>Q. What were you asked to do?  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, okay.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: It's entitled "List of cases in which Dr. Kueper has testified as an</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.<br>Q. What were you asked to do?<br>A. To take a look at the data and provide   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, okay.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: It's entitled "List of cases in which Dr. Kueper has testified as an expert at trial or deposition in the last</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.<br>Q. What were you asked to do?<br>A. To take a look at the data and provide<br>an appendix to HET's report, my opinions regarding   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, okay.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: It's entitled "List of cases in which Dr. Kueper has testified as an expert at trial or deposition in the last four years."</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.<br>Q. What were you asked to do?<br>A. To take a look at the data and provide<br>an appendix to HET's report, my opinions regarding<br>viable remediation methods for the site, for the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, okay.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: It's entitled "List of cases in which Dr. Kueper has testified as an expert at trial or deposition in the last four years."</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, so you were trying to</li> </ul>             | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.<br>Q. What were you asked to do?<br>A. To take a look at the data and provide<br>an appendix to HET's report, my opinions regarding<br>viable remediation methods for the site, for the<br>Levert property.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, okay.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: It's entitled "List of cases in which Dr. Kueper has testified as an expert at trial or deposition in the last four years."</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, so you were trying to obscure it.</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.<br>Q. What were you asked to do?<br>A. To take a look at the data and provide<br>an appendix to HET's report, my opinions regarding<br>viable remediation methods for the site, for the<br>Levert property.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I'd like to mark as |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>A. It does, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Within this résumé, do you have a listing of cases in which you've testified?</li> <li>A. I'm trying to remember if that's part of this document; my résumé, that is. If it is, it will be either page 2 or the last page. I do remember going through and making sure my list of cases was up to date, and provided that to Liskow. So if you go to the very end of the document oh, let's see be about page 43 or something. I don't know. If it's not there, it's a separate submission. I remember we sent those in to, I think, to Mr. Troutman.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me see if we have that. MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, it is a separate submission.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, okay.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: It's entitled "List of cases in which Dr. Kueper has testified as an expert at trial or deposition in the last four years."</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh, so you were trying to</li> </ul>             | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | MR. HUDDELL: We'll try to grab that at<br>a break.<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Kevin, try Bates Label<br>139 of Dr. Kueper's production.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. We'll grab that.<br>Also, we were trying to find invoices.<br>Were you able to find that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Yes. We'll be<br>circulating those shortly. We're getting<br>those Bates labeled right now.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay, great.<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. When were you first involved in this<br>case; when were you first asked to be involved in<br>this case that we're here for today?<br>A. I would have to check, but I believe<br>it's on the order of five, six months ago. But I<br>need to verify that if that's super important.<br>Q. What were you asked to do?<br>A. To take a look at the data and provide<br>an appendix to HET's report, my opinions regarding<br>viable remediation methods for the site, for the<br>Levert property.   |



|  | 9   |  | 10   |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | Tab 7.  | 1  | closely together on these types of things.   |
| 2  | (EXHIBIT 2 IDENTIFIED)  | 2  | Q. Were you involved in the Iberville  |
| 3  | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   | 3  | Parish School Board case?  |
| 4  | Q. Does this appear to be a copy of your  | 4  | A. No.   |
| 5  | report for this case?   | 5  | MR. HUDDELL: Okay. Let's go to PDF   |
| 6  | A. If you scroll down to the next page,   | 6  | page 3, Bill, of the report.   |
| 7  | please. I just see the cover page, HET appendix   | 7  | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| 8  | cover page.   | 8  | Q. And in particular, in the middle of the   |
| 9  | Yes, there it is. Yes. That's got our   | 9  | second paragraph, you write, "Laboratory measured  |
| 10   | signatures on it, sure.   | 10   | vertical hydraulic conductivities in clay ranged   |
| 11   | Q. Okay. Now, this is also signed by  | 11   | from 4.0 times 10 to the negative 8 centimeters  |
| 12   | Dr. West. Who is he?  | 12   | per second to 1.4 times 10 to the negative   |
| 13   | A. Dr. West is employed by B. Kueper &  | 13   | 7 centimeters per second at the IPSB property."  |
| 14   | Associates. He and I have worked together for, I  | 14   | And you reference HET 2016, correct?   |
| 15   | want to say, about 12 years now. So he's an   | 15   | And you reference fill 1 2010, concert:<br>A. Correct.   |
| 16   | employee.   | 16   | Q. Do you know how those conductivities  |
| 17   | Q. Okay. Are there any opinions in this   | 17   | were calculated?   |
| 18   | report that I should talk to Dr. West about   | 18   | A. I believe they were measured in the lab.  |
| 19   | instead of you?   | 19   | So HET went up there, and they took some soil  |
| 20   | A. I don't think so. He prepared it.  | 20   | core. And then they preserved the core, and then   |
| 20   | Q. Okay. What did he assist you with?   | 21   | they would send it to we've got the lab report.  |
| 22   | A. Well, Dr. West takes a look, initial   | 22   | I don't know if it was Cooley or who it was, but   |
| 23   | look, at the data. He and I talk about it. And  | 23   | there was a lab that they used. So they're intact  |
| 24   | sometimes he does initial draft of paragraphs and   | 24   | samples, and those are measured by a lab.  |
| 25   | documents, and then I edit and review. So we work   | 25   | Q. Okay. And so based on that, I believe,  |
| 20   | documents, and then I cut and Ieview. So we work  | 20   | Q. Okay. And so based on that, I believe,  |
|  | 11  |  | 12   |
| 1  | you then write, geometric mean horizontal no,   | 1  | A. The IPSB property.  |
| 1<br>2   | okay. So that's vertical hydraulic conductivity.  | 1 2  | Q. Okay. And so when you look at the   |
| 3  | The next sentence is, "Geometric mean   | 3  | vertical hydraulic conductivity versus the   |
| 4  | horizontal hydraulic conductivities were derived  | 4  | horizontal conductivity, does that tell you  |
| 5  | from slug tests in monitoring wells screened  | 5  | anything about the groundwater flow?   |
| 6  | across predominantly silty layers on the IPSB   | 6  | A. Well, first of all, the vertical  |
| 7  | property, and ranged from 4.6 times 10 to the   | 7  | hydraulic conductivities that we talked about in   |
| 8  | negative 5 centimeters per second to 1.4 times 10   | 8  | the previous sentence, those were from clay  |
| 9  | to the negative 4 centimeters per second to 1.4 times 10  | 9  | samples. So I would expect those numbers to be   |
| 10   | Is that right?  | 10   | lower than the slug test values, because the slug  |
| 11   | A. That's correct.  | 11   | test values were done in monitoring wells screened   |
|  | Q. Okay. And so how are those values  | 12   | across predominantly silty layers. So they're a  |
| 12   |   | 1  |  |
| 12<br>13   |   | 1 1 3  | couple of magnitude two orders of magnitude  |
| 13   | calculated?   | 13   | couple of magnitude two orders of magnitude  |
| 13<br>14   | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug  | 14   | higher, which is completely expected.  |
| 13<br>14<br>15   | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug   | 14<br>15   | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water   | 14<br>15<br>16   | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the   | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the<br>water level inside the well to recover with time.  | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic<br>setting, which is completely consistent with the  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the<br>water level inside the well to recover with time.<br>And that rate of recovery can be used to calculate  | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic<br>setting, which is completely consistent with the<br>boring logs; in other words, silts and clays don't  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the<br>water level inside the well to recover with time.  | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic<br>setting, which is completely consistent with the<br>boring logs; in other words, silts and clays don't<br>have a lot of conductivity, and that tells me that  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the<br>water level inside the well to recover with time.<br>And that rate of recovery can be used to calculate<br>the hydraulic conductivity of the geologic<br>materials that are screened across that or that   | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic<br>setting, which is completely consistent with the<br>boring logs; in other words, silts and clays don't<br>have a lot of conductivity, and that tells me that<br>the groundwater is not going to flow very fast  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the<br>water level inside the well to recover with time.<br>And that rate of recovery can be used to calculate<br>the hydraulic conductivity of the geologic<br>materials that are screened across that or that<br>are across the screen of that monitoring well.   | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic<br>setting, which is completely consistent with the<br>boring logs; in other words, silts and clays don't<br>have a lot of conductivity, and that tells me that<br>the groundwater is not going to flow very fast<br>through those materials.  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the<br>water level inside the well to recover with time.<br>And that rate of recovery can be used to calculate<br>the hydraulic conductivity of the geologic<br>materials that are screened across that or that   | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic<br>setting, which is completely consistent with the<br>boring logs; in other words, silts and clays don't<br>have a lot of conductivity, and that tells me that<br>the groundwater is not going to flow very fast  |
| 13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | calculated?<br>A. Those are calculated based on slug<br>tests, as mentioned in this sentence. So a slug<br>test is where you either add water or remove water<br>from a monitoring well, and then you allow the<br>water level inside the well to recover with time.<br>And that rate of recovery can be used to calculate<br>the hydraulic conductivity of the geologic<br>materials that are screened across that or that<br>are across the screen of that monitoring well.<br>Q. The slug test that ICON performed, were | 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | higher, which is completely expected.<br>Overall, these two sets of numbers, the clay<br>and the silt hydraulic conductivities, tell me<br>that this is a low hydraulic conductivity geologic<br>setting, which is completely consistent with the<br>boring logs; in other words, silts and clays don't<br>have a lot of conductivity, and that tells me that<br>the groundwater is not going to flow very fast<br>through those materials.<br>Q. So you write, "Groundwater elevation |



| 13  | 14   |
|---|--|
| <ul> <li>is variable with a horizontal component of</li> <li>hydraulic gradient of approximately .005 or less."</li> <li>Is that right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. That gradient, that's a unitless</li> <li>measurement; is that right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Then you write, "The shallow</li> <li>groundwater velocity at the site is estimated to</li> <li>be approximately 2.4 feet per year or less,"</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And how did you come up with that value</li> <li>of 2.4 feet per year?</li> <li>A. That is what's known as Darcy's law, the</li> <li>well-established empirical relationship within the</li> <li>groundwater profession. And Darcy's law utilizes</li> <li>hydraulic conductivity as an input parameter, and</li> <li>it also utilizes the hydraulic gradient of 0.005</li> <li>as the an input parameter. Pardon me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Is that a directionless</li> <li>measurement, the 2.4 feet per year?</li> <li>A. No. You would use those hydraulic</li> <li>conductivity values from the slug test, and then</li> <li>you'd say, okay, my hydraulic gradient is</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>unitless, but it does have direction. So you</li> <li>would say the 005 was in that direction, in that</li> <li>direction, as well, and that's the direction that</li> <li>you get the 2.4 feet per year from. This</li> <li>calculation is an overall typical value for this</li> <li>geologic environment.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So what is the direction of the</li> <li>2.4 feet per year?</li> <li>A. It would be whatever the direction of</li> <li>the gradient is. And that you get from the</li> <li>groundwater elevation contour maps that are</li> <li>mentioned at the beginning of the previous</li> <li>sentence.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So it sometimes is going to be</li> <li>flowing one direction, and sometimes another</li> <li>direction, right?</li> <li>A. I thought you okay. What you just</li> <li>touched on is that the direction might vary in</li> <li>time. I thought we were talking about direction</li> <li>site a different direction. But you're right, it</li> </ul>  |
| 15  | 16   |
| <ul> <li>can also vary in time, as well as spatially.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for some months of the year,</li> <li>it could be traveling west at that 2.4 feet per</li> <li>year rate. But then some other months of the</li> <li>year, it might start traveling east 2.4 feet per</li> <li>year?</li> <li>A. Well, that's hypothetical, right, the</li> <li>way you asked that question. We have to go look</li> <li>at the groundwater elevation maps to make this a</li> <li>site-specific conversation, if you want.</li> <li>Q. Well, just conceptually, when you say</li> <li>that the flow is variable, you're talking about</li> <li>the direction of the flow, right?</li> <li>A. Correct. Yes, that's right.</li> <li>Q. All right. So it can be going one</li> <li>direction at a certain rate, and then it could</li> <li>go the opposite direction at the same rate; is</li> <li>that right?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I'm not sure about the word</li> <li>"opposite," but it can go the groundwater</li> <li>overall could be flowing in a particular direction</li> <li>on a portion of the site. And on a different</li> <li>portion of the site, the groundwater may be</li> <li>flowing a different direction. In other words,</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>when I say that it's variable, I didn't mean it</li> <li>moves that way one day, and then it moves the</li> <li>opposite way the next day. That's not the intent</li> <li>of that sentence.</li> <li>Q. Well, seasonally, based on, for example,</li> <li>the flood or drop conditions of the Atchafalaya</li> <li>Basin, correct?</li> <li>A. Well, like I said, the groundwater flow</li> <li>direction at a particular location can vary the</li> <li>direction of it can vary in time. At the same</li> <li>I don't want to say the word "time" again, but I</li> <li>will. At the same time, you know, for a given</li> <li>point in time, given day of the year, month,</li> <li>season, at two different flow directions,</li> <li>groundwater flow directions.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Is it important to any of your</li> <li>opinions in this case the direction of</li> <li>groundwater flow?</li> <li>A. As a hydrogeologist, direction of</li> <li>groundwater flow is usually important, yes. My</li> <li>main opinion, as you know, in this appendix is</li> <li>suitability of monitored natural attenuation as a</li> <li>strategy for this site. And that does not the</li> </ul> |



Pages 13 to 16

866.870.7233 RO. Box 1554 Hammond LA 70404 Fax 985.419.0799

|  | 17   |  | 18  |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1  | direction.   | 1  | THE WITNESS: Are you referring to the   |
| 2  | Q. Okay. The use of MNA is not dependent;  | 2  | Levert site or the IPSB site?   |
| 3  | is that what you said?   | 3  | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   |
| 4  | A. That's what I said, yes, that's right.  | 4  | Q. Well, let's start with the Levert site.  |
| 5  | Q. Is not dependent on groundwater flow  | 5  | A. Okay. We don't have water level data   |
| 6  | direction?   | 6  | for the Levert site.  |
| 7  | A. MNA can work in any direction, that's   | 7  | Q. Okay. So does that mean we don't know  |
| 8  | right.   | 8  | the velocity of the groundwater at the Levert   |
| 9  | Q. I'm trying to remember from physics. Is   | 9  | site?   |
| 10   | velocity, is the term "velocity," is that what   | 10   | A. I think it's pretty very reasonable  |
| 11   | is it; vector, is that a vectorless term, or does  | 11   | to assume that the velocities are going to be much  |
| 12   | it require direction?  | 12   | the same at Levert as IPSB. I mean, those sites   |
| 13   | A. It's a vector, yes.   | 13   | are right next to each other. The geology is  |
| 14   | Q. Okay. So it requires direction, right?  | 14   | very, very similar. I'd be shocked if there was a   |
| 15   | A. That's right.   | 15   | difference in groundwater flow conditions on  |
| 16   | Q. Okay.   | 16   | Levert compared to IPSB.  |
| 17   | A. It doesn't require direction; it is in a  | 17   | Q. Okay. So you're assuming that and  |
| 18   | certain direction.   | 18   | you explained why, but you're assuming that the   |
| 19   | Q. Okay. And in this case, you've  | 19   | velocity on the Levert site will be the same as   |
| 20   | determined that the direction is variable,   | 20   | the velocity on the IPSB site, correct?   |
| 21   | correct?   | 21   | A. Yes. Very similar, if not the same.  |
| 22   | A. It can be, yes.   | 22   | Q. Okay. So then what is the direction of   |
| 23   | Q. Well, at this particular site, it is  | 23   | flow on the IPSB site?  |
| 24   | variable or it's not, right?   | 24   | A. Well, it varies, like we've been talking   |
| 25   | MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.  | 25   | about.  |
|  |  | 20   |   |
|  | 19   |  | 20  |
|  |  |  | 20  |
| 1  | Q. Okay. So it is variable on the IPSB   | 1  | screen. It's identical to what you're   |
| 1<br>2   | Q. Okay. So it is variable on the IPSB site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?  | 1<br>2   |   |
|  |  |  | screen. It's identical to what you're   |
| 2  | site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?   | 2  | screen. It's identical to what you're showing.  |
| 2<br>3   | site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?<br>A. Correct.  | 2<br>3   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | <ul><li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4  | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul><li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | <ul><li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the<br>Appendix B figures.<br>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the<br>Appendix B figures.<br>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the<br>Appendix B figures.<br>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the<br>Appendix B figures.<br>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. Is this one of the things you would have  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the<br>Appendix B figures.<br>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. Is this one of the things you would have<br>looked at in coming up with any of your opinions  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.<br/>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the<br>Appendix B figures.<br>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. Is this one of the things you would have<br>looked at in coming up with any of your opinions<br>in this case?   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.<br/>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | screen. It's identical to what you're<br>showing.<br>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember<br>what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.<br>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the<br>Appendix B figures.<br>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. Is this one of the things you would have<br>looked at in coming up with any of your opinions<br>in this case?<br>A. Definitely looked at it.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.</li> <li>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.</li> <li>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.</li> <li>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no. I say that because groundwater is moving</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.</li> <li>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we would have gotten the hydraulic gradient from,</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no. I say that because groundwater is moving extremely slowly and really not going</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.</li> <li>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we would have gotten the hydraulic gradient from, which then leads to a groundwater velocity.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no. I say that because groundwater is moving extremely slowly and really not going anywhere, so to speak. I can say that.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4? THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3. MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures. (EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we would have gotten the hydraulic gradient from, which then leads to a groundwater velocity.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so this is, I guess, a</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no. I say that because groundwater is moving extremely slowly and really not going anywhere, so to speak. I can say that. MR. HUDDELL: Bill, can we pull up Tab</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4? THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3. MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures. (EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL: Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we would have gotten the hydraulic gradient from, which then leads to a groundwater velocity.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so this is, I guess, a snapshot in time, right, October 13, 2015; is that</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no. I say that because groundwater is moving extremely slowly and really not going anywhere, so to speak. I can say that. MR. HUDDELL: Bill, can we pull up Tab 4. Tab 4 is the figures for it's Appendix</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br/>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.<br/>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we would have gotten the hydraulic gradient from, which then leads to a groundwater velocity.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so this is, I guess, a snapshot in time, right, October 13, 2015; is that right?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no. I say that because groundwater is moving extremely slowly and really not going anywhere, so to speak. I can say that.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Bill, can we pull up Tab 4. Tab 4 is the figures for it's Appendix B. These are your figures. And I wanted to</li> </ul>                                       | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br/>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.<br/>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we would have gotten the hydraulic gradient from, which then leads to a groundwater velocity.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so this is, I guess, a snapshot in time, right, October 13, 2015; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes. I had to look at the date.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>site, the groundwater flow direction, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you said the use of MNA is not dependent on the groundwater flow direction. Is it a factor in some way with respect to the propriety of using MNA?</li> <li>A. What do you mean by "propriety of using MNA?" If I could just</li> <li>Q. Does the groundwater flow direction have any let me restate that.</li> <li>Is the groundwater flow direction a factor in determining whether MNA is an appropriate methodology?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Not for Levert site, no. I say that because groundwater is moving extremely slowly and really not going anywhere, so to speak. I can say that.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Bill, can we pull up Tab 4. Tab 4 is the figures for it's Appendix B. These are your figures. And I wanted to go to figure 16 I'm sorry, figure 17,</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>screen. It's identical to what you're showing.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Okay. I can't remember what exhibit we're on. Is this Exhibit 4?<br/>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'm at 3.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: So Exhibit 3 will be the Appendix B figures.<br/>(EXHIBIT 3 IDENTIFIED)</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Is this one of the things you would have looked at in coming up with any of your opinions in this case?</li> <li>A. Definitely looked at it.</li> <li>Q. You looked at it, all right.</li> <li>A. I'm thinking pardon me for interrupting. It's a figure like this where we would have gotten the hydraulic gradient from, which then leads to a groundwater velocity.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And so this is, I guess, a snapshot in time, right, October 13, 2015; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes. I had to look at the date.</li> <li>Q. So what's this show us with respect to</li> </ul> |



Pages 17 to 20

866.870.7233 RO. Box 1554 Hammond LA 70404 Fax 985.419.0799

|  | 21  |  | 22  |
|--|---|--|---|
| 1  | would take the difference in the magnitude of   | 1  | THE WITNESS: You're asking about the  |
| 2  | these contours, divide by the distance between the  | 2  | Levert site, I take it?   |
| 3  | contours, gets you the hydraulic gradient.  | 3  | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   |
| 4  | Q. Okay. So based on this potentiometric  | 4  | Q. Well, let's start with the Levert site.  |
| 5  | map and the hydraulic gradient, you what would  | 5  | A. Okay. It would be to the west.   |
| 6  | you say is the groundwater velocity?  | 6  | Q. Okay. And there's also, I guess what   |
|  |   | 7  | · · ·   |
| 7  | A. Well, we took the gradient, based on a   |  | if we is it also to the south, if we moved  |
| 8  | map like this, multiplied it by hydraulic   | 8  | if we looked at the groundwater in the northern   |
| 9  | conductivity. And then you also have to divide  | 9  | most part of that gradient on the Levert property,  |
| 10   | all that, that product, by the porosity to get  | 10   | we would have and we were right on the property   |
| 11   | your velocity. That, in its entirety, is Darcy's  | 11   | boundary, it would be to the south; is that right?  |
| 12   | law. So without a hydraulic gradient map, you'd   | 12   | A. If we're on the western property   |
| 13   | have to estimate sorry, without a groundwater   | 13   | boundary of the Levert site in the northern part,   |
| 14   | elevation map, you would have to estimate the   | 14   | it would be to the south, that's right. Then as   |
| 15   | hydraulic gradient. But here we have measured   | 15   | you work your way more eastward, the flow becomes   |
| 16   | values.   | 16   | completely west, and then you can see a mirror of   |
| 17   | Q. Okay. Your report says that the shallow  | 17   | that on the IPSB property.  |
| 18   | groundwater velocity at the site is estimated to  | 18   | Q. Okay. So then on the IPSB property, the  |
| 19   | be approximately 2.4 feet per year or less, right?  | 19   | predominant flow direction is to the east   |
| 20   | A. Correct.   | 20   | probably?   |
| 21   | Q. If we looked at the what would you   | 21   | A. Yes, I would say east. And as you go   |
| 22   | say is the direction, since velocity requires a   | 22   | north on that property, as you can see, it's more   |
| 23   | direction component, what's the direction of the  | 23   | of a southeast component to it.   |
| 24   | groundwater flow at this site?  | 24   | Q. Okay. So the direction component of the  |
| 25   | MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.   | 25   | groundwater velocity is different from the Levert   |
|  | 23  |  | 24  |
| 1  |   | 1  |   |
| 1  | property to the IPSB property; is that fair?  | 1  |   |
| 2  | A Decad on this data was  |  | velocity that would affect whether the chemical   |
| 2  | A. Based on this date, yes.   | 2  | constituents found in the groundwater are   |
| 3  | Q. Okay. Would you expect that the  | 2<br>3   | constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?   |
| 4  | Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5   | 2<br>3<br>4  | constituents found in the groundwater are<br>migrating one direction or the other?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.   |
| 4<br>5   | Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year;  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | constituents found in the groundwater are<br>migrating one direction or the other?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with   |
| 4<br>5<br>6  | Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further,   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | constituents found in the groundwater are<br>migrating one direction or the other?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with<br>"other than the velocity;" was that your   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | Q. Okay. Would you expect that the<br>groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5<br>would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year;<br>that it would be moving slower than the further,<br>you know, east or west of those locations?  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | constituents found in the groundwater are<br>migrating one direction or the other?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with<br>"other than the velocity;" was that your<br>question?  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul><li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li><li>A. I have to go back and check that. I</li></ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | constituents found in the groundwater are<br>migrating one direction or the other?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with<br>"other than the velocity;" was that your<br>question?<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul><li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li><li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: In general, constituents</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater velocity. And depending on</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of the groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak,</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of the groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be processes other than velocity that dictate</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak, though, based on this date.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of the groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be processes other than velocity that dictate how quickly it moves.</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak, though, based on this date.</li> <li>Q. Right. Is there anything other than</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of the groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be processes other than velocity that dictate how quickly it moves.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak, though, based on this date.</li> <li>Q. Right. Is there anything other than groundwater flow that would impact not impact.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of the groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be processes other than velocity that dictate how quickly it moves.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for example, chlorides, if we</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak, though, based on this date.</li> <li>Q. Right. Is there anything other than groundwater flow that would impact not impact. Let me restate that.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be processes other than velocity that dictate how quickly it moves.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for example, chlorides, if we were finding chlorides at 12,000 milligrams per</li> </ul>   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak, though, based on this date.</li> <li>Q. Right. Is there anything other than groundwater flow that would impact not impact. Let me restate that.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of the groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be processes other than velocity that dictate how quickly it moves.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for example, chlorides, if we were finding chlorides at 12,000 milligrams per liter at MW4, with this sort of potentiometric</li> </ul>  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak, though, based on this date.</li> <li>Q. Right. Is there anything other than groundwater flow that would impact not impact. Let me restate that.</li> <li>Is there anything other than groundwater flow okay, let me try one more time.</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are<br/>migrating one direction or the other?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with<br/>"other than the velocity;" was that your<br/>question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the<br/>velocity of the groundwater itself that would<br/>factor into the potential for contaminants to move<br/>in the groundwater?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: In general, constituents<br/>in groundwater will move in the direction of<br/>the groundwater velocity. And depending on<br/>what the constituent is, there can be<br/>processes other than velocity that dictate<br/>how quickly it moves.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for example, chlorides, if we<br/>were finding chlorides at 12,000 milligrams per<br/>liter at MW4, with this sort of potentiometric<br/>regime, would you expect there to be movement of</li> </ul> |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>Q. Okay. Would you expect that the groundwater between monitoring wells MW4 and MW5 would actually not be moving at 2.4 feet per year; that it would be moving slower than the further, you know, east or west of those locations?</li> <li>A. I have to go back and check that. I mean, we have values of hydraulic head at both 4 and 5. You could calculate a gradient based on those two posted numbers. I don't know what it would be. Again, the 2.4 feet per year velocity is a typical value for these sites.</li> <li>Q. But in between MW4 and MW5, it seems like the water is probably going to be pretty much standing still, right?</li> <li>A. There would be a very small component of flow. I would expect it to be pretty weak, though, based on this date.</li> <li>Q. Right. Is there anything other than groundwater flow that would impact not impact. Let me restate that.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>constituents found in the groundwater are migrating one direction or the other?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: Did you start that with "other than the velocity;" was that your question?</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Is there something other than the velocity of the groundwater itself that would factor into the potential for contaminants to move in the groundwater?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: In general, constituents in groundwater will move in the direction of the groundwater velocity. And depending on what the constituent is, there can be processes other than velocity that dictate how quickly it moves.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. So for example, chlorides, if we were finding chlorides at 12,000 milligrams per liter at MW4, with this sort of potentiometric</li> </ul>  |

Pages 21 to 24



Kueper, Dr. Bernard 11/22/2022

| 1MR. TROUTMAN: Object to the form.2THE WITNESS: So are you saying that if3there's chloride at MW4, you're asking me on4October 13th, 2015, on that particular day,5were they moving south?6Yes. There would also be other7components of flow, but, in general, there's8a southerly component of flow there.9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:10Q. Okay. What are the other components of11flow?12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?13Q. Yes.   | 26<br>t   |
|--|-----------|
| 2THE WITNESS: So are you saying that if<br>there's chloride at MW4, you're asking me on<br>42Q. Okay. So if the groundwater is no<br>moving at all, you're still going to have<br>   | t         |
| 2THE WITNESS: So are you saying that if<br>there's chloride at MW4, you're asking me on<br>42Q. Okay. So if the groundwater is no<br>moving at all, you're still going to have<br>dispersion of chlorides, right?3were they moving south?3moving at all, you're still going to have<br>dispersion of chlorides, right?4October 13th, 2015, on that particular day,<br>were they moving south?4A. Diffusion.5Yes. There would also be other<br>r<br>r<br>components of flow, but, in general, there's<br>a southerly component of flow there.6Q. Diffusion?7Components of flow, but, in general, there's<br>a southerly component of flow there.8Q. I get those very confused. So what<br>99EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>109A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing<br>1110Q. Okay. What are the other components of<br>flow?10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing<br>1112A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs | t         |
| 3there's chloride at MW4, you're asking me on<br>43moving at all, you're still going to have<br>dispersion of chlorides, right?4October 13th, 2015, on that particular day,<br>54dispersion of chlorides, right?5were they moving south?5A. Diffusion.6Yes. There would also be other6Q. Diffusion?7components of flow, but, in general, there's<br>8a southerly component of flow there.89EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of<br>flow?10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing<br>mechanism mechanical dispersion let<br>1212A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs  | ı         |
| 4October 13th, 2015, on that particular day,4dispersion of chlorides, right?5were they moving south?5A. Diffusion.6Yes. There would also be other6Q. Diffusion?7components of flow, but, in general, there's7A. Yes.8a southerly component of flow there.8Q. I get those very confused. So what9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs   |           |
| 5were they moving south?5A. Diffusion.6Yes. There would also be other6Q. Diffusion?7components of flow, but, in general, there's7A. Yes.8a southerly component of flow there.8Q. I get those very confused. So what9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs   |           |
| 6Yes. There would also be other6Q. Diffusion?7components of flow, but, in general, there's7A. Yes.8a southerly component of flow there.8Q. I get those very confused. So what9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs   |           |
| 7components of flow, but, in general, there's7A. Yes.8a southerly component of flow there.8Q. I get those very confused. So what9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs  |           |
| 8a southerly component of flow there.8Q. I get those very confused. So what9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs   |           |
| 9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs  |           |
| 9EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:9dispersion, and what's diffusion?10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs  | t is      |
| 10Q. Okay. What are the other components of10A. Okay. Dispersion is a mixing11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occurs  |           |
| 11flow?11mechanism mechanical dispersion let12A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015?12there is a mixing mechanism that occur   |           |
| 12 A. You're asking about October 13th, 2015? 12 there is a mixing mechanism that occurs   | s start   |
| $\theta$ $\theta$  |           |
| 1.5 Q. Tes.  |           |
|  |           |
|  | Jity      |
| 15 on these data. If you want to talk about, you 15 variations. And that's called mechanic   |           |
| 16 know, the overall chloride impacts in that general 16 dispersion. It leads to dilution.   |           |
| 17area, then you can see that there are other17Diffusion is in response to a concentra   |           |
| 18directions, as well. But just specifically18gradient. Diffusion will occur whether the   |           |
| 19 between 4 and 5, looking at those water levels, 19 velocity or not. The velocity can be zero,   | you'll    |
| 20 one is minus .24 feet, one is minus .28 feet 20 still have diffusion occurring. And then  |           |
| 21 elevation, you see that there's a driving force to 21 mathematically, mechanical dispersion plu   | IS        |
| 22 the south on that date. 22 diffusion, we call that hydrodynamic disp  |           |
| 23 Q. A very slight driving force to the 23 So diffusion is actually a subcomponent of   |           |
| 24 south? 24 dispersion.   |           |
| 25 A. Whatever that grading works out to be. 25 Q. Diffusion is a subcomponent of  |           |
| 2.5 A. whatever that grading works out to be. 2.5 Q. Diffusion is a subcomponent of  |           |
| 27   | 28        |
| 1 dispersion? 1 A. Mechanism controlling the fate of   |           |
|  |           |
|  | **        |
|  | 10        |
| 4 They're separate processes in a way, because 4 might be a silt lands here or there where   |           |
| 5 dispersion, most people think of the mechanical 5 advection is more important. But overall,  |           |
| 6 part. And then diffusion is this other thing, but 6 a very slow-moving groundwater regime v  | 1th a lot |
| 7 you lump them together mathematically when you 7 of diffusion going on.  |           |
| 8 deal with anything quantitatively. 8 Q. Okay. That other word you were u   | sing,     |
| 9 Q. You lump them together into what 9 did you say "advection?"   |           |
| 10 category? 10 A. Yes. Okay, pardon me. I shouldn't   | have      |
| 11 A. The hydrodynamic dispersion coefficient. 11 introduced a new term without defining it.   | So        |
| 12 Q. Did you calculate the hydrodynamic 12 advection, think of that as the same as  |           |
| 13 dispersion coefficient at the IPSB property or the 13 groundwater velocity. In other words, the   |           |
| 14 Levert property? 14 groundwater moves. Whatever is dissolve   | l in the  |
| 15A. I did not.1515groundwater moves, also. That's advection   |           |
| 15A. Fuld hot.15groundwater moves, also.Full a state advection16Q. Okay. How would you go about16water rate at the velocity.   | , 11111   |
|  |           |
|  |           |
| 18 A. Well, I think the important thing here 18 since it's the dominant mechanism, how m   |           |
| 19   is that this is, I would say, a     19   movement of chlorides would you expect a   | 0         |
| 20 diffusion-dominated environment. As we've been 20 property boundary, the western part bound   |           |
| 21 talking, groundwater velocity is slow. So I think 21 the Levert property between MW4 and MV   |           |
| 22 diffusion into the clays is a very dominant 22 A. You're asking about October 13th,   | 2015?     |
| 23 process acting on the chlorides at this site. 23 Q. Yes.  |           |
| 24 Q. So at this site, diffusion is the 24 A. I haven't calculated that. It will be  |           |
| 25 dominant what did you say? 25 slow.   |           |
|  |           |



Pages 25 to 28

|  | 29  |  | 30   |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1  | Q. Okay. It would be faster than the  | 1  | diffusion being the primary mechanism controlling  |
| 2  | groundwater velocity, though?   | 2  | the fate of chlorides here, right?   |
| 3  | A. I haven't done that calculation.   | 3  | MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.  |
| 4  | Q. Okay. So do we know how far chlorides  | 4  | THE WITNESS: Given the figure that   |
| 5  | at MW4 would travel to the east in sort of, you   | 5  | we're looking at, there would be diffusive   |
| 6  |   | 6  |  |
|  | know, feet per year, like you did with groundwater  |  | movement well, not based on this figure,   |
| 7  | velocity?   | 7  | but there will be diffusive movement of  |
| 8  | A. On this particular date, they're moving  | 8  | chloride in all directions. And, of course,  |
| 9  | from MW4, if you want to pinpoint that as the   | 9  | as that chlorides move, you know, the  |
| 10   | starting point, these data indicate that they'd be  | 10   | concentrations are reduced. Diffusion as a   |
| 11   | moving to the south by advection and in all   | 11   | dispersion is an attenuation mechanism.  |
| 12   | directions by diffusion.  | 12   | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| 13   | Q. Okay. And the diffusion in all   | 13   | Q. So again, assuming that we had about  |
| 14   | directions, how fast is that?   | 14   | 12,000 milligrams per liter of chlorides at MW4,   |
| 15   | A. I didn't calculate that.   | 15   | how long would it take for those chlorides to drop   |
| 16   | Q. Is that something that can be  | 16   | down to 250 milligrams per liter?  |
| 17   | calculated?   | 17   | A. Due to natural attenuation processes,   |
| 18   | A. You could estimate it. I'm not sure we   | 18   | like dispersion and diffusion, it would be on the  |
| 19   | need to do that here. I don't need to do that to  | 19   | order of decades.  |
| 20   | support my opinions, put it that way.   | 20   | Q. Okay. Is that a calculation you've made   |
| 21   | Q. Okay. Well, what I'm getting at is, if   | 21   | in this case?  |
| 22   | we found chlorides at MW4, let's say at about   | 22   | A. I did not do that.  |
| 23   | 12,000 milligrams per liter, we could expect that   | 23   | Q. Are you capable of doing that   |
| 24   | those chlorides are going to be moving to the east  | 24   | calculation?   |
| 25   | onto the Levert property at some rate based on  | 25   | A. I don't think we I could do it, but I   |
|  |   |  |  |
|  | 21  |  |  |
|  | 31  |  | 32   |
| 1  |   | 1  |  |
| 1<br>2   | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know   | 1  | A. Well, you'd want literature, and you  |
| 2  | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to  | 2  | A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the   |
| 2<br>3   | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know<br>for sure is that concentrations are going to<br>continue to decline in groundwater, because our  | 2<br>3   | A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other   |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know<br>for sure is that concentrations are going to<br>continue to decline in groundwater, because our<br>sources have been removed, right. It's no longer  | 2<br>3<br>4  | A. Well, you'd want literature, and you<br>would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the<br>molecular weight of chloride and a couple other<br>things that are easy to look up for chloride.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know<br>for sure is that concentrations are going to<br>continue to decline in groundwater, because our<br>sources have been removed, right. It's no longer<br>operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | <ul><li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li><li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li></ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know<br>for sure is that concentrations are going to<br>continue to decline in groundwater, because our<br>sources have been removed, right. It's no longer<br>operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse<br>me. So concentrations will continuously decline.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | <ul><li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li><li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li><li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd</li></ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know<br>for sure is that concentrations are going to<br>continue to decline in groundwater, because our<br>sources have been removed, right. It's no longer<br>operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse<br>me. So concentrations will continuously decline.<br>And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment,  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul><li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li><li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li><li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But</li></ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know<br>for sure is that concentrations are going to<br>continue to decline in groundwater, because our<br>sources have been removed, right. It's no longer<br>operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse<br>me. So concentrations will continuously decline.<br>And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment,<br>yes, it will be on the order of decades.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul><li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li><li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the A. Tortuosity.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts,</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration,</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of theA. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of theA. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I always come back to, you know, you don't need to</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of theA. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I always come back to, you know, you don't need to do that for this site.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of theA. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any opinions as to the</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I always come back to, you know, you don't need to do that for this site.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Starting concentration, and then</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any opinions as to the source of the chlorides that have been found in</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I always come back to, you know, you don't need to do that for this site.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Starting concentration, and then what else would you need?</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any opinions as to the source of the chlorides that have been found in limited admission area 1?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I always come back to, you know, you don't need to do that for this site.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Starting concentration, and then what else would you need?</li> <li>A. That would be basically it.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any opinions as to the source of the chlorides that have been found in limited admission area 1?</li> <li>A. They would have come from the IPSB</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I always come back to, you know, you don't need to do that for this site.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Starting concentration, and then what else would you need?</li> <li>A. That would be basically it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So what would we need to</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any opinions as to the source of the chlorides that have been found in limited admission area 1?</li> <li>A. They would have come from the IPSB property, that pit that's since has been closed</li> </ul> |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>don't think we need it. I mean, one thing we know for sure is that concentrations are going to continue to decline in groundwater, because our sources have been removed, right. It's no longer operating and also pit closure going on. Excuse me. So concentrations will continuously decline. And given it's a diffusion-dominated environment, yes, it will be on the order of decades.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, what would you need to do that calculation?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I don't think we need it. But if I had to do it, I would need a diffusion coefficient, which you can calculate.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You'd need a diffusion coefficient to calculate, okay. What else would you need?</li> <li>A. You'd need your starting concentration, which in your question was 12,000. But again, I always come back to, you know, you don't need to do that for this site.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Starting concentration, and then what else would you need?</li> <li>A. That would be basically it.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>A. Well, you'd want literature, and you would estimate the diffusion coefficient given the molecular weight of chloride and a couple other things that are easy to look up for chloride.</li> <li>Q. Anything else you would need?</li> <li>A. For the diffusion coefficient, you'd need the tortuosity of the porous medium. But again, that can be estimated.</li> <li>Q. What was that word, the what of the</li> <li>A. Tortuosity.</li> <li>Q. How do you spell that?</li> <li>A. T-O-R-T-U-O-S-I-T-Y.</li> <li>Q. Is that a site-specific parameter?</li> <li>A. You can estimate it given knowledge of the geology. So, you know, for clays and silts, you can make an estimate as to what it is.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Anything else we would need to determine diffusion coefficient?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Do you have any opinions as to the source of the chlorides that have been found in limited admission area 1?</li> <li>A. They would have come from the IPSB</li> </ul>   |



Pages 29 to 32

| 33   | 34   |
|--|--|
| 1 Q. What mechanism brought the chlorides  | 1 MR. HUDDELL: Can we go to figure 8 of  |
| 2 from the IPSB property to the Levert property and  | 2 Exhibit 3, Bill.   |
| 3 limited admission area 1?  | 3 THE WITNESS: That's the 1987 aerial  |
| 4 A. It would have been advection; in other  | 4 photo; is that right?  |
| 5 words, the velocity, which back when those pits  | 5 MR. HUDDELL: Yes.  |
| 6 were operating, would have been much higher that   |  |
| 7 it is here in October 2015.  | 7 number is that?  |
| 8 Q. Can you explain what you're referring to  | 8 MR. HUDDELL: Tab 4. It's PDF page 9.   |
| 9 about using the pits, how that affects the   | 9 EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| 10 movement of chlorides?  | 10 Q. All right. Do you see this, Dr. Kueper?  |
| 11 A. Sure. Yes. The pits have fluids going  | 11 A. I see let me just flip back to the   |
| 12 into them, and that creates a hydraulic mound,  | 12 Zoom meeting, make sure. Just a little better   |
| 13 which increases the hydraulic gradient and pushes   | 13 focused on my screen.   |
| 14 the chlorides faster than they're moving today.   | 14 Q. Sure.  |
| 15 Q. Do you know when the large pit on the  | 15 A. Yes, same one up.  |
| 16 IPSB property was no longer used?   | 16 Q. Okay. So I think what you're referring   |
| 17 MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.   | 17 to as this pit feature on the left side of the '87  |
| 18 THE WITNESS: The pit on the IPSB  | 18 aerial photo; is that right?  |
| 19 property that I think we're talking about, I  | 19 A. Yes. I was just on my screen. Did you  |
| 20 remember reading that. I think it's in the  | 20 point to it? I can't see a pointer.   |
| HET report, may be in the ICON report, as  | 21 Q. No, I didn't point to it.  |
| 22 well. I don't want to speculate when it was   | 22 A. Oh, okay.  |
| 23 no longer operating. I remember reading the   | 23 Q. Let's see.   |
| 24 numbers the other day, but I don't want to  | 24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Is this it, Kevin?  |
| 25 speculate.  | 25 MR. HUDDELL: Sure. Do you see where it  |
|  |  |
| 33   | 36   |
| 1 says "LT-1" there, Bill? And then there's a  |  |
|  | 1 the pit.   |
| 2 pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.   | 2 Q. Do you know the chloride content of the   |
| <ul> <li>2 pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>3 EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>2 Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>3 produced water that was put into that pit?</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>2 pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>3 EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>4 Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>4 A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>2 pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>3 EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>4 Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>5 black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>2 pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>3 EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>4 Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>5 black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>6 had the hydraulic head?</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>2 pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>3 EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>4 Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>5 black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>6 had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>7 A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>2 pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>3 EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>4 Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>5 black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>6 had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>7 A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>8 Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> <li>Q. So if we're finding chlorides of</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> <li>Q. So if we're finding chlorides of</li> <li>12,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>uould have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> <li>Q. So if we're finding chlorides of</li> <li>12,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you</li> <li>able does that help you figure out how long it</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> <li>12,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you</li> <li>able does that help you figure out how long it</li> <li>would have been before those chlorides got there?</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> <li>Q. So if we're finding chlorides of</li> <li>12,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you</li> <li>able does that help you figure out how long it</li> <li>would have been before those chlorides got there?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> </ul>   | 2Q. Do you know the chloride content of the3produced water that was put into that pit?4A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm5not even sure it's available. Probably is6somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.7Q. Do you know generally what the chloride8content is of produced water?9A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands10of milligrams per liter.11Q. So if we're finding chlorides of1212,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you13able does that help you figure out how long it14would have been before those chlorides got there?15MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16THE WITNESS: Just knowing the   |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> </ul>  | 2Q. Do you know the chloride content of the3produced water that was put into that pit?4A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm5not even sure it's available. Probably is6somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.7Q. Do you know generally what the chloride8content is of produced water?9A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands10of milligrams per liter.11Q. So if we're finding chlorides of1212,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you13able does that help you figure out how long it14would have been before those chlorides got there?15MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16THE WITNESS: Just knowing the17concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> <li>the Levert property back when that pit was</li> </ul>  | 2Q. Do you know the chloride content of the3produced water that was put into that pit?4A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm5not even sure it's available. Probably is6somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.7Q. Do you know generally what the chloride8content is of produced water?9A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands10of milligrams per liter.11Q. So if we're finding chlorides of1212,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you13able does that help you figure out how long it14would have been before those chlorides got there?15MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16THE WITNESS: Just knowing the17concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not18tell me how long it took for them to get  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> <li>the Levert property back when that pit was</li> <li>operating?</li> </ul>  | 2Q. Do you know the chloride content of the3produced water that was put into that pit?4A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm5not even sure it's available. Probably is6somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.7Q. Do you know generally what the chloride8content is of produced water?9A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands10of milligrams per liter.11Q. So if we're finding chlorides of1212,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you13able does that help you figure out how long it14would have been before those chlorides got there?15MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16THE WITNESS: Just knowing the17concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not18tell me how long it took for them to get19there. But that number is a lot lower than  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> <li>the Levert property back when that pit was</li> <li>operating?</li> <li>A. I didn't do that calculation.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> <li>Q. So if we're finding chlorides of</li> <li>12,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you</li> <li>able does that help you figure out how long it</li> <li>would have been before those chlorides got there?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Just knowing the</li> <li>concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not</li> <li>tell me how long it took for them to get</li> <li>there. But that number is a lot lower than</li> <li>typical produced water, chloride content.</li> </ul> |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> <li>the Levert property back when that pit was</li> <li>operating?</li> <li>A. I didn't do that calculation.</li> </ul>  | 2Q. Do you know the chloride content of the3produced water that was put into that pit?4A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm5not even sure it's available. Probably is6somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.7Q. Do you know generally what the chloride8content is of produced water?9A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands10of milligrams per liter.11Q. So if we're finding chlorides of1212,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you13able does that help you figure out how long it14would have been before those chlorides got there?15MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16THE WITNESS: Just knowing the17concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not18tell me how long it took for them to get19there. But that number is a lot lower than20typical produced water, chloride content.21EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> <li>the Levert property back when that pit was</li> <li>operating?</li> <li>A. I didn't do that calculation.</li> <li>What would you need to do that</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Q. Do you know the chloride content of the</li> <li>produced water that was put into that pit?</li> <li>A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm</li> <li>not even sure it's available. Probably is</li> <li>somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.</li> <li>Q. Do you know generally what the chloride</li> <li>content is of produced water?</li> <li>A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands</li> <li>of milligrams per liter.</li> <li>Q. So if we're finding chlorides of</li> <li>12,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you</li> <li>able does that help you figure out how long it</li> <li>would have been before those chlorides got there?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Just knowing the</li> <li>concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not</li> <li>tell me how long it took for them to get</li> <li>there. But that number is a lot lower than</li> <li>typical produced water, chloride content.</li> </ul> |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> <li>the Levert property back when that pit was</li> <li>operating?</li> <li>A. I didn't do that calculation.</li> <li>What would you need to do that</li> <li>calculation?</li> </ul>  | 2Q. Do you know the chloride content of the3produced water that was put into that pit?4A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm5not even sure it's available. Probably is6somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.7Q. Do you know generally what the chloride8content is of produced water?9A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands10of milligrams per liter.11Q. So if we're finding chlorides of1212,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you13able does that help you figure out how long it14would have been before those chlorides got there?15MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16THE WITNESS: Just knowing the17concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not18tell me how long it took for them to get19there. But that number is a lot lower than20typical produced water, chloride content.21EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:22Q. Okay. Let's talk about monitored23natural attenuation.   |
| <ul> <li>pit just to the, I guess, northwest of that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. So anyway, there what he's outlined in</li> <li>black, is that the pit you're referring to that</li> <li>had the hydraulic head?</li> <li>A. That's my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. All right. So back when that pit</li> <li>was in use, you had additional mechanisms that</li> <li>would have forced the chlorides to move to the</li> <li>Levert property; is that right?</li> <li>A. You would have had that hydraulic</li> <li>loading that I was talking about; in other words,</li> <li>it would be a stronger hydraulic gradient to the</li> <li>east than what we have today.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you know how long then i</li> <li>would have taken for the chlorides to move onto</li> <li>the Levert property back when that pit was</li> <li>operating?</li> <li>A. I didn't do that calculation.</li> <li>Q. What would you need to do that</li> <li>calculation?</li> <li>A. You'd need to know the fluid level in</li> </ul> | 2Q. Do you know the chloride content of the3produced water that was put into that pit?4A. I do not. I did not look that up. I'm5not even sure it's available. Probably is6somewhere, but I don't recall reading that, no.7Q. Do you know generally what the chloride8content is of produced water?9A. Well, it's in the many tens of thousands10of milligrams per liter.11Q. So if we're finding chlorides of1212,400 milligrams per liter at LT-1, are you13able does that help you figure out how long it14would have been before those chlorides got there?15MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16THE WITNESS: Just knowing the17concentration of chlorides at LT-1 does not18tell me how long it took for them to get19there. But that number is a lot lower than20typical produced water, chloride content.21EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:22Q. Okay. Let's talk about monitored23natural attenuation.   |

Pages 33 to 36



|   | 27   |  | 20   |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | 37   |  | 38   |
| 1   | you're switching topics now?   | 1  | Natural Attenuation at Superfund, RCRA Corrective  |
| 2   | MR. HUDDELL: Sure, absolutely. 10  | 2  | Action, and Underground Storage Tank Sites, OSWER  |
| 3   | minutes?   | 3  | Directive 9200.4-17P, as in Peter.   |
| 4   | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the  | 4  | Then RECAP also discusses RECAP 2003   |
| 5   | record, it's 9:58 a.m.   | 5  | document discusses MNA, as well. And there are   |
| 6   | (RECESS 9:58-10:12 A.M.)   | 6  | other MNA documents out there, as accepted remedy  |
| 7   | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Back on the record,  | 7  | at certain sites. Been around for quite a while.   |
| 8   | it's 10:12 a.m.  | 8  | Q. Okay. Did you follow RECAP did you  |
| 9   | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  | 9  | look at RECAP before you wrote your opinions in  |
| 10  | Q. All right. Dr. Kueper, can you tell us  | 10   | this case?   |
| 11  | what monitored natural attenuation is, or MNA?   | 11   | A. Yes.  |
| 12  | A. Sure. Monitored natural attenuation,  | 12   | MR. HUDDELL: Okay. So, Bill, let's   |
| 13  | we'll call it MNA as you suggest, is a remediation   | 13   | pull up Tab 13, which is the RECAP document.   |
| 14  | strategy whereby natural processes attenuate; in   | 14   | We'll mark that as Exhibit 4.  |
| 15<br>16  | other words, lower the concentrations of constituents over time.   | 15<br>16   | (EXHIBIT 4 IDENTIFIED)<br>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| 16<br>17  |  | 17   | Q. All right. So this is the Louisiana   |
| 18  | Q. Okay. So what documents or what   | 18   | RECAP document. My understanding is it discusses   |
| 19  | literature are you relying on to support your opinions with respect to MNA?  | 19   | monitored natural attenuation in Section 2.16; is  |
| 20  | A. The two primary ones I'm just   | 20   | that right?  |
| 21  | flipping on my other screen here to my appendix,   | 21   | A. That sounds familiar.   |
| 22  | and it's EPA 1999 document, I believe. Where is  | 22   | MR. HUDDELL: Okay. And, Bill, that is  |
| 23  | that? We would have produced it. Just give me a  | 23   | at PDF page 79.  |
| 24  | second here.   | 24   | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| 25  | Yes. U.S. EPA April 1999, Use of Monitored   | 25   | Q. Okay. And so for this case, one of our  |
|   | 1  |  |  |
|   | 39   |  | 40   |
| 1   | primary constituents is chlorides, correct?  | 1  |  |
| 2   |  |  | other sites other reports. I think what you  |
|   | A Correct  |  | other sites, other reports. I think what you know a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in   |
|   | A. Correct.<br>O. And so with respect to chlorides, your   | 2  | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in   |
| 3   | Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your  | 2<br>3   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low  |
| 3<br>4  | Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be  | 2<br>3<br>4  | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for  |
| 3<br>4<br>5   | Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the  | 2<br>3   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic   |
| 3<br>4  | Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your<br>use of monitored natural attenuation would be<br>simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the<br>chlorides, right?   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | <ul><li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li><li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul><li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li><li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li></ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12  | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.<br>That's for LDNR to decide.  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.<br>That's for LDNR to decide.<br>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.<br>That's for LDNR to decide.<br>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that<br>MNA should be evaluated and compared to other   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.<br>That's for LDNR to decide.<br>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that<br>MNA should be evaluated and compared to other<br>remedial processes to determine which is the most  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want another year. I don't know. Maybe they want a</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.<br>That's for LDNR to decide.<br>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that<br>MNA should be evaluated and compared to other<br>remedial processes to determine which is the most<br>appropriate process for a site, right?  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want a few more years. Maybe they'll decrease the</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.<br>That's for LDNR to decide.<br>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that<br>MNA should be evaluated and compared to other<br>remedial processes to determine which is the most<br>appropriate process for a site, right?<br>A. I see that on my version here, that  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want a few more years. Maybe they'll decrease the frequency. You start with one year quarterly and</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in<br>Louisiana in that you get this very low<br>permeability, you know, upper geology. And for<br>this particular site, given the low hydraulic<br>conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we<br>talked about before the break and lack of<br>receptors, which is really key.<br>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the<br>HET report. And where you have a situation like<br>this with no receptors being impacted and not<br>expected to be in the future, you start with<br>quarterly per year and see where you're at.<br>That's for LDNR to decide.<br>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that<br>MNA should be evaluated and compared to other<br>remedial processes to determine which is the most<br>appropriate process for a site, right?<br>A. I see that on my version here, that<br>sentence, yes. It, meaning MNA, yes.  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want a few more years. Maybe they'll decrease the frequency. You start with one year quarterly and see where you're at with the data.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in Louisiana in that you get this very low permeability, you know, upper geology. And for this particular site, given the low hydraulic conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we talked about before the break and lack of receptors, which is really key.</li> <li>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the HET report. And where you have a situation like this with no receptors being impacted and not expected to be in the future, you start with quarterly per year and see where you're at. That's for LDNR to decide.</li> <li>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that MNA should be evaluated and compared to other remedial processes to determine which is the most appropriate process for a site, right?</li> <li>A. I see that on my version here, that sentence, yes. It, meaning MNA, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes. As with any remedial process,</li> </ul>  |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want a few more years. Maybe they'll decrease the frequency. You start with one year quarterly and see where you're at with the data.</li> <li>Q. Well, in your experience, monitored</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in Louisiana in that you get this very low permeability, you know, upper geology. And for this particular site, given the low hydraulic conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we talked about before the break and lack of receptors, which is really key.</li> <li>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the HET report. And where you have a situation like this with no receptors being impacted and not expected to be in the future, you start with quarterly per year and see where you're at. That's for LDNR to decide.</li> <li>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that MNA should be evaluated and compared to other remedial processes to determine which is the most appropriate process for a site, right?</li> <li>A. I see that on my version here, that sentence, yes. It, meaning MNA, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes. As with any remedial process, monitored natural attenuation should be selected</li> </ul>   |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want a few more years. Maybe they'll decrease the frequency. You start with one year quarterly and see where you're at with the data.</li> <li>Q. Well, in your experience, monitored natural attenuation requires at least three years</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in Louisiana in that you get this very low permeability, you know, upper geology. And for this particular site, given the low hydraulic conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we talked about before the break and lack of receptors, which is really key.</li> <li>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the HET report. And where you have a situation like this with no receptors being impacted and not expected to be in the future, you start with quarterly per year and see where you're at. That's for LDNR to decide.</li> <li>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that MNA should be evaluated and compared to other remedial processes to determine which is the most appropriate process for a site, right?</li> <li>A. I see that on my version here, that sentence, yes. It, meaning MNA, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes. As with any remedial process, monitored natural attenuation should be selected only where it can meet all other remedial goals</li> </ul> |
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>Q. And so with respect to chlorides, your use of monitored natural attenuation would be simply to put in monitoring wells and look at the chlorides, right?</li> <li>A. Well, for chloride, you would put in monitoring wells, as proposed in the HET plan, and monitor them and look at the data and move forward.</li> <li>Q. All right. How long would you monitor the chlorides?</li> <li>A. Well, HET has proposed one year with quarterly sampling in that year. And HET makes the argument in their report that there's no adverse risk at this site. So you start with one year, and then LDNR can decide maybe they want a few more years. Maybe they'll decrease the frequency. You start with one year quarterly and see where you're at with the data.</li> <li>Q. Well, in your experience, monitored</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>know, a lot of these sites are somewhat similar in Louisiana in that you get this very low permeability, you know, upper geology. And for this particular site, given the low hydraulic conductivity, the low groundwater velocity that we talked about before the break and lack of receptors, which is really key.</li> <li>Now, I'm not a risk assessor, but I read the HET report. And where you have a situation like this with no receptors being impacted and not expected to be in the future, you start with quarterly per year and see where you're at. That's for LDNR to decide.</li> <li>Q. All right. So under RECAP, it says that MNA should be evaluated and compared to other remedial processes to determine which is the most appropriate process for a site, right?</li> <li>A. I see that on my version here, that sentence, yes. It, meaning MNA, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yes. As with any remedial process, monitored natural attenuation should be selected</li> </ul>   |

Pages 37 to 40



| 1   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | 41   |  | 42   |
| 1   | A. I see that sentence, yes.   | 1  | THE WITNESS: I can't comment on your   |
| 2   | Q. All right. Do you agree with that?  | 2  | definition of strongly versus mine, but I  |
| 3   | MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.  | 3  | don't object to that sentence. Does that   |
| 4   | THE WITNESS: I think that MNA is   | 4  | help?  |
| 5   | appropriate for this site. Remember, this is   | 5  | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  |
| 6   | RECAP. And where it can obtain those goals   | 6  | Q. Okay. You don't object to it?   |
| 7   | in an appropriate timeframe, yes, I agree  | 7  | A. Right.  |
| 8   | with that, sure.   | 8  | Q. So what are the remedial goals for the  |
| 9   | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  | 9  | groundwater at the site?   |
| 10  | Q. Okay. So this is Department of  | 10   | A. Well, if you look at the HET report,  |
| 11  | Environmental Quality, in their RECAP document,  | 11   | they calculated a dilution attenuation factor.   |
| 12  | saying that it should be selected MNA should be  | 12   | That value, I think it was 440. And multiply that  |
| 13  | selected only where it can meet all of the   | 13   | by the secondary EPA secondary drinking water  |
| 14  | remedial goals for the site and where it can   | 14   | standard for chloride was 250 milligrams per   |
| 14  | obtain those goals in an appropriate timeframe,  | 15   | liter, which I think is also the leave it at   |
| 16  | right?   | 16   | that. Then you multiply those two numbers  |
| 17  | A. I see that, yes.  | 17   | together, and you get 110,000. So HET is   |
| 18  |  | 18   |  |
| 18  | Q. Okay. Do you strongly agree with that?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.   | 19   | proposing 110,000 milligrams per liter as the  |
|   |  | 20   | acceptable concentration of chloride in  |
| 20<br>21  | THE WITNESS: I agree with that sentence, let's put it that way.  | 20   | groundwater. And we not we. But the site does  |
|   | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:  | 21   | not exceed 110,000 milligrams per liter.   |
| 22<br>23  |  | 22   | Q. Okay.<br>A. Now   |
| 23  | Q. Okay. But you don't strongly agree with it?   | 23   |  |
| 24<br>25  |  | 24   | Q. Go ahead. I'm sorry.  |
| 20  | MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.  | 25   | A. Yes. I mean, if you want to the   |
|   | 43   |  | 44   |
| 1   | other way not the other way yes, the other   | 1  | here.  |
| 2   | way I think of it is, MNA, would it get you to   | 2  | Yes, that's right, 110,000.  |
| 3   | whatever your clean-up goal is, whether it's how   | 3  | Q. Okay. So you looked at 124 milligrams   |
| 4   | you want to calculate it or whatever the number  | 4  | per liter. You looked at 250 milligrams per  |
| 5   | is. I don't see pump and treat being appreciably   | 5  | liter, and you looked at 110 milligrams per liter?   |
| 6   | faster, if at all, than MNA. And that was a key  | 6  | A. 110,000 milligrams per liter.   |
| 7   | thing in my thinking. I read the ICON plan. And  | 7  |  |
|   |  |  | Q. Right. And what do you mean you looked  |
| 8   | given that this is a diffusion-dominated   | 8  | Q. Right. And what do you mean you looked at them; what analysis did you do?   |
| 8<br>9  | given that this is a diffusion-dominated<br>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference  |  |  |
|   |  | 8  | at them; what analysis did you do?   |
| 9   | environment, I just don't see a lot of difference  | 8<br>9   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,  |
| 9<br>10   | environment, I just don't see a lot of difference<br>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the<br>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying<br>to get down to.  | 8<br>9<br>10   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's   |
| 9<br>10<br>11   | environment, I just don't see a lot of difference<br>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the<br>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying<br>to get down to.<br>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did   | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it  |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | environment, I just don't see a lot of difference<br>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the<br>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying<br>to get down to.  | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the   |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | environment, I just don't see a lot of difference<br>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the<br>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying<br>to get down to.<br>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did   | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the  |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> </ul>   | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution  |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul><li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li><li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li><li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li><li>to get down to.</li><li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li><li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li><li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li></ul>   | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration  |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> </ul>   | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you   |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> <li>are going to be about the same timescale to get</li> </ul>  | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17                                     | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you<br>want to get to 124 or 250, MNA is going to be on   |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> <li>are going to be about the same timescale to get</li> <li>there. I looked at 124 milligrams per liter,</li> </ul>  | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                               | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you<br>want to get to 124 or 250, MNA is going to be on<br>the same order timescale as pump and treat,  |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> <li>are going to be about the same timescale to get</li> <li>there. I looked at 124 milligrams per liter,</li> <li>which is the ICON background number. I looked at</li> </ul>  | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                         | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you<br>want to get to 124 or 250, MNA is going to be on<br>the same order timescale as pump and treat,<br>because it's a diffusion-dominated environment.   |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> <li>are going to be about the same timescale to get</li> <li>there. I looked at 124 milligrams per liter,</li> <li>which is the ICON background number. I looked at</li> <li>250 milligrams per liter. And then like we just</li> </ul>   | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                   | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you<br>want to get to 124 or 250, MNA is going to be on<br>the same order timescale as pump and treat,<br>because it's a diffusion-dominated environment.<br>You got back diffusion that's going to occur.  |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> <li>are going to be about the same timescale to get</li> <li>there. I looked at 124 milligrams per liter,</li> <li>which is the ICON background number. I looked at</li> <li>250 milligrams per liter. And then like we just</li> <li>talked about, there's the HET point that with a</li> </ul>  | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you<br>want to get to 124 or 250, MNA is going to be on<br>the same order timescale as pump and treat,<br>because it's a diffusion-dominated environment.<br>You got back diffusion that's going to occur.<br>Q. What's back diffusion?   |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> <li>are going to be about the same timescale to get</li> <li>there. I looked at 124 milligrams per liter,</li> <li>which is the ICON background number. I looked at</li> <li>250 milligrams per liter. And then like we just</li> <li>talked about, there's the HET point that with a</li> <li>DAF applied, you don't exceed the goal at all</li> </ul>   | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you<br>want to get to 124 or 250, MNA is going to be on<br>the same order timescale as pump and treat,<br>because it's a diffusion-dominated environment.<br>You got back diffusion that's going to occur.<br>Q. What's back diffusion?<br>A. Okay. So these chlorides were   |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | <ul> <li>environment, I just don't see a lot of difference</li> <li>between pump and treat and MNA in terms of the</li> <li>timescale to get to whatever number you're trying</li> <li>to get down to.</li> <li>Q. Well, Dr. Kueper, what remedial goal did</li> <li>you have in mind when you recommended MNA?</li> <li>A. Well, like I just said, whatever number</li> <li>DNR decides on, you know, pump and treat and MNA</li> <li>are going to be about the same timescale to get</li> <li>there. I looked at 124 milligrams per liter,</li> <li>which is the ICON background number. I looked at</li> <li>250 milligrams per liter. And then like we just</li> <li>talked about, there's the HET point that with a</li> <li>DAF applied, you don't exceed the goal at all</li> <li>right now for chloride in groundwater.</li> </ul> | 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 | at them; what analysis did you do?<br>A. Well, like I said, I read, you know,<br>where those three numbers come from. And it's<br>clear to me that MNA is going to ultimately, it<br>will get you there. The site is not above the<br>110,000 currently; therefore, won't be in the<br>future, because the entire chloride distribution<br>is in declining condition, declining concentration<br>condition going forward in time. So whether you<br>want to get to 124 or 250, MNA is going to be on<br>the same order timescale as pump and treat,<br>because it's a diffusion-dominated environment.<br>You got back diffusion that's going to occur.<br>Q. What's back diffusion?<br>A. Okay. So these chlorides were<br>introduced to the groundwater system. And when |



## Kueper, Dr. Bernard 11/22/2022

| 45  | 46   |
|---|--|
| 1 qualitative but basically higher in the silts   | 1 A. Possibly. I didn't feel the need to.  |
| 2 than the surrounding clays, you get diffusion into  | 2 I'd have to think that through. But again, it's a  |
| 3 the clay. That's called forward diffusion. And  | 3 back diffusion-dominated environment.  |
| 4 then with time and it's already occurring now,  | 4 Concentrations are declining now. So pump and  |
| 5 in my opinion concentrations of chloride in the   | 5 treat is going to be subject to this back  |
| 6 silts are going down because of dispersion and  | 6 diffusion limitation, as will MNA. So therefore,   |
| 7 diffusion and because the pits are no longer  | 7 there's not, you know, a big difference in those   |
| 8 operating.  | 8 two technologies. So I selected MNA, in my   |
| 9 So what happens when the chloride   | 9 opinion.   |
| 10 concentrations in the silts end up lower than in   | 10 Q. You didn't determine the time it would   |
| 11 the adjacent clays, now that the concentration   | 11 take to reach 124 milligrams per liter with MNA,  |
| 12 gradient is reversed, you now get diffusion out of   | 12 correct?  |
| 13 the clay back into the silt. And that will be the  | 13 A. I didn't feel a need to determine that   |
| 14 ultimate time-limiting factor at this site. And  | 14 time. I did not do that. And again, I come back   |
| 15 that back diffusion is going to dictate the  | 15 to what I said in the previous answer: I don't  |
| 16 timescale for both MNA and for pump and treat.   | 16 see a difference, an appreciable difference, in   |
| 17 That's really the point there, is both those   | 17 the time for MNA and pump and treat to reach a  |
| 18 approaches are subject to this back diffusion  | 18 specified concentration in groundwater.   |
| 19 process. Therefore, pump and treat is not  | 19 Q. You don't see an appreciable difference,   |
| 20 appreciably faster, if at all, than MNA.   | 20 but you didn't actually calculate that difference,  |
| 21 Q. You did not calculate time it would take  | 21 correct?  |
| 22 for MNA to reach 250 milligrams per liter, did   | 22 MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.   |
| 23 you?   | 23 THE WITNESS: That's correct. I did not  |
| A. No, I did not.   | 24 calculate it sorry, John, did you say   |
| 25 Q. You could have done that, right?  | 25 something?  |
|   |  |
| 47  | 48   |
|   |  |
| 1 MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object   | 1 appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable  |
| 1 MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object<br>2 to form. You can answer the question if you  | <ol> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> </ol>  |
| 1 MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object<br>2 to form. You can answer the question if you<br>3 can.  | <ol> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> </ol>   |
| <ol> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object</li> <li>to form. You can answer the question if you</li> <li>can.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> </ol>  | <ol> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> </ol>   |
| <ol> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object</li> <li>to form. You can answer the question if you</li> <li>can.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>I didn't feel the need repeat the</li> </ol>   | <ol> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> </ol>   |
| <ol> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object</li> <li>to form. You can answer the question if you</li> <li>can.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>I didn't feel the need repeat the</li> </ol>   | <ol> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> </ol>   |
| <ol> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object</li> <li>to form. You can answer the question if you</li> <li>can.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>I didn't feel the need repeat the</li> <li>question, please.</li> </ol>  | <ol> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> </ol>   |
| <ol> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object</li> <li>to form. You can answer the question if you</li> <li>can.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>I didn't feel the need repeat the</li> <li>question, please.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> </ol>   | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> </ul>   |
| <ol> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object</li> <li>to form. You can answer the question if you</li> <li>can.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>I didn't feel the need repeat the</li> <li>question, please.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. You don't see an appreciable difference</li> </ol>   | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> </ul>  |
| <ol> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object</li> <li>to form. You can answer the question if you</li> <li>can.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>I didn't feel the need repeat the</li> <li>question, please.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. You don't see an appreciable difference</li> <li>in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,</li> </ol>  | <ol> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> </ol>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe   | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> </ul>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both   | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> </ul>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based  | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> </ul>   |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with  | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> </ul>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,   | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> </ul>   |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process  | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> </ul>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process18going forward at this site. There's no need to do   | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> <li>Department, the criteria presented in Sections</li> </ul>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process18going forward at this site. There's no need to do19a calculation to know that ultimately MNA will get   | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> <li>Department, the criteria presented in Sections</li> <li>2.16.1</li> </ul>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process18going forward at this site. There's no need to do19a calculation to know that ultimately MNA will get20you wherever you want to be in terms of a  | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> <li>Department, the criteria presented in Sections</li> <li>2.16.1</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Can you scroll down?</li> </ul>  |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process18going forward at this site. There's no need to do19a calculation to know that ultimately MNA will get20you wherever you want to be in terms of a21concentration. And that's going to be the same  | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> <li>Department, the criteria presented in Sections</li> <li>2.16.1</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Can you scroll down?</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: I'm sorry, what?</li> </ul>   |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process18going forward at this site. There's no need to do19a calculation to know that ultimately MNA will get20you wherever you want to be in terms of a21concentration. And that's going to be the same22with pump and treat. It's going to be a back  | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> <li>Department, the criteria presented in Sections</li> <li>2.16.1</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Can you scroll down?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Can we scroll down?</li> </ul>   |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process18going forward at this site. There's no need to do19a calculation to know that ultimately MNA will get20you wherever you want to be in terms of a21concentration. And that's going to be the same22with pump and treat. It's going to be a back23diffusion-limited process. I don't need to do | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> <li>Department, the criteria presented in Sections</li> <li>2.16.1</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Can you scroll down?</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Oh. Bill, can you put</li> </ul> |
| 1MR. TROUTMAN: No. I just said, object2to form. You can answer the question if you3can.4THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.5I didn't feel the need repeat the6question, please.7EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:8Q. You don't see an appreciable difference9in timeframe between MNA and pump and treat; yet,10you did not calculate the timeframe under MNA,11correct?12A. I did not calculate the timeframe13because I didn't need to. Diffusion affects both14pump and treat and MNA. I know, you know, based15on my experience and many years working with16diffusion, forward diffusion, back diffusion,17things like that, that it is a dominant process18going forward at this site. There's no need to do19a calculation to know that ultimately MNA will get20you wherever you want to be in terms of a21concentration. And that's going to be the same22with pump and treat. It's going to be a back  | <ul> <li>appropriate timeframe is one that is reasonable</li> <li>compared to that offered by other remedial</li> <li>methods. To ensure that the timeframe estimates</li> <li>are comparable, the assumptions used in each</li> <li>treatment proposal evaluated are to be</li> <li>consistent."</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I do, yes.</li> <li>Q. All right. And here, though, again, you</li> <li>didn't do a timeframe estimate for MNA, correct?</li> <li>A. The sentence doesn't tell you to do</li> <li>that. It just says, the assumption should be</li> <li>consistent. And I'm concluding that back</li> <li>diffusion is going to affect pump and treat as it</li> <li>will MNA. Therefore, there's no appreciable</li> <li>difference in timescales.</li> <li>Q. Unless otherwise approved by the</li> <li>Department, the criteria presented in Sections</li> <li>2.16.1</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Can you scroll down?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Can we scroll down?</li> </ul>   |

Pages 45 to 48



866.870.7233 RO. Box 1554 Hammond LA 70404 Fax 985.419.0799

|  |   | T  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | 49  |  | 50  |
| 1  | on my other screen.   | 1  | constituents of concern have been controlled and  |
| 2  | EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:   | 2  | NAPL has been removed/controlled to the extent of   |
| 3  | Q. Okay. So "Unless otherwise approved by   | 3  | technical practicability," right?   |
| 4  | the Department, the criteria presented in Sections  | 4  | A. I see that.  |
| 5  | 2.16.1, .2 and .3 should be followed for monitored  | 5  | Q. Number 2, "The plume has reached   |
| 6  | natural attenuation plans submitted to the  | 6  | declining conditions and the area of constituent  |
| 7  | Department," right?   | 7  | concentrations above screening standard is not  |
| 8  | A. I see that, yes.   | 8  | expanding."   |
| 9  | Q. 2.16.1, Evidence to Support Monitored  | 9  | Is that right?  |
| 10   | Natural Attenuation says, "Monitored natural  | 10   | A. I see that, yes.   |
| 11   | attenuation of constituents of concern impacting  | 11   | Q. So what have we done to show that the  |
| 12   | soil and/or groundwater may be allowed as a   | 12   | plume has reached declining conditions?   |
| 13   | remedial alternative when it has been demonstrated  | 13   | A. Well, produced water has relatively high   |
| 14   | to the Department that the constituent of concern   | 14   | concentrations of chloride. And the highest   |
| 15   | under site-specific conditions will naturally   | 15   | number, I think you mentioned it, was 12,400 or   |
| 16   | attenuate to the appropriate RECAP standard   | 16   | something on that order in a particular monitoring  |
| 17   | without causing adverse impacts."   | 17   | well. Those numbers are going to keep going down.   |
| 18   | Is that right?  | 18   | Those concentrations is what I mean by numbers.   |
| 19   | A. That's what that says, yes.  | 19   | Because going back to point 1 above, the sources  |
| 20   | Q. "Department requirements for a monitored   | 20   | have been controlled; in other words, the pits  |
| 21   | natural attenuation program shall include adequate  | 21   | have been closed or are going to be closed. And   |
| 22   | evidence to support a determination that:" And  | 22   | even more important, they just haven't been used  |
| 23   | then it lists five things, right?   | 23   | for a long time.  |
| 24   | A. Correct.   | 24   | So your sources are gone. And now you've got  |
| 25   | Q. Number 1 is that, "All sources of  | 25   | this chloride plume, which is going down, down,   |
|  |   |  |   |
| 1  | 51  | 1  |   |
|  |   |  | 52  |
| 1  | down, down in concentration and will continue to  | 1  | been removed, but you've not yet verified   |
| 2  | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to  | 2  | been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct?  |
| 2<br>3   | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It  | 2<br>3   | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.  |
| 2<br>3<br>4  | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It<br>has to have, because there's no more brine feeding  | 2<br>3<br>4  | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It<br>has to have, because there's no more brine feeding<br>the system.   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It<br>has to have, because there's no more brine feeding<br>the system.<br>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give<br>an opinion that the concentrations are   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It<br>has to have, because there's no more brine feeding<br>the system.<br>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of<br>constituent concentrations is expanding or   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give<br>an opinion that the concentrations are<br>declining in time, because, like I said, the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | <ul><li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li><li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li></ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8  | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give<br>an opinion that the concentrations are<br>declining in time, because, like I said, the<br>source has been removed. No more loading to  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give<br>an opinion that the concentrations are<br>declining in time, because, like I said, the<br>source has been removed. No more loading to<br>the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give<br>an opinion that the concentrations are<br>declining in time, because, like I said, the<br>source has been removed. No more loading to<br>the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the<br>pits. Three different sites in my head. So   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11   | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give<br>an opinion that the concentrations are<br>declining in time, because, like I said, the<br>source has been removed. No more loading to<br>the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the<br>pits. Three different sites in my head. So<br>yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | been removed, but you've not yet verified<br>constituent concentrations are declining, correct?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience<br>in 32 years of research in this area to give<br>an opinion that the concentrations are<br>declining in time, because, like I said, the<br>source has been removed. No more loading to<br>the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the<br>pits. Three different sites in my head. So<br>yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining<br>condition right now.   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL: Q. Okay. But we have no data to support</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a declining condition; in other words,</li> </ul>   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right?</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a declining condition; in other words, concentrations are going down in time. And</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br/>THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a declining condition; in other words, concentrations are going down in time. And that's why you monitor, as part of monitored</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It<br>has to have, because there's no more brine feeding<br>the system.<br>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of<br>constituent concentrations is expanding or<br>declining at the Levert property, right?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution<br>at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it<br>was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are<br>there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But<br>you got to remember, the sources have been<br>removed. So the whole plume is in a<br>declining condition; in other words,<br>concentrations are going down in time. And<br>that's why you monitor, as part of monitored<br>natural attenuation. You can actually   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that the chloride concentrations are going down in</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It<br>has to have, because there's no more brine feeding<br>the system.<br>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of<br>constituent concentrations is expanding or<br>declining at the Levert property, right?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution<br>at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it<br>was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are<br>there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But<br>you got to remember, the sources have been<br>removed. So the whole plume is in a<br>declining condition; in other words,<br>concentrations are going down in time. And<br>that's why you monitor, as part of monitored<br>natural attenuation. You can actually<br>measure those concentrations as a function of  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that the chloride concentrations are going down in time. If LDNR would like some monitoring</li> </ul>   |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | down, down in concentration and will continue to<br>do so going forward in time. And that gets us to<br>point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It<br>has to have, because there's no more brine feeding<br>the system.<br>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of<br>constituent concentrations is expanding or<br>declining at the Levert property, right?<br>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution<br>at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it<br>was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are<br>there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But<br>you got to remember, the sources have been<br>removed. So the whole plume is in a<br>declining condition; in other words,<br>concentrations are going down in time. And<br>that's why you monitor, as part of monitored<br>natural attenuation. You can actually<br>measure those concentrations as a function of<br>time to verify that.  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that the chloride concentrations are going down in time. If LDNR would like some monitoring data to support that, then that's fine, they</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a declining condition; in other words, concentrations are going down in time. And that's why you monitor, as part of monitored natural attenuation. You can actually measure those concentrations as a function of time to verify that.</li> </ul>  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that the chloride concentrations are going down in time. If LDNR would like some monitoring data to support that, then that's fine, they can ask for that.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a declining condition; in other words, concentrations are going down in time. And that's why you monitor, as part of monitored natural attenuation. You can actually measure those concentrations as a function of time to verify that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL: Q. Okay. So you haven't verified it yet,</li> </ul>                 | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that the chloride concentrations are going down in time. If LDNR would like some monitoring data to support that, then that's fine, they can ask for that.</li> </ul>  |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a declining condition; in other words, concentrations are going down in time. And that's why you monitor, as part of monitored natural attenuation. You can actually measure those concentrations as a function of time to verify that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. So you haven't verified it yet, right?</li> </ul> | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that the chloride concentrations are going down in time. If LDNR would like some monitoring data to support that, then that's fine, they can ask for that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you have a recommended</li> </ul> |
| 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>down, down in concentration and will continue to do so going forward in time. And that gets us to point 2, which is reach declining conditions. It has to have, because there's no more brine feeding the system.</li> <li>Q. Now, you don't know whether the area of constituent concentrations is expanding or declining at the Levert property, right?<br/>MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: The chloride distribution at the Levert property, I'd be shocked if it was expanding at any appreciable rate. Are there a couple molecules moving? Maybe. But you got to remember, the sources have been removed. So the whole plume is in a declining condition; in other words, concentrations are going down in time. And that's why you monitor, as part of monitored natural attenuation. You can actually measure those concentrations as a function of time to verify that.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL: Q. Okay. So you haven't verified it yet,</li> </ul>                 | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | <ul> <li>been removed, but you've not yet verified constituent concentrations are declining, correct? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: I am using my experience in 32 years of research in this area to give an opinion that the concentrations are declining in time, because, like I said, the source has been removed. No more loading to the ponds or the lagoons pardon me, the pits. Three different sites in my head. So yes, it's in my opinion we're in a declining condition right now.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay. But we have no data to support that yet; that's something that would have come after you did some amount of monitoring, right? MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, it's my opinion that the chloride concentrations are going down in time. If LDNR would like some monitoring data to support that, then that's fine, they can ask for that.</li> </ul>  |

Pages 49 to 52



| 5.3         5.4         5.4           4         during - for your MNA?         5.5         5.4           5         A. Well, 1 agree with the four quarters for<br>one year, and then left's see where we are. At the<br>same time having said that, LDNR may not require<br>any monitoring. So I think we have to see what<br>LDNR are going to say. But starting quarterly for<br>one year, I think that's the right place to start.         6.5         6.5         1.6         9.0         Sin We had organics, for example, we<br>would expect there to be some natural degradation<br>processes; right?           7         A. Bit her - well, if 10,000 milligrams<br>per liter is chosen as a remedial goal, you<br>wouldn't need the monitored natural attenuation at<br>all, would you?         A. That's correct:         0.0         Nay. So Number 3, "Constituents are<br>susceptible to natural degradation<br>processes?           8         A. That's correct:         0.0         Nay. Number 4, "Constituent<br>are not susceptible to natural degradation<br>processes?           7         A. Chlorides are not susceptible to oncentrations going<br>degradation. I dony take valuations.         9.0         O, way, Number 4, "Constituent<br>concentration, reaching human or cological<br>receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."           7         That's not really something that outer members of HET did,<br>right?           8         favorable for attenuation one unfavorable<br>conditions into the elays from the sills. and<br>then its says, This shall include documentation of<br>site-specific characteristics which support<br>natural attenuation."         76           1 </th <th></th> <th>50</th> <th></th> <th></th>   |    | 50   |    |   |
|--|----|--|----|---|
| 2       A. Well, largre with the four quarters for       are no biodegridation, for example, processes of         3       operation of the same time having said that, LDNR may not require       and in UDRR are going to say. But starting quarterly for         4       no eyear, I think that's the right place to start.       and in LDNR required in the informed sping further out in time,         4       no eyear, I think that's the right place to start.       and in LDNR required informed sping further out in time,         6       no eyear, I think that's the right place to start.       and in word in the anarchoic environment. So you can't just say blanket that         0       0. Is there - well, if 110,000 milligrams       and in would you?       A. That's correct.         1       0. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are start, yes.       Q. Okay. But we knew that chlorides are not susceptible to natural degradation processes,"         11       a. That's correct.       A. Right. Degradation and corrections in order destroyed, it just goes down in concentrations reaching human or ecological receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."         12       Do Kay. Nould you agree that chlorides are not susceptible to accentrations going degradation. I dear know ~ if 3 means is the constituent of concernt." And then Number 5, "Conditions are farvorable for datemation."         20       Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions are farvorable for attemation."       The thirt is shand then constituent of concern." And then bark how aris were saying?         1 <td></td> <td>53</td> <td></td> <td>54</td>   |    | 53   |    | 54  |
| 5         one year, and then let's see where we are. At the same time having said that, LDNR are going to say. But starting quarerly for one year, 1 hink that's the right place to start.         3         hydrolysis processes acting on organics. For example, we would expect there to be some natural degradation process. right?           6         LDNR are going to say. But starting quarerly for one year, 1 hink that's the right place to start.         6         7         A. Depending on the organic. Some require an anaerobic environment. Soy ou cart just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a carta in geochemical regime, yes.           10         Q. Is there - well, if 110,000 milligrams at all, wouldy ou?         7         A. Depending on the organic. Some require an anaerobic environment. Soy ou cart just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a carta in susceptible to natural degradation processes,"           11         Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are susceptible to natural degradation processes,"         10         10         10         11         10         11         10         11         10         10         11         10         11         10         11 <td>1</td> <td>during for your MNA?</td> <td>1</td> <td>because of dispersion and diffusion. But there</td>  | 1  | during for your MNA?                               | 1  | because of dispersion and diffusion. But there    |
| 5         one year, and then let's see where we are. At the same time having said that, LDNR are going to say. But starting quarerly for one year, 1 hink that's the right place to start.         3         hydrolysis processes acting on organics. For example, we would expect there to be some natural degradation process. right?           6         LDNR are going to say. But starting quarerly for one year, 1 hink that's the right place to start.         6         7         A. Depending on the organic. Some require an anaerobic environment. Soy ou cart just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a carta in geochemical regime, yes.           10         Q. Is there - well, if 110,000 milligrams at all, wouldy ou?         7         A. Depending on the organic. Some require an anaerobic environment. Soy ou cart just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a carta in susceptible to natural degradation processes,"           11         Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are susceptible to natural degradation processes,"         10         10         10         11         10         11         10         11         10         10         11         10         11         10         11 <td>2</td> <td>A. Well, I agree with the four quarters for</td> <td>2</td> <td>are no biodegradation, for example, processes or</td>   | 2  | A. Well, I agree with the four quarters for        | 2  | are no biodegradation, for example, processes or  |
| <ul> <li>any monitoring. So I think we have to see what</li> <li>LDNR are going to say. But starting quarterly for<br/>one year. I think that's the right place to start.</li> <li>And if LDNR recommends going further out in time,<br/>then I'm fine with that.</li> <li>Q. Is there – well, if I 10,000 milligrams</li> <li>per litre is chosen as a remedial goal, you</li> <li>would't need the monitored natural attenuation at<br/>all, would you?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are<br/>stall, would you agree that chlorides<br/>are not susceptible to natural degradation processes,"</li> <li>A. Chlorides are not susceptible to<br/>are not susceptible to natural degradation</li> <li>processes?</li> <li>A. Chlorides are not susceptible to<br/>are not susceptible to concentration sequity and identify and down yies, chloride concentration sequity and identifies and<br/>attenuation.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Mould you agree that chlorides<br/>are not susceptible to antural degradation<br/>processes?</li> <li>A. Chlorides are not susceptible to<br/>are favorable for degradation and/or natural<br/>attenuation."</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then Number 5.</li> <li>O. Okay. And then Number 5.</li> <li>M. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it<br/>goundwater; is that what you were saying?</li> <li>M. TROUTMAN: Object to form.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it<br/>goundwater; is that what you were saying?</li> <li>M. Traoutral attenuation."</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>M. Ta's process that's occurring out<br/>there. And it also is a natural attenuation<br/>process, because it does bid up the chloride and<br/>process, because it does bid up the chloride and<br/>process, because it does bid up the chloride and<br/>process, because it does bid up the ch</li></ul>                                 | 3  |  | 3  | hydrolysis processes acting on chloride.          |
| 6       LDNR are going to say. But starting quarterly for<br>one year, 1 think that's the right place to start.       6       process, right?         An dir LDNR recommends going further out in time,<br>then I'm fine with that.       7       A. Depending on the organic. Some require<br>an anaerobic<br>environment. So you carit just say blanket that<br>all would you?         10       0. Is therewith if 110,000 milligrams<br>at all, would you?       10         11       0. Is therewith if 10,000 milligrams<br>at all, would you?       10         12       0. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are<br>susceptible to natural degradation processes,"<br>right?       0. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are<br>susceptible to natural degradation<br>processes?         12       0. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are<br>susceptible to natural degradation<br>processes?       10       0. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent<br>concentration reduction. In other words, chloride<br>does not get destroyed; it just goes down in<br>concentrations reaching human or cological<br>receptors do not result in unacceptable risk."         11       11       0. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent<br>susceptible to concentrations going<br>down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down         12       0. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions<br>are favorable for degradation and/or natural<br>attenuation of the constituent of concent." And<br>then it says, "This shall include documentation of<br>the constituent' degradability and/or attenuation<br>diffusions into the clays into the silts. And<br>ther is any other.       11         12       0. Okay. And then Number 5, "Condititons<br>is that right?       12  | 4  | same time having said that, LDNR may not require   | 4  | Q. So if we had organics, for example, we         |
| 7       one year, I think that's the right place to start.       A. Depending on the organic. Some require a nanerobic environment; some require an anaerobic environment; some require an anaerobic environment; some require an anaerobic environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrade. But all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrades but all will under a environment. So you can' just say blanket that all organics degrades but allowed sou this shoutalore on the say sthat the chlorides are not s  | 5  | any monitoring. So I think we have to see what     | 5  | would expect there to be some natural degradation |
| 8       And if LDNR recommends going further out in time,       8       aerobic environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         10       Q. Is there well, if 110,000 milligrams       11       environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         11       per lifer is chosen as a remedial goal, you       11       environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         11       all, would you?       Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are       12         12       Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are       13       14       acorbic environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         13       all, would you?       Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are       10       Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are         14       cornert?       A. Right. Degradation not cells in not susceptible to natural degradation       10       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         12       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to astrations sile goadation       10       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         14       constituent's degradation and/or natural       20       That's not really something that you looked         15       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       11       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         16       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       11       favorable for attenuation off constituent of degradation and/or natural       11   | 6  | LDNR are going to say. But starting quarterly for  | 6  | process, right?                                   |
| 8       And if LDNR recommends going further out in time,       8       aerobic environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         10       Q. Is there well, if 110,000 milligrams       11       environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         11       per lifer is chosen as a remedial goal, you       11       environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         11       all, would you?       Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are       12         12       Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are       13       14       acorbic environment; So you cart'iust say blanket that         13       all, would you?       Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are       10       Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are         14       cornert?       A. Right. Degradation not cells in not susceptible to natural degradation       10       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         12       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to astrations sile goadation       10       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         14       constituent's degradation and/or natural       20       That's not really something that you looked         15       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       11       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         16       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       11       favorable for attenuation off constituent of degradation and/or natural       11   | 7  | one year, I think that's the right place to start. | 7  | A. Depending on the organic. Some require         |
| <ul> <li>then I'm fine with that.</li> <li>Q. Is there - well, if 110,000 milligrams</li> <li>per liter is chosen as a remedial goal, you</li> <li>wouldn't need the monitored natural attenuation at</li> <li>all, would you?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are</li> <li>susceptible to natural degradation processes,"</li> <li>A. Is ee that, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you agree that chlorides</li> <li>are not susceptible to natural degradation</li> <li>percesses?</li> <li>A. Chlorides are not susceptible to attart degradation</li> <li>processes?</li> <li>A. Chlorides are not susceptible to attart degradation</li> <li>processes?</li> <li>A. Chlorides are not susceptible to astart degradation</li> <li>processes?</li> <li>A. Chlorides are not susceptible to astart degradation</li> <li>processes?</li> <li>but I did not do any risk evaluations.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions</li> <li>are favorable for degradation and discussion of</li> <li>stic-specific characteristics which support</li> <li>natural attenuation."</li> <li>Is that right?</li> <li>A. Isee that.</li> <li>Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,</li> <li>it has an atten attenuation."</li> <li>Is that right?</li> <li>A. Isee that.</li> <li>Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,</li> <li>it as a problem.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I's a process. that's occurring out</li> <li>there. And it also is a natural attenuation for econs that's care that say and then recontaminate the</li> <li>groundwater; is that what you were saving?</li> <li>A. I's a process. that's occurring out</li> <li>there. And it also is a natural attenuation process, because it does it net with what is ace?</li> <li>A. I's a process. that's occurring out</li> <li>there. And it also is a natural attenuation process, because it does bind up the chloride and</li> <li>process, because it does bind up the chloride and</li> <li>process, because it does bind up the chloride and</li> <li>process,</li></ul> | 8  | And if LDNR recommends going further out in time,  | 8  |   |
| 11       per liter is chosen as a remedial goal, you       11       certain geochemical regime, yes.         12       wouldy ou?       12       Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are         13       all, would you?       13       concentration reduction degradation processes,         14       A. That's correct.       14       concentration.       14         15       Q. Okay. Soumber 3, "Constituents are       15       concentration.       16         16       assocptible to natural degradation       processes?       16       concentrations.       0. Okay. Nould you agree that chlorides         17       right?       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to natural degradation       17       concentrations.       0. Okay. Nould you agree that chlorides         16       consentiments susceptible to concentrations going       0. Okay. Nouth Knowif 3 means is the       21         16       constituents susceptible to concentrations will go down       25       That's not really something that you looked         17       right?       A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         16       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         2       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable       11 <td< td=""><td>9</td><td>then I'm fine with that.</td><td>9</td><td>environment. So you can't just say blanket that</td></td<>  | 9  | then I'm fine with that.                           | 9  | environment. So you can't just say blanket that   |
| 12       wouldn't need the monitored natural attenuation at       12       Q. Ökay. But we know that chlorides are         13       all, would you?       13       14       A. That's correct.       13         14       A. That's correct.       14       A. That's correct.       15       A. Right. Degradation does not imply         16       susceptible to natural degradation processes,"       16       concentration reduction. In other words, chloride         17       A. I see that, yes.       10       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         18       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to atural degradation processes?       10       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         19       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent to concentrations reaching human or ecological receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."       17         20       Acay. Number 4, "Constituent to concentrations going 20       at, it's something that other members of HET did, right?         21       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to concentrations going 20       at, it's something that other members of HET did, right?         22       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions are favorable for degradation and/or natural attenuation of the constituent of concern." And the issus, "This shall include documentation of the constituent's degradability and/or attenuation of the constituent's degradability and/or attenuation of the constituent's degradability and/or attenuation of the constituent's which support natural attenuation."       <  | 10 | Q. Is there well, if 110,000 milligrams            | 10 | all organics degrade. But all will under a        |
| 13       all, would you?       13       not susceptible to natural degradation processes,         14       A. That's correct.       14         15       Q. Okay, So Number 3, "Constituents are susceptible to natural degradation processes,"       16         17       right?       17         18       A. I see that, yes.       16         19       Q. Okay, Would you agree that chlorides       17         19       Q. Okay, Would you agree that chlorides       19         19       Q. Okay, Number 3, "Constituent susceptible to natural degradation processes?       10         21       processes?       12         22       A. Chorides are not susceptible to concentrations going       20         24       constituents susceptible to concentrations will go down       21         25       56       56         16       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       11         2       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions are favorable for degradation and/or natural atenuation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the start ght?       11         3       guess, was that the chlorides can become bound in the silts and then recontaminate the gradatist the chlorides can become bound in the silts and then recontaminate the gradatiste onore.       11 <td>11</td> <td>per liter is chosen as a remedial goal, you</td> <td>11</td> <td>certain geochemical regime, yes.</td>   | 11 | per liter is chosen as a remedial goal, you        | 11 | certain geochemical regime, yes.                  |
| 14       A. That's correct.       14       correct?       A. Right. Degradation does not imply concentration reduction. In other words, chloride does not get destroyed; it just goes down in concentration reduction. In other words, chloride does not get destroyed; it just goes down in concentration reduction. In other words, chloride does not get destroyed; it just goes down in concentrations reaching human or ecological receptors do not result in unacceptable insks."         19       O. Okay. Would you agree that chlorides are not susceptible to natural degradation processes?       0         21       processes?       Concentrations reaching human or ecological receptors do not result in unacceptable insks."         22       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to accurations will go down       23         25       56         1       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       1         2       O. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions are favorable for degradation and/or natural attenuation of the constituent of concern." And then it says, "This shall include documentation of the issays, "This shall include documentation of the issays, "This shall include documentation of the sitts and then recontaminate the groundwater; is that right?       1         10       Is that right?       1         11       A. Issee that.       1         12       Q. One of the problems that you were sayin?       1         13       Iguess, was that the chlorides can become bound in the silts and then recontaminate the groundwater; is that what you were sayin? <td>12</td> <td>wouldn't need the monitored natural attenuation at</td> <td>12</td> <td>Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are</td>   | 12 | wouldn't need the monitored natural attenuation at | 12 | Q. Okay. But we know that chlorides are           |
| 15       Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are susceptible to natural degradation processes,"       15       A. Right. Degradation does not imply concentration reduction. In other words, chloride does not get destroyed; it just goes down in concentration.         18       A. I see that, yes.       16       Concentration reduction. In other words, chloride does not get destroyed; it just goes down in concentration.         19       Q. Okay. Would you agree that chlorides       19       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent concentrations reaching human or ecological receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."         21       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to concentrations going down, yes, chloride concentrations going       20       Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions are favorable for degradation and/or natural attenuation of the constituent of concern." And then it says, "This shall include documentation of the constituent of degradation and discussion of site-specific characteristics which support natural attenuation."       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable condition is that tright?         10       Is that right?       1       favorable for attenuation mechanism. It's like and then recontaminate the sits and then recontaminate the sits and then cecontaminate the sits and then cecontaminate the sits and then recontaminate the sits and then recontaminate the groudwater; is that what you were saving?       1       M. HUDDELL:       1       M. HUDDELL:       1       August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for 4ugust 31st, 20   | 13 | all, would you?                                    | 13 | not susceptible to natural degradation processes, |
| 16       susceptible to natural degradation processes,"       16       concentration reduction. In other words, chloride         17       right?       16       concentration reduction. In other words, chloride         17       right?       does not get destroyed; it just goes down in       concentration.         18       A. I see that, yes.       17       does not get destroyed; it just goes down in         19       Q. Okay. Would you agree that chlorides       are not susceptible to natural degradation       20         20       are not susceptible to natural degradation going       21       receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."         21       down, yes, chloride concentrations going       22       That's not really something that you looked         23       degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the       22       That's not really something that you looked         24       constituents susceptible to concentrations going       24       right?         24       down, yes, chloride concentrations.       25       56         55       56       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable       56         17       then it says, "This shall include documentation of       56       favorable for attenuation, mechanism. It's         56       then it says, "This shall include documentation of       57       THE WITNESS: Well,   | 14 | A. That's correct.                                 | 14 | correct?  |
| 17       right?       17       idoes not get destroyed; it just goes down in concentration.         18       A. I see that, yes.       17       does not get destroyed; it just goes down in concentration.         19       O. Okay. Would you agree that chlorides are not susceptible to natural degradation processes?       0. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent concentrations reaching human or ecological receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."         21       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to concentrations going down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down       23       at; it's something that you looked at; it's something that you looked         23       down, yes, chloride concentrations going down, yes, chloride concentrations of HET did, right?       24       at; it's something that you looked         24       right?       A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         25       0. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions are favorable for degradation and/or natural attenuation of the constituent of concern." And then is asys, "This shall include documentation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of a site-specific characteristics which support natural attenuation."       16         26       O. One of the problems that you mentioned, in the silts and then recontaminate the groundwater; is that what you were saying?       MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.         27       A. I see that.       10       So well mark as Exhibit 5, these are your invoices.         28 <t< td=""><td>15</td><td>Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are</td><td>15</td><td>A. Right. Degradation does not imply</td></t<>  | 15 | Q. Okay. So Number 3, "Constituents are            | 15 | A. Right. Degradation does not imply              |
| 18       A. I see that, yes.       18       Concentration.         19       Q. Okay. Would you agree that chlorides       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         20       are not susceptible to natural degradation       19       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent         21       processes?       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to       20       Na. Number 4, "Constituent         23       degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the       concentrations reaching human or ecological         24       constituents susceptible to concentrations going       20       Na. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         25       55       56         10       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         2       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         3       attenuation of the constituent of concern." And       4       MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.         7       natural attenuation matche       10       Is that right?       13         14       in the silts and then recontaminate the       13       So well mark as Exhibit 5, these are       14         14       in the silts and then recontaminate the       13       So well mark as Exhibit 5, these are       14         15 <td< td=""><td>16</td><td>susceptible to natural degradation processes,"</td><td>16</td><td>concentration reduction. In other words, chloride</td></td<>   | 16 | susceptible to natural degradation processes,"     | 16 | concentration reduction. In other words, chloride |
| 19       Q. Okay. Would you agree that chlorides<br>are not susceptible to natural degradation<br>processes?       19       Q. Okay. Number 4, "Constituent<br>concentrations reaching human or ecological<br>receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."         21       processes?       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to concentrations going<br>degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the<br>constituents susceptible to concentrations going<br>down, yes, chloride concentration of<br>are favorable for degradation and/or natural<br>attenuation of the constituent of concern." And<br>then it says, "This shall include documentation of<br>site-specific characteristics which support<br>natural attenuation."       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable<br>condition is that this, I guess, reabsorption into<br>the sits; is that right?         10       Is that right?       4       MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: Will, we talked about<br>diffusions into the clays into the silts. And<br>that's a natural attenuation<br>groundwater; is that what you were saying?       5       56         11       A. I see that.<br>groundwater; is that what you were saying?       10       Is that right?       11         12       Q. Okay.<br>THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it<br>as a problem.       30 well mark as Exhibit 5, these are<br>your invoices.       11         13       Iguess, was that the chloride to form.       12       Q. Okay.       13  | 17 | right?   | 17 |   |
| 20       are not susceptible to natural degradation       20       concentrations reaching human or ecological         21       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to       21       receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."         23       degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the       22       That's not really something that you looked         24       constituents susceptible to concentrations going       23       at; it's something that you looked         25       55       56         1       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       2         2       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions       1         3       are favorable for degradability and/or natural       3         4       attenuation of the constituent of concern." And       5         4       then it says, "This shall include documentation of       5         6       then it says, "This shall include documentation of       6         6       then it says, was that the chlorides can become bound       7         7       natural attenuation."       9         9       like a big sponge out there not allowing the         10       Is that right?       1         11       A. I see that.       17         12       Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,       18   | 18 |  | 18 | concentration.                                    |
| 21       processes?       21       receptors do not result in unacceptable risks."         22       A. Chlorides are not susceptible to       23       degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the         23       degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the       21       That's nor really something that you looked         24       constituents susceptible to concentrations going       23       degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the         25       down, yes, chloride concentrations going       23       A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         26       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         2       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         3       reconstituents degradability and/or attenuation       3       the silts; is that right?         4       attenuation."       5       THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about         16       the constituents degradability and/or attenuation       6       there sater my screen for         3       site-specific characteristics which support       1       favorable for meconaminate the         17       R. Ise that.       11       M. HUDDELL:       M. HUDDELL:         18       guess, was that the chlorides can become bound       13       Sow   |    |  | 19 |   |
| 22A. Chlorides are not susceptible to<br>degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the<br>constituents susceptible to concentrations going<br>down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down22That's not really something that you looked<br>at; it's something that other members of HET did,<br>right?25down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down25A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,26Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions<br>are favorable for degradation and/or natural<br>attenuation of the constituent of concern." And<br>then it says, "This shall include documentation of<br>the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation<br>capacity and identification and discussion of<br>stice-specific characteristics which support<br>natural attenuation."1favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable<br>condition is that this, I guess, reabsorption into<br>the sits is that right?110Is that right?1MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about<br>diffusions into the clays ifto the silts. And<br>that's a natural attenuation."10Is that right?1011A. I see that.<br>in the silts and then recontaminate the<br>groundwater; is that what you were saying?1012Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,<br>in the silts and then recontaminate the<br>groundwater; is that what you were saying?1012MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it<br>as a problem.1013Fits a process that's occurring out<br>there. And it also is a natural attenuation<br>orcess, because it does bind up the chloride and<br>process, because it does bind up the chloride and<br>provents it from reaching potential ecceptors.22 <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td>   |    |  | 1  |   |
| 23       degradation. I don't know if 3 means is the       23       at; it's something that other members of HET did,         24       constituents susceptible to concentrations going       24       right?         25       down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down       25       A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         55       56         1       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable         2       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions       are favorable for degradation and/or natural       3         4       attenuation of the constituent of concern." And       4       MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.         6       the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation       5       THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about         10       Is that right?       1       MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.       THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about         11       A. I see that.       11       MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for         12       Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,       11       So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are         13       Iguess, was that the chlorides can become bound       13       So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are         14       in the silts and then recontaminate the       12       Q. Okay.       A. It's a process that's occ  | 21 | processes?   | 1  |   |
| 24       constituents susceptible to concentrations going       24       right?         25       down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down       25       A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         55       56         1       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       5         2       Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions are favorable for degradation and/or natural attenuation of the constituent of concern." And then it says, "This shall include documentation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of capacity and identification and discussion of site-specific characteristics which support natural attenuation."       1       MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.         1       A. I see that.       10       Is that right?       10       Is that right?         1       A. I see that.       11       So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are your invoices.       9         16       MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.       11       13       So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are your invoices.         17       THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it as a problem.       11       12       Q. Okay.         18       as a problem.       12       Q. Okay.       13       So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are your invoices.         19       EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:       11       12       Q. Itil ust go through them quickly. </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>   |    |  |    |   |
| 25       down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down       25       A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         55       56         1       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       5       56         1       but I did not do any risk evaluations.       1       favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable conditions is that this, I guess, reabsorption into the constituent of concern." And then it says, "This shall include documentation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation of the capacity and identification and discussion of site-specific characteristics which support natural attenuation."       1       M. TROUTMAN: Object to form. THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about diffusions into the clays from the silts and that right?         10       Is that right?       10       that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's like a big sponge out there not allowing the chloride to move.         11       A. I see that.       11       So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are your invoices.         12       Q. One of the problems that you were saying?       15       Image: Same are problem.         13       I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound in the silts and then recontaminate the gar problem.       13       So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are your invoices.         15       groundwater; is that what you were saying?       16       EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:         14 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></t<>  |    |  | 1  |   |
| 55561but I did not do any risk evaluations.52Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions3are favorable for degradation and/or natural4attenuation of the constituent of concern." And5then it says, "This shall include documentation of6the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation7capacity and identification and discussion of8site-specific characteristics which support9natural attenuation."9like a big sponge out there not allowing the10Is that right?11A. I see that.12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound14in the silts and then recontaminate the15groundwater; is that what you were saying?16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it18as a problem.19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:20Q. Okay.21A. If's a process that's occurring out22there. And it also is a natural attenuation23process, because it does bind up the chloride and24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.  |    |  |    | 6   |
| 1but I did not do any risk evaluations.1favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable2Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditionsare favorable for degradation and/or natural1favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable3are favorable for degradation and/or natural3the silts; is that right?4attenuation of the constituent of concern." And4MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.5then it says, "This shall include documentation of5THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about6the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation6diffusions into the clays from the silts and7capacity and identification and discussion of7then back from the clays into the silts. And8site-specific characteristics which support8that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's9natural attenuation."9like a big sponge out there not allowing the10Is that right?10chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, uny our invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for18A. I   | 25 | down, yes, chloride concentrations will go down    | 25 | A. Yes. HET or, I think, Helen is at ERM,         |
| 1but I did not do any risk evaluations.1favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable2Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditionsare favorable for degradation and/or natural1favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable3are favorable for degradation and/or natural3the silts; is that right?4attenuation of the constituent of concern." And4MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.5the it says, "This shall include documentation of5THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about6the it says, "This shall include documentation of6diffusions into the clays from the silts and7capacity and identification and discussion of7then back from the clays into the silts. And8site-specific characteristics which support8that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's9natural attenuation."9like a big sponge out there not allowing the10Is that right?10chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, up or up or cefor15groundwater; is that what you were saying?16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19A. I i   |    |  |    |   |
| 2Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions3are favorable for degradation and/or natural4attenuation of the constituent of concern." And5then it says, "This shall include documentation of6the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation7capacity and identification and discussion of8site-specific characteristics which support9natural attenuation."10Is that right?11A. I see that.12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound14in the silts and then recontaminate the15groundwater; is that what you were saying?16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it18as a problem.19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:20Q. Okay.21A. It's a process that's occurring out22ther. And it also is a natural attenuation23process, because it does bind up the chloride and24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.  |    | 55   |    | 56  |
| 2Q. Okay. And then Number 5, "Conditions3are favorable for degradation and/or natural4attenuation of the constituent of concern." And5then it says, "This shall include documentation of6the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation7capacity and identification and discussion of8site-specific characteristics which support9natural attenuation."10Is that right?11A. I see that.12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound14in the silts and then recontaminate the15groundwater; is that what you were saying?16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it18as a problem.19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:20Q. Okay.21A. It's a process that's occurring out22ther. And it also is a natural attenuation23process, because it does bind up the chloride and24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.  | 1  | but I did not do any risk evaluations.             | 1  | favorable for attenuation, one unfavorable        |
| 3are favorable for degradation and/or natural<br>attenuation of the constituent of concern." And<br>then it says, "This shall include documentation of<br>the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation<br>capacity and identification and discussion of<br>site-specific characteristics which support<br>natural attenuation."3the silts; is that right?<br>HE WITNESS: Well, we talked about<br>diffusions into the clays from the silts and<br>then back from the clays into the silts. And<br>that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's<br>natural attenuation."10Is that right?10Ike a big sponge out there not allowing the<br>chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for<br>a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound<br>in the silts and then recontaminate the<br>groundwater; is that what you were saying?15IEXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>(EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>(Q. Okay.16August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for<br>August. Is it - do you recall that you were<br>retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out<br>there. And it also is a natural attenuation<br>process, because it does bind up the chloride and<br>prevents it from reaching potential receptors.2424prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24  | 2  |  | 2  |   |
| 5then it says, "This shall include documentation of<br>the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation<br>capacity and identification and discussion of<br>site-specific characteristics which support<br>natural attenuation."5THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about<br>diffusions into the clays from the silts and<br>then back from the clays into the silts. And<br>that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's<br>like a big sponge out there not allowing the<br>chloride to move.10Is that right?10like a big sponge out there not allowing the<br>chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for<br>a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound<br>in the silts and then recontaminate the<br>groundwater; is that what you were saying?12So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are<br>your invoices.16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.<br>THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it<br>as a problem.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>1819EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:<br>Q. Okay.19August 31 st, 2022, this is your invoice for<br>August 31 st, 2022, this is your invoice for<br>4 usust 31 st, 2022, this is your invoice for<br>4 usust 31 st, 2022, this is gour invoice for<br>4 usust 31 st, 2022, this is and they usere<br>eretained in August for this case?20Q. Okay.20A. It's a process that's occurring out<br>there. And it also is a natural attenuation<br>process, because it does bind up the chloride and<br>prevents it from reaching potential receptors.2123process, because it does bind up the chloride and<br>process, because it does bind up the chloride and<br>process.23Ext and the<br>process, because it does bind up the chlorid   | 3  |  | 3  | the silts; is that right?                         |
| 6the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation6diffusions into the clays from the silts and7capacity and identification and discussion of7then back from the clays into the silts. And8site-specific characteristics which support8that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's9natural attenuation."9like a big sponge out there not allowing the10Is that right?10chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,12a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22letter, but if this is my first invoice, then23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potenti   | 4  | attenuation of the constituent of concern." And    | 4  | MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.                     |
| 7capacity and identification and discussion of<br>site-specific characteristics which support<br>natural attenuation."7then back from the clays into the silts. And<br>that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's<br>like a big sponge out there not allowing the<br>chloride to move.10Is that right?10chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for<br>a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound<br>1413So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are<br>your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it<br>a s a problem.17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for<br>August. Is it do you recall that you were<br>retained in August for this case?20Q. Okay.20R. It's a process that's occurring out<br>there. And it also is a natural attenuation<br>process, because it does bind up the chloride and<br>2421A. I am not sure when I got my retention<br>that's consistent with what I said at the<br>beginning of this deposition, which is on the   | 5  | then it says, "This shall include documentation of | 5  | THE WITNESS: Well, we talked about                |
| 8site-specific characteristics which support8that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's9natural attenuation."9like a big sponge out there not allowing the10Is that right?10chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,12a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22Ietter, but if this is my first invoice, then23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   |    | the constituents' degradability and/or attenuation | 6  | diffusions into the clays from the silts and      |
| 9natural attenuation."9like a big sponge out there not allowing the10Is that right?10chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,12a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22Letter, but if this is my first invoice, then23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   |    |  | 7  | then back from the clays into the silts. And      |
| 10Is that right?10chloride to move.11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,12a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   | 8  | site-specific characteristics which support        | 8  | that's a natural attenuation mechanism. It's      |
| 11A. I see that.11MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,12a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   | 9  | natural attenuation."                              | 9  | like a big sponge out there not allowing the      |
| 12Q. One of the problems that you mentioned,12a second, Bill.13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the  | 10 | Is that right?                                     | 1  | chloride to move.                                 |
| 13I guess, was that the chlorides can become bound13So we'll mark as Exhibit 5, these are14in the silts and then recontaminate the14your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.21A. It's a process that's occurring out21there. And it also is a natural attenuation21A. I am not sure when I got my retention23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24beginning of this deposition, which is on the24   |    |  | 1  | MR. HUDDELL: Let me share my screen for           |
| 14in the silts and then recontaminate the<br>groundwater; is that what you were saying?14your invoices.15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22letter, but if this is my first invoice, then23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24beginning of this deposition, which is on the24  |    |  | 1  |   |
| 15groundwater; is that what you were saying?15(EXHIBIT 5 IDENTIFIED)16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.16EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   |    |  |    |   |
| 16MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it18as a problem.19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:20Q. Okay.21A. It's a process that's occurring out22there. And it also is a natural attenuation23process, because it does bind up the chloride and24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.   |    |  | 1  | •   |
| 17THE WITNESS: I didn't characterize it17Q. I'll just go through them quickly.18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22letter, but if this is my first invoice, then23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   |    |  |    |   |
| 18as a problem.18August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August 31st, 2022, this is your invoice for20Q. Okay.19August. Is it do you recall that you were21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22It is a process, because it does bind up the chloride and23provents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   |    |  | 1  |   |
| 19EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:19August. Is it do you recall that you were20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22It's a process, because it does bind up the chloride and23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the  |    |  |    |   |
| 20Q. Okay.20retained in August for this case?21A. It's a process that's occurring out21A. I am not sure when I got my retention22there. And it also is a natural attenuation22letter, but if this is my first invoice, then23process, because it does bind up the chloride and23that's consistent with what I said at the24prevents it from reaching potential receptors.24beginning of this deposition, which is on the   |    |  | 1  | •   |
| <ul> <li>A. It's a process that's occurring out</li> <li>there. And it also is a natural attenuation</li> <li>process, because it does bind up the chloride and</li> <li>prevents it from reaching potential receptors.</li> <li>A. I am not sure when I got my retention</li> <li>I etter, but if this is my first invoice, then</li> <li>that's consistent with what I said at the</li> <li>beginning of this deposition, which is on the</li> </ul>   |    |  | 1  |   |
| <ul> <li>there. And it also is a natural attenuation</li> <li>process, because it does bind up the chloride and</li> <li>prevents it from reaching potential receptors.</li> <li>letter, but if this is my first invoice, then</li> <li>that's consistent with what I said at the</li> <li>beginning of this deposition, which is on the</li> </ul>  |    |  | 1  |   |
| <ul> <li>process, because it does bind up the chloride and</li> <li>prevents it from reaching potential receptors.</li> <li>that's consistent with what I said at the</li> <li>beginning of this deposition, which is on the</li> </ul>  |    |  |    |   |
| 24 prevents it from reaching potential receptors. 24 beginning of this deposition, which is on the   |    |  |    |   |
|  |    |  |    |   |
| 2. Okay. But as far as conditions being 25 order of maybe six months when I was first  |    |  |    |   |
|  | 23 | Q. Okay. But as far as conditions being            | 25 | order of maybe six months when I was first        |

Pages 53 to 56



| 57   | 58  |
|--|---|
| <ol> <li>contacted.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And we got one for October, one</li> <li>for September. And I think that's it. All right.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: Can we take a two-minute</li> <li>break? I think I might be just about done.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Sounds good.</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the</li> <li>record. It's 10:42 a.m.</li> <li>(RECESS 10:42-10:52 A.M.)</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the</li> <li>record. It is 10:52 a.m.</li> <li>EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:</li> <li>Q. Dr. Kueper, with MNA, do you continue to</li> <li>monitor until the remedial goal is met?</li> <li>A. I think it depends on the particular</li> <li>site. For some sites, you might do that. For</li> <li>this site, I don't well, you'll have to defer</li> </ol> | 1Q. And so if that is the case, you would2agree that MNA is not even necessary, correct?3A. Under that particular scenario, yes.4Q. Okay. And so unless DNR comes up with a5different remedial goal for the groundwater, your6recommendation is that no MNA is necessary,7correct?8MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form.9THE WITNESS: Can you read back the10question, please?11EXAMINATION BY MR. HUDDELL:12Q. Sure. Unless the DNR were to come up13with a more stringent remedial goal than what HET14has already developed for the groundwater, your15recommendation would be that no MNA is required,16correct?17MR. TROUTMAN: Object to form. |
| <ul> <li>to DNR on that. The answer is, not necessarily.</li> <li>Q. So according to HET, the remedial goals</li> <li>for the groundwater have already been met. The</li> <li>site conditions are below the remedial goals that</li> <li>HET has identified for the groundwater; do you</li> <li>agree with that?</li> <li>A. That's how I understand their report,</li> <li>yes, using RECAP, that's right.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: I think that if the</li> <li>110,000 is adopted, then there's no MNA</li> <li>required for groundwater.</li> <li>MR. HUDDELL: All right. That's all the</li> <li>questions I have.</li> <li>MR. TROUTMAN: Thank you, Kevin.</li> <li>No questions here.</li> <li>THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This concludes the</li> </ul>  |
| 59<br>1 deposition of Bernard Kueper. We're going<br>2 off the record. It is 10:55 a.m.<br>3 (DEPOSITION CONCLUDED AT 10:55 A.M.)<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24<br>25  | 60         1       CORRECTION SHEET         2       PAGE LINE DESCRIPTION         3   |

Pages 57 to 60



|          | 61  |  | 62                     |
|----------|---|--|------------------------|
| 1        | WITNESS' CERTIFICATE  | 1 REPORTER'S I   | PAGE                   |
| 2        |   | 2 I, ANNA COATES, Cert   | ified Court Reporter,  |
| 3        |   | 3 in and for the State of Loui   |                        |
| 4        | I, DR. BERNARD KUEPER, read or have had the   | 4 officer, as defined in Rule 2  | 28 of the Federal      |
| 5        | foregoing testimony read to me and hereby certify   | 5 Rules of Civil Procedure an  | nd/or Article 1434(B)  |
| 6        | that it is a true and correct transcription of my   | 6 of the Louisiana Code of C   | ivil Procedure, before |
| 7        | testimony, with the exception of any attached   | 7 whom this sworn testimony  | y was taken, do hereby |
| 8        | corrections or changes.   | 8 state on the record;   |                        |
| 9        |   | 9 That due to the interacti  |                        |
| 10       |   | 10 spontaneous discourse of the  |                        |
| 11       |   | 11 () have been used to indic  |                        |
| 12       |   | 12 in thought, and/or talkover   |                        |
| 13       |   | 13 proper method for the cour  |                        |
| 14<br>15 | DATE SIGNED DR. BERNARD KUEPER  | <ul><li>transcription of a proceedir</li><li>() do not indicate that wo</li></ul>        |                        |
| 15<br>16 | DATE SIGNED DR. BERNARD KUEPER  | <ul><li>15 () do not indicate that wo</li><li>16 been left out of this transcr</li></ul> |                        |
| 17       |   | <ul><li>words and/or names which</li></ul>   |                        |
| 18       |   | 18 through reference material  |                        |
| 19       | INITIAL ONE:  | 19 the phrase "(spelled phonet   |                        |
| 20       |   | 20   | iculty).               |
| 21       | Signed with corrections as noted.   | 21   |                        |
| 22       | 0   | 22   |                        |
| 23       | Signed with no corrections.   | 23   |                        |
| 24       |   | 24 ANNA COATE  |                        |
| 25       | DATE TAKEN: NOVEMBER 22, 2022   | 25 LOUISIANA C   | CR NO. 97018           |
|          |   |  |                        |
|          | 63  |  |                        |
| 1        | <b>REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE</b>   |  |                        |
| 2        | This certification is valid only for a  |  |                        |
| 3        | transcript accompanied by my original signature   |  |                        |
| 4        | and original seal on this page.   |  |                        |
| 5        | I, ANNA C. COATES, CCR, RPR, do hereby  |  |                        |
| 6        | certify that DR. BERNARD KUEPER, to whom the oath   |  |                        |
| 7<br>8   | was administered, after having been duly sworn by me upon authority of R.S. 37:2554, did testify as |  |                        |
| 8<br>9   | herein above set forth in the foregoing 63 pages;   |  |                        |
| 10       | that this testimony was reported by me in the   |  |                        |
| 11       | stenotype reporting method, was prepared and  |  |                        |
| 12       | transcribed by me and is a true and correct   |  |                        |
| 13       | transcript to the best of my ability; that the  |  |                        |
| 14       | transcript has been prepared in compliance with   |  |                        |
| 15       | transcript format guidelines required by rules of   |  |                        |
| 16       | the board; that I have acted in compliance with   |  |                        |
| 17       | the prohibition on contractual relationships, as  |  |                        |
| 18       | defined by Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure  |  |                        |
| 19       | Article 1434 and in rules and advisory opinions of  |  |                        |
| 20       | the board; that I am not related to counsel or the  |  |                        |
| 21<br>22 | parties hereto, nor am I otherwise interested in the outcome of this matter.                        |  |                        |
| 22       | the outcome of this matter.   |  |                        |
| 24       | DATE ANNA COATES, CCR, RPR  |  |                        |
| 25       | LOUISIANA CCR NO. 97018   |  |                        |
|          |   |  |                        |
|          |   |  |                        |



| Page | 64  |
|------|-----|
| LUGC | U 1 |

|                     |                     |                                       |                            |                      |               |                     | - )                |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| . <u> </u>          | 0.0000 41.0.7       | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 40-22                      | 1.10 5 2             | 27.17         | ahar (1.9           | alay: 12 10        |
| A                   | agree 41:2,7        | appropriate                           | 40:22                      | 1:19 5:2             | 27:17         | changes 61:8        | clays 12:19        |
| <b>a.m</b> 1:21 5:5 | 41:18,20            | 19:13                                 | 42:11 49:6                 | 5:15 6:1             | calculation   | 62:11               | 27:22              |
| 37:5,6,8            | 41:23 53:2          | 40:18,25                              | 49:10,11                   | 59:1 60:23           | 14:5 29:3     | characteri          | 32:15 45:2         |
| 57:8,9,11           | 53:19               | 41:5,7,15                             | 49:21                      | 61:4,15              | 30:20,24      | 55:8                | 45:11 56:6         |
| 59:2,3              | 57:23 58:2          | 48:1 49:16                            | 51:19                      | 63:6                 | 31:10         | characterize        | 56:7               |
| ability 63:13       | AGREED              | approved                              | 53:12 55:4                 | <b>best</b> 63:13    | 35:20,22      | 55:17               | clean-up           |
| able 8:7            | 4:3                 | 48:17 49:3                            | 55:6,9,22                  | <b>better</b> 34:12  | 47:19         | <b>check</b> 8:16   | 43:3               |
| 36:13               | <b>ahead</b> 42:24  | approxima                             | 56:1,8                     | <b>big</b> 46:7 56:9 |               | 23:8                | <b>clear</b> 44:11 |
| ABOVE               | <b>AL</b> 1:7       | 13:2,10                               | August 1:7                 | <b>Bill</b> 2:24     | 47:24         | chemical            | closed 32:24       |
| 5:17                | <b>allow</b> 11:17  | 21:19                                 | 56:18,19                   | 6:20 10:6            | calculator    | 24:1                | 50:21,21           |
| absolutely          | allowed             | <b>April</b> 37:25                    | 56:20                      | 19:20 34:2           | 43:25         | chloride            | closely 10:1       |
| 37:2                | 49:12               | <b>area</b> 25:17                     | authority                  | 35:1 38:12           | call 26:22    | 25:3,16             | closure 31:5       |
| acceptable          | allowing            | 32:22 33:3                            | 63:8                       | 38:22                | 37:13         | 30:8 32:3           | CLVS 2:24          |
| 42:19               | 56:9                | 50:6 51:6                             | available                  | 48:23                | called 26:15  | 32:4 35:25          | co-owners          |
| accepted            | alternative         | 52:5                                  | 36:5                       | 56:12                | 45:3          | 36:2,7,20           | 6:17               |
| 38:6                | 49:13               | argument                              |                            | <b>bind</b> 55:23    | Canada 6:4    | 39:7 42:14          | COATES             |
| accompani           | America 1:9         | 39:15                                 | B                          | <b>bio</b> 36:25     | capable       | 42:19               | 2:25 4:22          |
| 63:3                | 5:12                | Arnold 2:5                            | <b>B</b> 3:12,16           | biodegrad            | 30:23         | 43:23               | 60:25 62:2         |
| acted 63:16         | amount              | 5:9                                   | 6:10 9:13                  | 54:2                 | capacity      | 44:14 45:5          | 62:24 63:5         |
| acting 27:23        | 52:16               | Article 62:5                          | 19:22 20:7                 | black 35:5           | 55:7          | 45:9 50:14          | 63:24              |
| 54:3                | anaerobic           | 63:19                                 | back 23:8                  | blanket 54:9         | case 8:14,15  | 50:25               | <b>Code</b> 4:6    |
| Action 38:2         | 54:8                | asked 8:14                            | 31:19 33:5                 | board 10:3           | 9:5 10:3      | 51:10               | 62:6 63:18         |
| add 11:16           | analysis 44:8       | 8:19 15:8                             | 34:11 35:8                 | 63:16,20             | 16:18         | 52:19               | coefficient        |
| additional          | and/or 49:12        | asking 22:1                           | 35:18 37:7                 | boring 12:19         | 17:19         | 53:25 54:3          | 27:11,13           |
| 35:9                | 55:3,6              | 25:3,12                               | 44:20,21                   | <b>bound</b> 55:13   | 20:12         | 54:16               | 31:13,15           |
| adequate            | 62:5,12,17          | 28:22                                 | 45:13,15                   | boundary             | 30:21         | 55:23               | 31:25 32:2         |
| 49:21               | ANNA 2:25           | assessor                              | 45:18 46:3                 | 22:11,13             | 38:10,25      | 56:10               | 32:6,18            |
| adjacent            | 4:22 60:25          | 40:9                                  | 46:5,14                    | 28:20,20             | 56:20 58:1    | chlorides           | COKÉR              |
| 45:11               | 62:2,24             | assist 9:21                           | 47:16,22                   | <b>BP</b> 1:9 5:12   | cases 7:4,9   | 24:21,22            | 4:22               |
| administer          | 63:5,24             | Associates                            | 48:13                      | break 8:2            | 7:20 39:25    | 24:25 26:4          | come 13:13         |
| 63:7                | <b>answer</b> 4:16  | 6:10 9:14                             | 50:19 56:7                 | 36:25 40:7           | category      | 27:23 28:2          | 31:19              |
|                     | 46:15 47:2          | assume                                | 57:10 58:9                 | 57:5                 | 27:10         | 28:19 29:4          | 32:23              |
| administer          | 57:18               | 18:11                                 | background                 | brine 35:25          | causing       | 29:22,24            | 44:10              |
| 4:24                | anyway 35:4         | assuming                              | 43:19                      | 51:4                 | 49:17         | 30:2,9,14           | 46:14              |
| admission           | appear 6:25         | 18:17,18                              | based 10:25                | brought 33:1         |               | 30:15               | 52:15              |
| 32:22 33:3          | 9:4                 | 30:13                                 | 11:14 16:5                 | biought 55.1         | 4:22 60:25    | 32:21 33:1          | 58:12              |
| adopted             | APPEAR              | assumption                            | 21:4,7                     | C                    | 62:24,25      | 33:10,14            | comes 58:4         |
| 58:19               | 2:1                 | 48:12                                 | 23:2,10,19                 | C 2:12 63:5          | 63:5,24,25    | 35:10,17            | coming             |
| advection           | appendix            | assumptions                           | 25:14                      | calculate            | centimeters   | 36:11,14            | 20:11              |
| 26:13 28:5          | 3:15,16             | 48:4                                  | 29:25 30:6                 | 11:19                | 10:11,13      | 36:17 39:1          | comment            |
| 28:9,12,15          | 8:21,25             | Atchafalaya                           | 47:14                      | 23:10                | 11:8,9        | 39:3,6,12           | 42:1               |
| 29:11 33:4          | 9:7 16:22           | 16:6                                  | 51:25                      | 27:12                | certain       | 44:22               | company 1:9        |
| adverse             | 19:21 20:7          | attached                              | basically                  | 29:12                | 15:16         | 53:19,22            | 5:13 6:10          |
| 39:16               | 37:21               | 61:7                                  | 31:23 45:1                 | 31:13,15             | 17:18 38:7    | 54:12               | 6:13,14,18         |
| 49:17               | applied             | attenuate                             | Basin 16:7                 | 43:4 45:21           | 54:11         | 55:12               | comparable         |
| advisory            | 43:22               | 37:14                                 | Basin 10.7<br>Bates 8:3,10 | 46:20,24             | CERTIFI       | <b>chosen</b> 53:11 | 48:4               |
| 63:19               | appreciable         | 49:16                                 | bates 8.5,10<br>beginning  | 40:20,24 47:10,12    | 3:5 61:1      | circulating         | compared           |
| aerial 34:3         | 46:16,19            | attenuation                           | 14:12                      | calculated           | 63:1          | 8:9                 | 18:16              |
| 34:18               | 47:8 48:15          | 16:23                                 | 56:24                      | 10:17                | certification | 8:9<br>Civil 4:7    | 40:16 48:2         |
| aerobic 54:8        | 47:8 48:15<br>51:12 |                                       |                            |                      | 4:11 63:2     | 62:5,6              |                    |
| affect 24:1         |                     | 30:11,17                              | <b>behalf</b> 5:9,12       | 11:13,14             |               |                     | completely         |
| 48:14               | appreciably         | 36:23                                 | <b>believe</b> 8:16        | 28:24                | Certified     | 63:18               | 12:14,18           |
| aforementi          | 43:5 45:20          | 37:11,12                              | 10:18,25                   | 29:17                | 4:22 62:2     | clay 10:10          | 22:16              |
| 4:5                 | approaches          | 38:1,19                               | 37:22                      | 42:11                | certify 61:5  | 12:8,15             | compliance         |
| <b>ago</b> 8:17     | 45:18               | 39:4,23                               | Bernard                    | calculating          | 63:6          | 45:3,13             | 63:14,16           |
|                     |                     |                                       |                            |                      |               |                     |                    |
|                     |                     |                                       |                            |                      |               |                     |                    |



| Page | 65 |
|------|----|
|------|----|

| 12:20<br>13:18,24<br>21:9 40:6<br><b>onfused</b><br>26:8<br><b>onsistent</b><br>12:18 48:6<br>48:13<br>56:23<br><b>onstituent</b><br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   | 13:7,11<br>14:15,16<br>15:14 16:7<br>17:21<br>18:20 19:2<br>19:3 21:20<br>27:3 39:1<br>39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11<br>48:10  | 29:10 39:9<br>39:21<br>52:14,21<br><b>date</b> 7:9<br>20:22 23:2<br>23:19<br>25:22 29:8<br>61:15,25<br>63:24<br><b>day</b> 16:2,3<br>16:12 25:4   | 62:18<br>density<br>35:24<br>Department<br>41:10<br>48:18 49:4<br>49:7,14,20<br>dependent<br>16:25 17:2   | 26:22,23<br>26:25 27:6<br>27:22,24<br>28:7,17<br>29:12,13<br>30:1,10,18<br>31:12,14<br>31:25 32:2  | 25:18<br>29:12,14<br>30:8<br><b>Directive</b><br>38:3<br><b>discourse</b><br>62:10<br><b>discourse</b>  | 9:22 34:10<br>37:10<br>43:13<br>57:13<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br>draft 9:24 |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 13:18,24<br>21:9 40:6<br>onfused<br>26:8<br>onsistent<br>12:18 48:6<br>48:13<br>56:23<br>onstituent<br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   | 14:15,16<br>15:14 16:7<br>17:21<br>18:20 19:2<br>19:3 21:20<br>27:3 39:1<br>39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11  | 39:21<br>52:14,21<br><b>date</b> 7:9<br>20:22 23:2<br>23:19<br>25:22 29:8<br>61:15,25<br>63:24<br><b>day</b> 16:2,3   | density<br>35:24<br>Department<br>41:10<br>48:18 49:4<br>49:7,14,20<br>dependent<br>16:25 17:2  | 26:25 27:6<br>27:22,24<br>28:7,17<br>29:12,13<br>30:1,10,18<br>31:12,14  | 29:12,14<br>30:8<br><b>Directive</b><br>38:3<br><b>discourse</b><br>62:10   | 37:10<br>43:13<br>57:13<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6                             |
| 21:9 40:6<br><b>onfused</b><br>26:8<br><b>onsistent</b><br>12:18 48:6<br>48:13<br>56:23<br><b>onstituent</b><br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4  | 15:14 16:7<br>17:21<br>18:20 19:2<br>19:3 21:20<br>27:3 39:1<br>39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11  | 52:14,21<br><b>date</b> 7:9<br>20:22 23:2<br>23:19<br>25:22 29:8<br>61:15,25<br>63:24<br><b>day</b> 16:2,3  | 35:24<br>Department<br>41:10<br>48:18 49:4<br>49:7,14,20<br>dependent<br>16:25 17:2   | 27:22,24<br>28:7,17<br>29:12,13<br>30:1,10,18<br>31:12,14  | 30:8<br>Directive<br>38:3<br>discourse<br>62:10   | 43:13<br>57:13<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6                                      |
| onfused           26:8           onsistent           12:18 48:6           48:13           56:23           onstituent           24:17           49:14 50:6           51:7 52:2           54:19 55:4                                | 17:21<br>18:20 19:2<br>19:3 21:20<br>27:3 39:1<br>39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11  | date 7:9<br>20:22 23:2<br>23:19<br>25:22 29:8<br>61:15,25<br>63:24<br>day 16:2,3  | <b>Department</b><br>41:10<br>48:18 49:4<br>49:7,14,20<br><b>dependent</b><br>16:25 17:2  | 28:7,17<br>29:12,13<br>30:1,10,18<br>31:12,14  | Directive<br>38:3<br>discourse<br>62:10   | 57:13<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6   |
| 26:8<br><b>onsistent</b><br>12:18 48:6<br>48:13<br>56:23<br><b>onstituent</b><br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   | 18:20 19:2<br>19:3 21:20<br>27:3 39:1<br>39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11   | 20:22 23:2<br>23:19<br>25:22 29:8<br>61:15,25<br>63:24<br><b>day</b> 16:2,3   | 41:10<br>48:18 49:4<br>49:7,14,20<br><b>dependent</b><br>16:25 17:2   | 29:12,13<br>30:1,10,18<br>31:12,14   | 38:3<br><b>discourse</b><br>62:10   | 60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6  |
| Densistent           12:18         48:6           48:13         56:23           56:23         56:23           015         74:17           24:17         49:14         50:6           51:7         52:2         54:19         55:4 | 19:3 21:20<br>27:3 39:1<br>39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11   | 23:19<br>25:22 29:8<br>61:15,25<br>63:24<br><b>day</b> 16:2,3   | 48:18 49:4<br>49:7,14,20<br><b>dependent</b><br>16:25 17:2  | 30:1,10,18<br>31:12,14   | discourse<br>62:10  | 61:15 63:6  |
| 12:18 48:6<br>48:13<br>56:23<br><b>onstituent</b><br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   | 27:3 39:1<br>39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11   | 25:22 29:8<br>61:15,25<br>63:24<br><b>day</b> 16:2,3  | 49:7,14,20<br><b>dependent</b><br>16:25 17:2  | 31:12,14   | 62:10   |   |
| 48:13<br>56:23<br><b>onstituent</b><br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   | 39:2 40:25<br>46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11  | 61:15,25<br>63:24<br><b>day</b> 16:2,3  | <b>dependent</b><br>16:25 17:2  |  |   | draft 9:24  |
| 56:23<br><b>onstituent</b><br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4  | 46:12,21<br>46:23<br>47:11  | 63:24<br>day 16:2,3   | 16:25 17:2  | 31:25 32:2   | digonagog   |   |
| <b>onstituent</b><br>24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   | 46:23<br>47:11  | day 16:2,3  |   |  | discusses   | drinking  |
| 24:17<br>49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4  | 47:11   |   |   | 32:6,18  | 38:4,5,18   | 42:13   |
| 49:14 50:6<br>51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   |   | 16.12 25 4  | 17:5 19:5   | 44:20,21   | discussion  | driving   |
| 51:7 52:2<br>54:19 55:4   | 48:10   | 16:13 25:4  | depending   | 45:2,3,7,12  | 55:7  | 25:21,23  |
| 54:19 55:4  |   | 33:24   | 24:16 54:7  | 45:15,18   | dispersion  | <b>drop</b> 16:6  |
|   | 49:24 52:2  | <b>deal</b> 27:8  | depends   | 46:6 47:13   | 26:4,9,10   | 30:15   |
|   | 53:14   | decades   | 57:15   | 47:16,16   | 26:11,16  | due 30:17   |
| onstituents   | 54:14 58:2  | 30:19 31:8  | deposition  | 47:16  | 26:21,22  | 62:9  |
| 24:2,14   | 58:7,16   | decide 39:17  | 1:18 4:4  | 48:14 54:1   | 26:24 27:1  | duly 5:16   |
| 37:16 39:1  | 61:6 63:12  | 40:14   | 4:17 5:2,3  | diffusion-d  | 27:5,11,13  | 63:7  |
| 49:11 50:1  | CORREC  | decides   | 7:21 56:24  | 27:20 31:7   | 30:11,18  |   |
| 53:15,24  | 60:1  | 43:16   | 59:1,3  | 43:8 44:19   | 45:6 54:1   | E   |
| onstituents'  | corrections   | decline 31:3  | derived 11:4  | 46:3   | dissolved   | E 3:1,12,12   |
| 55:6  | 61:8,21,23  | 31:6  | DESCRIP   | diffusion-li   | 28:14   | <b>E-R</b> 6:2  |
| onsulting   | Corrective  | declining   | 3:13 60:2   | 47:23  | distance  | east 15:5   |
| 6:10,16   | 38:1  | 44:15,15  | destroyed   | diffusions   | 21:2  | 22:19,21  |
| ontacted  | counsel 4:4   | 46:4 50:6   | 54:17   | 56:6   | distribution  | 23:7 24:25  |
| 57:1  | 5:6 63:20   | 50:12 51:3  | determina   | diffusive  | 44:14   | 29:5,24   |
| ontamina  | <b>couple</b> 12:13   | 51:8,16   | 49:22   | 30:5,7   | 51:10   | 35:15   |
| 24:11   | 32:3 51:13  | 52:2,7,11   | determine   | dilution   | DISTRICT  | eastward  |
| ontent 36:2   | course 30:8   | decrease  | 31:25   | 26:16  | 1:1   | 22:15   |
| 36:8,20   | <b>court</b> 1:1  | 39:19   | 32:18   | 42:11  | divide 21:2,9   | easy 32:4   |
| ontinue   | 2:12 4:22   | DEFEND  | 40:17   | direction  | DIVISION  | ecological  |
|   | 5:11,17   | 2:9   | 46:10,13  | 12:25 14:1   | 1:5   | 54:20   |
| 57:13   |   | defer 57:17   |   | 14:2,3,3,7   | <b>DNR</b> 43:16  | edit 9:25   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | either 7:7  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 11:16   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | elevation   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 12:23   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 14:11 15:9  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 21:14   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 25:21   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | Email 2:7,13  |
|   | D   |   |   |  |   | emeritus 6:8  |
|   | <b>D</b> 2:11 3:1   |   |   |  |   | empirical   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 13:16   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | employed  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 6:7 9:13  |
|   |   |   |   |  | 0   | employee  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 9:16  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | ensure 48:3   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | entire 44:14  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | entirety  |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 21:11   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | entitled 7:19   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | environment   |
|   |   |   |   |  |   | 14:6 27:20  |
| 11.11 13.4  | 23.13   | uchoteu   | 20.10,20  | 10.13,10   | 7.12,13,18  | 14.0 27:20  |
|   | 53:15,24<br><b>onstituents'</b><br>55:6<br><b>onsulting</b><br>6:10,16<br><b>ontacted</b><br>57:1<br><b>ontamina</b><br>24:11<br><b>ontent</b> 36:2<br>36:8,20<br><b>ontinue</b><br>31:3 51:1 | 53:15,24 $60:1$ onstituents'corrections55:6 $61:8,21,23$ onsultingCorrective $6:10,16$ $38:1$ ontactedcounsel 4:4 $57:1$ $5:6 63:20$ ontaminacouple 12:13 $24:11$ $32:3 51:13$ ontent 36:2course 30:8 $36:8,20$ court 1:1ontinue $2:12 4:22$ $31:3 51:1$ $5:11,17$ $57:13$ $62:2,13$ ontinue $2:12 4:22$ $31:3 51:1$ $5:11,17$ $57:13$ $62:2,13$ ontinuouslycover 9:7,8 $31:6$ createsontour $33:12$ $12:24$ criteria $14:11$ $48:18 49:4$ ontourscurrently $21:2,3$ $6:7 44:13$ ontractual $63:17$ $50:1,20$ $3:12$ ontrolled $D 2:11 3:1$ $50:1,20$ $3:12$ ontrolling $DAF 43:22$ $28:1 30:1$ $Darcy's$ $13:15,17$ $15:10$ $21:11$ $0ASCHB$ $299$ $2:4$ ore $10:20$ $62:14$ orectdata 8:20 $10:14,15$ $9:23 18:5$ | 53:15,2460:143:16onstituents'correctionsdecline 31:355:6 $61:8,21,23$ $31:6$ onsultingCorrectivedeclining $6:10,16$ $38:1$ $44:15,15$ ontactedcounsel 4:446:4 50:6 $57:1$ $5:6 63:20$ $50:12 51:3$ ontaminacouple 12:13 $51:8,16$ $24:11$ $32:3 51:13$ $52:2,7,11$ ontent $36:2$ course $30:8$ decrease $36:8,20$ court 1:1 $39:19$ ontinue $2:12 4:22$ DEFEND $31:3 51:1$ $5:11,17$ $2:9$ $57:13$ $62:2,13$ defined $62:4$ $31:6$ creates $63:18$ ontour $33:12$ defining $12:24$ criteria $28:11$ $14:11$ $48:18 49:4$ Definitely $20:13$ $21:2,3$ $6:7 44:13$ $6:7 44:13$ definition $42:2$ $63:17$ $D$ $0$ $2:11 3:1$ $55:6$ $50:1,20$ $3:12$ degradabil $51:10$ $21:11$ $55:3$ $0oley 10:22$ $DASCHB$ $degrade$ $0:20$ $62:14$ $49:13$ $0:20$ $62:14$ $49:13$ $0:20$ $62:14$ $49:13$ | 53:15,2460:143:1659:1,3onstituents'correctionsdecline 31:3derived 11:455:661:8,21,2331:6DESCRIPonsultingCorrectivedeclining3:13 60:26:10,1638:144:15,15destroyedontactedcounsel 4:446:4 50:654:1757:15:6 63:2050:12 51:3determinaontantiancouple 12:1351:8,1649:2224:1132:3 51:1352:2,7,11determineontent 36:2course 30:8decrease31:2536:8,20court 1:139:1932:18ontinue2:12 4:22DEFEND40:1731:3 51:15:11,172:946:10,1357:1362:2,13defined 62:417:2031:6creates63:18determinedontinuouslycover 9:7,8defined 62:417:2031:6creates63:18determiningontour33:12definiton45:15ontour3:12definition45:15ontactualD2:11 3:155:643:9 46:750:1,203:12degradation46:16,16ontrollingDAF 43:2253:16,2046:19,2028:1 30:1Darcy's53:23 54:547:8 48:16onversation13:15,1754:13,15different15:1021:1155:314:25ooley 10:22DASCHBdegrade15:23,25opy 9:42:454:10< | 53:15,2460:143:1659:1,343:8 44:19onstituents'correctionsdecline 31:3derived 11:446:355:661:8,21,2331:6DESCRIPdiffusion-lionsultingCorrectivedeclining31:3 60:247:236:10,1638:144:15,15destroyeddiffusionsontactedcounsel 4:446:4 50:654:1756:657:15:6 63:2050:12 51:3determinadiffusionontaminacouple 12:1351:8,1649:2230:5,724:1132:3 51:1352:2,7,11determinedilutionontant 36:2course 30:8decrease31:2526:1636:8,20court 1:139:1932:1842:11ontinue2:12 4:22DEFEND40:17direction31:3 51:15:11,172:946:10,1312:25 14:157:1362:2,13defer 57:17determined14:2,3,3,7ontinuouslycover 9:7,8defined 62:417:2014:9,15,1831:6creates63:18determining14:19,21ontour33:12definitely58:1415:18,2212:24criteria28:11developed14:22,514:1148:18 49:4Definitely58:1415:18,2212:236:7 44:13definition45:1515:25 16:9ontractual $$ | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$                           |



| Page 66 |
|---------|
|---------|

| 31:7 43:9    | exception    | favorable         | 14:18,24            | general             | 44:11,16     | 27:21 28:6    | horizontal  |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| 44:19 46:3   | 61:7         | 55:3 56:1         | 15:22,25            | 24:14 25:7          | 44:17,20     | 28:13,14      | 11:1,4      |
| 54:8,9       | Excuse 31:5  | feature           | fluid 35:23         | 25:16               | 45:6,15      | 28:15 29:2    | 12:4 13:1   |
| Environm     | exhibit 3:14 | 34:17             | fluids 33:11        | generally           | 46:5 47:18   | 29:6 31:3     | hour 36:24  |
| 41:11        | 3:15,16,17   | Federal 62:4      | focused             | 36:7                | 47:21,22     | 40:6 42:9     | Huddell 2:4 |
| EPA 37:22    | 3:18 6:22    | feeding 51:4      | 34:13               | geochemical         | 48:14        | 42:20         | 2:4 3:3 5:8 |
| 37:25        | 6:23 8:25    | feel 46:1,13      | follow 38:8         | 54:11               | 50:17,17     | 43:23         | 5:8,19      |
| 42:13        | 9:2 20:4,4   | 47:5              | followed            | geologic            | 50:19,21     | 44:23         | 6:20,24     |
| ERM 54:25    | 20:6,8       | feet 13:10,14     | 49:5                | 11:20               | 50:25 51:2   | 46:18         | 7:18,23     |
| ESQUIRE      | 34:2 38:14   | 13:22 14:4        | FOLLOWS             | 12:17 14:6          | 51:17        | 49:12         | 8:1,5,11,12 |
| 2:4,5,10,11  | 38:15        | 14:8 15:3         | 5:18                | geology             | 52:19 53:6   | 55:15         | 8:24 9:3    |
| 2:11,12      | 56:13,15     | 15:5 21:19        | force 25:21         | 18:13               | 53:8,24      | 57:20,22      | 10:5,7      |
| estimate     | expanding    | 23:5,12           | 25:23               | 32:15 40:4          | 57:7 59:1    | 58:5,14,20    | 18:3 19:20  |
| 21:13,14     | 50:8 51:7    | 25:20,20          | forced 35:10        |                     | good 5:20    | guess 20:19   | 20:3,6,9    |
|              | 51:12        | 29:6              |                     | geometric           | 57:6         |               | 20:3,0,9    |
| 29:18 32:2   |              |                   | foregoing           | 11:1,3              |              | 22:6 35:2     |             |
| 32:14,16     | expect 12:9  | figure 19:23      | 61:5 63:9           | getting 8:9         | gotten 20:17 | 55:13 56:2    | 24:20 25:9  |
| 48:10        | 23:3,18      | 19:23             | form 4:15           | 29:21               | grab 8:1,5   | guidelines    | 30:12 34:1  |
| estimated    | 24:24        | 20:16 30:4        | 17:25               | give 37:23          | gradient     | 63:15         | 34:5,8,9,25 |
| 13:9 21:18   | 28:19        | 30:6 34:1         | 19:15               | 52:5                | 13:2,5,19    | н             | 35:3 36:21  |
| 32:8         | 29:23 54:5   | 36:13             | 21:25 24:4          | given 16:12         | 13:25        |               | 37:2,9      |
| estimates    | expected     | figures 19:21     | 24:13 25:1          | 16:13 30:4          | 14:10        | <b>H</b> 3:12 | 38:12,16    |
| 48:3         | 12:14        | 19:22 20:7        | 30:3 33:17          | 31:7 32:2           | 20:17,24     | happens       | 38:22,24    |
| ET 1:7       | 40:12        | filing 4:11       | 36:15 41:3          | 32:14 40:5          | 20:25 21:3   | 45:9          | 41:9,22     |
| evaluated    | experience   | <b>find</b> 8:6,7 | 41:19,25            | 43:8                | 21:5,7,12    | Harding       | 42:5 47:7   |
| 40:16 48:5   | 39:22        | finding           | 46:22 47:2          | <b>go</b> 7:10 10:5 | 21:15 22:9   | 2:12          | 48:21,23    |
| evaluations  | 47:15 52:4   | 24:22             | 51:9 52:3           | 15:8,18,21          | 23:10        | head 23:9     | 49:2 51:22  |
| 55:1         | expert 7:21  | 36:11             | 52:17               | 19:23               | 26:18        | 35:6 52:10    | 52:13,23    |
| evidence     | explain 33:8 | <b>fine</b> 5:23  | 55:16 56:4          | 22:21 23:8          | 33:13        | held 5:3      | 55:19       |
| 4:18 49:9    | explained    | 52:21 53:9        | 58:8,17             | 27:16 34:1          | 35:14        | Helen 54:25   | 56:11,16    |
| 49:22        | 18:18        | first 5:16        | formalities         | 42:24               | 45:12        | help 36:13    | 57:4,12     |
| EXAMIN       | extent 50:2  | 8:13,14           | 4:10                | 53:25               | grading      | 42:4          | 58:11,21    |
| 3:2 5:19     | extremely    | 12:6 56:22        | format 63:15        | 56:17               | 25:25        | hereof 4:17   | human       |
| 6:24 8:12    | 19:18        | 56:25             | forth 63:9          | goal 43:3,13        | great 8:11   | hereto 4:4    | 54:20       |
| 9:3 10:7     |              | five 8:17         | forward             | 43:22               | groundwat    | 63:21         | hydraulic   |
| 18:3 20:9    | F            | 49:23             | 39:10               | 53:11               | 12:5,21,23   | HET 9:7       | 10:10 11:2  |
| 22:3 24:8    | factor 19:6  | <b>flip</b> 34:11 | 44:16 45:3          | 57:14 58:5          | 12:25 13:9   | 10:14,19      | 11:4,20     |
| 24:20 25:9   | 19:12        | flipping          | 47:16,18            | 58:13               | 13:17        | 12:24         | 12:3,7,16   |
| 30:12 34:9   | 24:11        | 37:21             | 51:2                | goals 40:23         | 14:11 15:9   | 33:21 39:8    | 12:17 13:2  |
| 35:3 36:21   | 42:11        | <b>flood</b> 16:6 | found 24:2          | 40:24 41:6          | 15:21,24     | 39:13,14      | 13:18,19    |
| 37:9 38:16   | 45:14        | flow 12:5,21      | 29:22               | 41:14,15            | 16:8,16,19   | 40:10         | 13:23,25    |
| 38:24 41:9   | fair 23:1    | 12:25             | 32:21               | 42:8 57:19          | 16:21,25     | 42:10,17      | 20:17,24    |
| 41:22 42:5   | familiar     | 15:12,13          | four 7:22           | 57:21               | 17:5 18:8    | 43:21         | 20:25 21:3  |
| 47:7 49:2    | 38:21        | 16:8,15,16        | 53:2                | goes 54:17          | 18:15 19:2   | 54:23,25      | 21:5,8,12   |
| 51:22        | FAMILY       | 16:19,21          | frequency           | going 7:8           | 19:5,10,12   | 57:19,22      | 21:15 23:9  |
| 52:13,23     | 1:7          | 16:25 17:5        | 39:20               | 12:21               | 19:17        | 58:13         | 33:12,13    |
| 55:19        | far 29:4     | 18:15,23          | full 5:24           | 14:17               | 20:18,24     | HET's 8:21    | 35:6,12,14  |
| 56:16        | 55:25        | 19:2,5,10         | function            | 15:15               | 21:6,13,18   | high 44:24    | 40:5        |
| 57:12        | fast 12:21   | 19:12             | 51:20               | 18:11               | 21:24 22:8   | 44:25         | hydrodyna   |
| 58:11        | 29:14        | 21:24             | further 23:6        | 19:18               | 22:25 23:4   | 50:13         | 26:22       |
| example      | faster 29:1  | 22:15,19          | 53:8                | 23:15 26:3          | 23:21,23     | higher 12:14  | 27:11,12    |
| 16:5 24:21   | 33:14 43:6   | 23:18,21          | <b>future</b> 40:12 | 26:14 28:7          | 23:25 24:2   | 33:6 45:1     | hydrogeol   |
| 54:2,4       | 45:20        | 23:24 25:7        | 44:14               | 29:24 31:2          | 24:10,12     | highest       | 16:20       |
| exceed 42:21 | fate 28:1    | 25:8,11           |                     | 31:5 33:11          | 24:15,16     | 50:14         | hydrogeol   |
| 43:22        | 30:2         | flowing           | G                   | 37:4 43:17          | 26:2,13      | home 6:6      | 27:3        |
|              | 50.2         |                   |                     | 27.1.10.17          | _0.2,10      |               | _,          |
|              |              |                   |                     |                     |              |               |             |



| LAYE U/ |
|---------|
|---------|

| hydrolysis  | interested  | Kingston 6:4  | lands 28:4  | liter 24:23   | 63:18,25   | mechanism  | <b>MNA</b> 16:25  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 54:3  | 63:21   | 6:6,9   | large 33:15   | 29:23   | low 12:17  | 26:11,12   | 17:2,7  |
| hypothetical  | interrupting  | know 7:12   | law 4:7   | 30:14,16  | 40:3,5,6   | 28:1,2,18  | 19:4,7,9,13   |
| 15:7  | 20:16   | 10:16,22  | 13:15,17  | 36:10,12  | lower 12:10  | 30:1,11  | 37:11,13  |
| 10.7  | introduce   | 16:12,22  | 21:12   | 42:15,18  | 36:19  | 33:1 56:8  | 37:19 38:5  |
| I   | 5:6   | 18:7 23:7   | layers 11:6   | 42:21   | 37:15  | mechanisms   | 38:6 40:16  |
| Iberville   | introduced  | 23:11   | 12:12   | 43:18,20  | 45:10  | 35:9   | 40:20 41:4  |
| 10:2  | 28:11   | 25:16 26:1  | LDNR 39:17  | 43:24 44:4  | LT-1 35:1  | medium   | 41:12 43:2  |
| <b>ICON</b> 11:23   | 44:23   | 28:3 29:4   | 40:14   | 44:5,5,6  | 36:12,17   | 32:7   | 43:6,10,14  |
| 12:24   | invoice   | 29:6 30:9   | 52:20 53:4  | 45:22   | lump 27:7,9  | meet 40:23   | 43:16   |
| 33:21 43:7  | 56:18,22  | 31:1,19   | 53:6,8  | 46:11   |  | 41:13  | 44:11,17  |
| 43:19   | invoices 3:18   | 32:15   | leads 20:18   | 53:11   | Μ  | meeting  | 45:16,20  |
| identical   | 8:6 56:14   | 33:15   | 26:16   | literature  | magnitude  | 34:12  | 45:22 46:6  |
| 20:1  | involved  | 35:16,23  | leaking   | 32:1 37:18  | 12:13,13   | members  | 46:8,11,17  |
| identificati  | 8:13,14   | 35:24 36:2  | 35:25   | little 34:12  | 21:1   | 54:23  | 47:9,10,14  |
| 55:7  | 10:2  | 36:7 39:18  | leave 42:15   | live 6:4  | main 16:22   | memorized  | 47:19   |
| identified  | <b>IPSB</b> 10:13   | 40:2,4  | left 34:17  | LLC 1:7 2:4   | making 7:8   | 26:1   | 48:10,15  |
| 6:23 9:2  | 11:6,24   | 43:16 44:9  | 62:16   | loading   | map 21:5,8   | mentioned  | 53:1 57:13  |
| 20:8 38:15  | 12:1 18:2   | 44:24,25  | let's 7:11  | 35:13 52:8  | 21:12,14   | 11:15  | 58:2,6,15   |
| 56:15   | 18:12,16  | 46:7 47:14  | 10:5 18:4   | location 16:9   | maps 12:24   | 14:12  | 58:19   |
| 57:22   | 18:20,23  | 47:14,19  | 22:4 26:11  | locations   | 14:11 15:9   | 50:15  | molecular   |
| impact 23:21  | 19:1 22:17  | 51:6 53:23  | 29:22   | 16:14 23:7  | mark 6:21  | 55:12  | 32:3  |
| 23:21   | 22:18 23:1  | 54:12   | 34:23   | logs 12:19  | 8:24 38:14   | met 57:14,20   | molecules   |
| impacted  | 27:13   | knowing   | 36:22   | long 30:15  | 56:13  | method   | 51:13   |
| 40:11   | 32:23 33:2  | 36:16   | 38:12   | 35:16   | <b>MARY</b> 1:2  | 62:13  | monitor 39:9  |
| impacting   | 33:16,18  | knowledge   | 41:21 53:3  | 36:13,18  | material   | 63:11  | 39:11   |
| 49:11   |   | 32:14   | letter 56:22  | 39:11   | 62:18  | methodolo  | 51:18   |
| impacts   | J   | known 13:15   | level 11:18   | 50:23   | materials  | 19:14  | 57:14   |
| 25:16   | <b>J</b> 1:7  | Kueper 1:19   | 18:5 35:23  | longer 31:4   | 11:21  | methods  | monitored   |
| 49:17   | Jamie 2:11  | 3:14,18   | levels 25:19  | 33:16,23  | 12:22  | 8:22 48:3  | 16:23   |
| imply 54:15   | 5:10  | 5:2,15,20   | Levert 1:7  | 45:7  | mathemati  | middle 10:8  | 36:22   |
| important   | <b>John</b> 2:5,10  | 6:1,10,25   | 8:23 11:25  | look 8:20   | 26:21 27:7   | migrating  | 37:11,12  |
| 8:18 16:17  | 5:8,10  | 7:20 9:13   | 18:2,4,6,8  | 9:22,23   | matter 63:22   | 24:3   | 37:25   |
| 16:21   | 46:24   | 34:10   | 18:12,16  | 12:2 15:8   | mean 11:1,3  | milligrams   | 38:19 39:4  |
| 27:18 28:5  | JONES 2:4   | 37:10   | 18:19   | 20:22 32:4  | 16:1 18:7  |  |   |
| 50:22   | ID 1 7  |   | 10.17   | 20:22 32:4  | 10.1 10.7  | 24:22  | 39:22   |
| 30.22   | <b>JR</b> 1:7   | 43:13   | 19:16 22:2  | 20:22 32:4<br>36:4 38:9   | 18:12 19:8   | 24:22<br>29:23   |   |
|   | JR 1:7<br>jtroutman   | 43:13<br>57:13 59:1   |   |   |  |  | 39:22   |
|   |   |   | 19:16 22:2  | 36:4 38:9   | 18:12 19:8   | 29:23  | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5   |
| <b>include</b><br>49:21 55:5  | jtroutman   | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6  | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13   | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9   | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1  | 29:23<br>30:14,16  | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20   |
| <b>include</b><br>49:21 55:5  | <b>jtroutman</b><br>2:13  | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4  | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21  | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14   | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning  | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21   | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18  |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13   | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1  | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4   | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14   | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8   | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18   | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18  | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12   |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13   | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K   | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6  | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21  | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14   | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning  | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21   | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br>monitoring   |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate   | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1  | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4   | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2  | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8   | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br><b>meaning</b><br>40:20  | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20   | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22  |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24  | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K   | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br>Kueper's 8:4  | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18  | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19   | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br><b>meaning</b><br>40:20<br><b>means</b> 53:23  | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3   | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16  |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15   | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4  | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><u>L</u> 3:15 4:1  | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br>LEWIS 2:10<br>limitation   | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br><b>looking</b>  | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure   | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11   | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20  |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22  | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16  | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><b>L</b> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>Iab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24   | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br><b>LEWIS</b> 2:10<br><b>limitation</b><br>46:6   | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br><b>looking</b><br>25:19 30:5  | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured<br>10:9,18,24  | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10  | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5  |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22<br>9:24 61:19  | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16<br>8:3 34:6  | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><b>L</b> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>Iab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24<br><b>Label</b> 8:3   | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br><b>LEWIS</b> 2:10<br><b>limitation</b><br>46:6<br><b>limited</b> 6:11  | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br><b>looking</b><br>25:19 30:5<br><b>lot</b> 12:20  | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured  | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10<br>mind 43:14  | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5<br><b>month</b> 16:13  |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22<br>9:24 61:19<br>input 13:18   | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16<br>8:3 34:6<br>34:24                                       | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><b>L</b> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>Iab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24<br><b>Label</b> 8:3<br><b>Iabeled</b> 8:10  | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br><b>LEWIS</b> 2:10<br><b>limitation</b><br>46:6<br><b>limited</b> 6:11<br>32:22 33:3                              | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br>looked 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br>looking<br>25:19 30:5<br>lot 12:20<br>28:6 36:19   | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured<br>10:9,18,24<br>21:15<br>measurem   | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10<br>mind 43:14<br>mine 42:2   | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5<br><b>month</b> 16:13<br><b>months</b> 8:17  |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22<br>9:24 61:19<br>input 13:18<br>13:20  | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16<br>8:3 34:6<br>34:24<br>36:24                              | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><u>L</u> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>lab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24<br><b>Label</b> 8:3<br><b>labeled</b> 8:10<br><b>Laboratory</b>   | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br>LEWIS 2:10<br>limitation<br>46:6<br>limited 6:11<br>32:22 33:3<br>LINE 60:2                                      | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br>looked 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br>looking<br>25:19 30:5<br>lot 12:20<br>28:6 36:19<br>40:2 43:9  | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured<br>10:9,18,24<br>21:15<br>measurem<br>13:6,22                                    | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10<br>mind 43:14<br>mine 42:2<br>minus 25:20  | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5<br><b>month</b> 16:13<br><b>months</b> 8:17<br>15:2,4                                    |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22<br>9:24 61:19<br>input 13:18<br>13:20<br>inside 11:18                                | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16<br>8:3 34:6<br>34:24<br>36:24<br>58:23                     | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><b>L</b><br><b>L</b> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>Iab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24<br><b>Label</b> 8:3<br><b>Iabeled</b> 8:10<br><b>Laboratory</b><br>10:9                             | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br>LEWIS 2:10<br>limitation<br>46:6<br>limited 6:11<br>32:22 33:3<br>LINE 60:2<br>Liskow 2:10                       | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br><b>looked</b> 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br><b>looking</b><br>25:19 30:5<br><b>lot</b> 12:20<br>28:6 36:19<br>40:2 43:9<br><b>Louisiana</b> | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured<br>10:9,18,24<br>21:15<br>measurem<br>13:6,22<br>mechanic                        | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10<br>mind 43:14<br>mine 42:2<br>minus 25:20<br>25:20                                 | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5<br><b>month</b> 16:13<br><b>months</b> 8:17<br>15:2,4<br>56:25                           |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22<br>9:24 61:19<br>input 13:18<br>13:20<br>inside 11:18<br>intact 10:23                | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16<br>8:3 34:6<br>34:24<br>36:24<br>58:23<br>key 40:8         | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><b>L</b><br><b>L</b> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>lab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24<br><b>Label</b> 8:3<br><b>labeled</b> 8:10<br><b>Laboratory</b><br>10:9<br><b>lack</b> 40:7         | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br>LEWIS 2:10<br>limitation<br>46:6<br>limited 6:11<br>32:22 33:3<br>LINE 60:2<br>Liskow 2:10<br>7:9                | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br>looked 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br>looking<br>25:19 30:5<br>lot 12:20<br>28:6 36:19<br>40:2 43:9<br>Louisiana<br>1:3 2:6,13               | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured<br>10:9,18,24<br>21:15<br>measurem<br>13:6,22<br>mechanic<br>26:15               | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10<br>mind 43:14<br>mine 42:2<br>minus 25:20<br>25:20<br>minutes 37:3                 | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5<br><b>month</b> 16:13<br><b>months</b> 8:17<br>15:2,4<br>56:25<br><b>morning</b>         |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22<br>9:24 61:19<br>input 13:18<br>13:20<br>inside 11:18<br>intact 10:23<br>intent 16:3 | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16<br>8:3 34:6<br>34:24<br>36:24<br>58:23<br>key 40:8<br>43:6 | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><b>L</b> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>lab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24<br><b>Label</b> 8:3<br><b>labeled</b> 8:10<br><b>Laboratory</b><br>10:9<br><b>lack</b> 40:7<br><b>Lafayette</b> | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br>LEWIS 2:10<br>limitation<br>46:6<br>limited 6:11<br>32:22 33:3<br>LINE 60:2<br>Liskow 2:10<br>7:9<br>list 7:8,19 | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br>looked 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br>looking<br>25:19 30:5<br>lot 12:20<br>28:6 36:19<br>40:2 43:9<br>Louisiana<br>1:3 2:6,13<br>4:6,23     | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured<br>10:9,18,24<br>21:15<br>measurem<br>13:6,22<br>mechanic<br>26:15<br>mechanical | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10<br>mind 43:14<br>mine 42:2<br>minus 25:20<br>25:20<br>minutes 37:3<br>mirror 22:16 | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5<br><b>month</b> 16:13<br><b>months</b> 8:17<br>15:2,4<br>56:25<br><b>morning</b><br>5:20 |
| include<br>49:21 55:5<br>increases<br>33:13<br>indicate<br>12:24<br>29:10<br>62:11,15<br>indicated 5:4<br>initial 9:22<br>9:24 61:19<br>input 13:18   | jtroutman<br>2:13<br>JUDICIAL<br>1:1<br>K-U-E-P 6:1<br>keep 50:17<br>Kevin 2:4<br>5:8 7:16<br>8:3 34:6<br>34:24<br>36:24<br>58:23<br>key 40:8         | 57:13 59:1<br>60:23 61:4<br>61:15 63:6<br><b>Kueper's</b> 8:4<br><b>L</b><br><b>L</b> 3:15 4:1<br>8:25<br><b>lab</b> 10:18,21<br>10:23,24<br><b>Label</b> 8:3<br><b>labeled</b> 8:10<br><b>Laboratory</b><br>10:9<br><b>lack</b> 40:7         | 19:16 22:2<br>22:4,9,13<br>22:25<br>27:14<br>28:21<br>29:25 33:2<br>35:11,18<br>51:8,11<br>LEWIS 2:10<br>limitation<br>46:6<br>limited 6:11<br>32:22 33:3<br>LINE 60:2<br>Liskow 2:10<br>7:9                | 36:4 38:9<br>39:5,9<br>42:10<br>looked 20:11<br>20:13,14<br>21:21 22:8<br>43:18,19<br>44:3,4,5,7<br>54:22<br>looking<br>25:19 30:5<br>lot 12:20<br>28:6 36:19<br>40:2 43:9<br>Louisiana<br>1:3 2:6,13               | 18:12 19:8<br>23:9 31:1<br>42:25 44:7<br>50:18<br>meaning<br>40:20<br>means 53:23<br>measure<br>51:20<br>measured<br>10:9,18,24<br>21:15<br>measurem<br>13:6,22<br>mechanic<br>26:15               | 29:23<br>30:14,16<br>36:10,12<br>42:14,18<br>42:21<br>43:18,20<br>43:24 44:3<br>44:4,5,6<br>45:22<br>46:11<br>53:10<br>mind 43:14<br>mine 42:2<br>minus 25:20<br>25:20<br>minutes 37:3                 | 39:22<br>40:22 49:5<br>49:9,10,20<br>51:18<br>53:12<br><b>monitoring</b><br>11:5,17,22<br>12:11 23:4<br>39:5,8,24<br>50:16<br>52:16,20<br>52:25 53:5<br><b>month</b> 16:13<br><b>months</b> 8:17<br>15:2,4<br>56:25<br><b>morning</b>         |



| Page | 68 |
|------|----|
| LUYC | 00 |

| -                   |                |                     |             |                    |                   |               | - )                   |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| maya 24.11          | 53:20 54:5     |                     | 17.10 19.5  | 63:19              | 51:18             |               |                       |
| <b>move</b> 24:11   |                | 0                   | 17:19 18:5  |                    |                   | plume 50:5    | primary<br>30:1 37:20 |
| 24:15 30:9          | 54:13 55:3     | <b>O</b> 4:1        | 18:7,17,22  | opposite           | particular        | 50:12,25      |                       |
| 35:10,17            | 55:9,22        | oath 4:24           | 19:1,4      | 15:18,21           | 10:8 15:22        | 51:15         | 39:1                  |
| 39:9 56:10          | 56:8           | 63:6                | 20:3,19,25  | 16:3               | 16:9 17:23        | plus 26:21    | probably              |
| moved 22:7          | naturally      | object 17:25        | 21:4,17     | order 8:17         | 25:4 29:8         | point 16:13   | 22:20                 |
| movement            | 49:15          | 19:15               | 22:5,6,18   | 30:19 31:8         | 40:5 50:16        | 29:10         | 23:15 36:5            |
| 24:24               | necessarily    | 21:25 24:4          | 22:24 23:3  | 44:18              | 57:15 58:3        | 34:20,21      | problem               |
| 28:19 30:6          | 57:18          | 24:13 25:1          | 23:24       | 50:16              | parties 4:4       | 43:21         | 55:18                 |
| 30:7 33:10          | necessary      | 30:3 33:17          | 24:21       | 56:25              | 63:21             | 45:17         | problems              |
| <b>moves</b> 16:2,2 | 58:2,6         | 36:15 41:3          | 25:10 26:2  | orders 12:13       | Paul 6:2          | 50:19 51:3    | 55:12                 |
| 24:19               | need 8:18      | 41:19,25            | 26:10       | organic 54:7       | pauses 62:11      | pointer       | Procedure             |
| 26:14               | 29:19,19       | 42:3,6              | 27:16 28:8  | organics           | <b>PDF</b> 10:5   | 34:20         | 4:7 62:5,6            |
| 28:14,15            | 31:1,9,11      | 46:22 47:1          | 28:10,17    | 54:4,10            | 19:24 34:6        | ponds 52:9    | 63:18                 |
| moving              | 31:12,14       | 51:9 52:3           | 29:1,4,13   | original 63:3      | 34:8 38:23        | pore-scale    | proceeding            |
| 19:17 23:5          | 31:16,17       | 52:17               | 29:21       | 63:4               | people 27:5       | 26:14         | 62:10,14              |
| 23:6 25:5           | 31:19,22       | 55:16 56:4          | 30:20 31:9  | <b>Orleans</b> 2:6 | performed         | porosity      | process               |
| 26:3 29:8           | 31:24 32:5     | 58:8,17             | 31:14,15    | OSWER              | 11:23,24          | 21:10         | 27:23                 |
| 29:11,24            | 32:7,17        | objections          | 31:21,24    | 38:2               | permeability      | porous 32:7   | 40:18,21              |
| 33:14               | 35:21,23       | 4:14,14             | 32:17       | outcome            | 40:4              | portion       | 45:19                 |
| 51:13               | 46:1,13        | obscure 7:24        | 34:16,22    | 63:22              | permitted         | 15:23,24      | 47:17,23              |
| multiplied          | 47:5,13,18     | <b>obtain</b> 40:24 | 35:8,16     | outlined           | 4:6               | portions      | 54:6 55:21            |
| 21:8                | 47:23          | 41:6,15             | 36:22       | 35:4               | <b>Peter</b> 38:3 | 28:3          | 55:23                 |
| multiply            | 53:12          | occur 26:18         | 37:17 38:8  | overall 12:15      |                   | Possibly      | processes             |
| 42:12,16            | negative       | 44:20               | 38:12,22    | 14:5 15:22         | 62:19             | 46:1          | 24:18 27:4            |
| <b>MW4</b> 23:4     | 10:11,12       | 52:25               | 38:25       | 25:16 28:5         | photo 34:4        | posted 23:11  | 30:17                 |
| 23:14               | 11:8,9         | occurring           | 41:10,18    |                    | 34:18             | potential     | 37:14                 |
| 24:23 25:3          | <b>new</b> 2:6 | 26:20 45:4          | 41:23 42:6  | P                  | phrase 62:19      | 24:11         | 40:17                 |
| 28:21 29:5          | 28:11          | 55:21               | 42:22 44:3  | <b>P</b> 4:1       | phrases           | 55:24         | 53:16,21              |
| 29:9,22             | north 22:22    | occurs 26:12        | 44:22 49:3  | page 3:2,13        | 62:15             | potentiom     | 54:2,3,13             |
| 30:14               | northern       | 26:13               | 51:23       | 7:7,7,11           | physically        | 21:4 24:23    | produced              |
| <b>MW5</b> 23:4     | 22:8,13        | October             | 52:14,24    | 9:6,7,8            | 6:5               | Poydras 2:5   | 36:3,8,20             |
| 23:14               | northwest      | 20:20 25:4          | 53:15,19    | 10:6 19:24         | physics 17:9      | practicabil   | 37:23                 |
| 28:21               | 35:2           | 25:12               | 54:12,19    | 34:8 38:23         | pinpoint          | 50:3          | 50:13                 |
| MYERS               | noted 61:21    | 28:22 33:7          | 55:2,20,25  | 47:25 60:2         | 29:9              | practice 6:16 | product               |
| 2:24                | notice 4:8     | 57:2                | 57:2 58:4   | 62:1 63:4          | pit 31:5          | predomina     | 21:10                 |
|                     | November       | offered 48:2        | ones 37:20  | pages 48:24        | 32:24             | 22:19         | production            |
| <u> </u>            | 1:21 5:4       | office 6:6          | Ontario 6:4 | 63:9               | 33:15,18          | predomina     | 1:9 5:13              |
| N 3:1,12 4:1        | 60:24          | officer 62:4        | open 19:25  | paragraph          | 34:17 35:2        | 11:6 12:12    | 8:4                   |
| name 5:24           | 61:25          | officiated          | 48:25       | 10:9               | 35:5,8,18         | 25:14         | profession            |
| names 62:17         | number 34:7    | 4:24                | operating   | paragraphs         | 35:24 36:1        | prepared      | 13:17                 |
| NAPL 50:2           | 36:19 43:4     | oh 7:11,18          | 31:5 33:6   | 9:24               | 36:3              | 9:20 12:24    | professor             |
| natural             | 43:11,15       | 7:23 34:22          | 33:23       | parameter          | pits 33:5,9       | 63:11,14      | 6:8                   |
| 16:23               | 43:19          | 48:23               | 35:19 45:8  | 13:18,20           | 33:11 45:7        | presented     | program               |
| 30:17               | 49:25 50:5     | okay 6:7 7:3        | opinion     | 32:13              | 50:20             | 48:18 49:4    | 49:21                 |
| 36:23               | 50:15          | 7:15,18             | 16:22 45:5  | pardon             | 52:10             | preserved     | prohibition           |
| 37:11,12            | 53:15          | 8:5,11,24           | 46:9 52:6   | 13:20              | place 53:7        | 10:20         | 63:17                 |
| 37:14 38:1          | 54:19 55:2     | 9:11,17,21          | 52:11,18    | 20:15              | Plaintiffs 2:3    | pretty 18:10  | proper 62:13          |
| 38:19 39:4          | numbers        | 10:5,25             | opinions    | 28:10 52:9         | 5:9               | 23:15,18      | property              |
| 39:23               | 12:9,15        | 11:2,12             | 8:21 9:17   | Parish 1:2         | <b>plan</b> 39:8  | prevents      | 8:23 10:13            |
| 40:22 49:6          | 23:11          | 12:2 13:8           | 16:18       | 10:3               | 43:7              | 55:24         | 11:7,24,25            |
| 49:10,10            | 33:24          | 13:21,25            | 20:11       | part 4:17 7:5      | <b>plans</b> 49:6 | previous      | 12:1 22:9             |
| 49:21               | 42:16          | 14:7,17,20          | 29:20       | 14:23,24           | please 5:6,24     | 12:8 14:12    | 22:10,12              |
| 51:19               | 44:10          | 15:2 16:17          | 32:20       | 22:9,13            | 9:7 47:6          | 14:14         | 22:17,18              |
| 53:12,16            | 50:17,18       | 17:2,14,16          | 37:19 38:9  | 27:6 28:20         | 58:10             | 46:15         | 22:22 23:1            |
| -                   |                | 1,.2,17,10          |             |                    |                   |               |                       |
|                     |                |                     |             |                    |                   |               |                       |



| 23:1 27:13                   | 47:2,6               | 55:24                     | 57:21 58:5                | 52:5                       | 48:9 49:7               | sealing 4:11                | shallow                 |
|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 27:14                        | 58:10                | RECESS                    | 58:13                     | reserved                   | 49:18,23                | season 16:14                | 12:25 13:8              |
| 28:20,21                     | questions            | 37:6 57:9                 | remediation               | 4:16                       | 50:3,9                  | seasonally                  | 21:17                   |
| 29:25                        | 58:22,24             | recommen                  | 8:22 37:13                | reside 6:3                 | 51:8,24                 | 16:5                        | share 56:11             |
| 32:24 33:2                   | quickly              | 58:6,15                   | remedy 38:6               | respect 6:12               | 52:12,16                | second 10:9                 | <b>SHEET</b> 60:1       |
| 33:2,16,19                   | 24:19                | recommen                  | remember                  | 19:6 20:23                 | 53:7,17                 | 10:12,13                    | shocked                 |
| 35:11,18                     | 56:17                | 43:14                     | 7:5,8,13                  | 28:17                      | 54:6,15,24              | 11:8,9                      | 18:14                   |
| 51:8,11                      | <b>quite</b> 38:7    | 52:24                     | 17:9 20:3                 | 37:19 39:3                 | 55:10 56:3              | 37:24                       | 51:11                   |
| proposal                     | R                    | recommends                | 33:20,23                  | response                   | 57:3,25                 | 56:12                       | <b>short</b> 36:25      |
| 48:5                         |                      | 53:8                      | 41:5 51:14                | 26:17                      | 58:21                   | secondary                   | shortly 8:9             |
| <b>proposed</b> 39:8,13      | <b>R.S</b> 63:8      | <b>recontami</b><br>55:14 | <b>remove</b><br>11:16    | responsive<br>4:15         | risk 39:16<br>40:9 55:1 | 42:13,13<br>Section         | <b>show</b> 20:23 50:11 |
| proposing                    | ranged<br>10:10 11:7 | record 5:25               | removed                   | restate 19:11              | risks 54:21             | 38:19                       | showing                 |
| 42:18                        | rate 11:19           | 37:5,7                    | 31:4 51:15                | 23:22                      | role 6:12               | Sections                    | 20:2                    |
| propriety                    | 15:4,16,17           | 57:8,11                   | 52:1,8                    | result 54:21               | <b>RPR</b> 2:25         | 48:18 49:4                  | side 34:17              |
| 19:7,8                       | 15:18                | 59:2 62:8                 | removed/c                 | résumé 3:14                | 4:22 60:25              | see 7:11,15                 | signature               |
| provide 8:20                 | 28:16                | recover                   | 50:2                      | 6:21 7:1,3                 | 62:24 63:5              | 9:7 22:16                   | 63:3                    |
| provide 8.20<br>provided 7:9 | 29:25                | 11:18                     | repeat 47:5               | 7:6                        | 63:24 05.5              | 22:22                       | signatures              |
| <b>pull</b> 6:20             | 51:12                | recovery                  | report 8:21               | retained                   | Rule 62:4               | 25:17,21                    | 9:10                    |
| 19:20                        | RCRA 38:1            | 11:19                     | 9:5,18                    | 56:20                      | rules 62:5              | 34:10,11                    | signed 9:11             |
| 38:13                        | reabsorpti           | Redd-Robi                 | 10:6,21                   | retention                  | 63:15,19                | 34:20,23                    | 61:15,21                |
| pump 43:5                    | 56:2                 | 2:11 5:12                 | 21:17                     | 56:21                      | 00110,119               | 34:25                       | 61:23                   |
| 43:10,16                     | reach 45:22          | reduced                   | 33:21,21                  | reversed                   | S                       | 39:21                       | signing 4:10            |
| 44:18                        | 46:11,17             | 30:10                     | 39:15                     | 45:12                      | <b>S</b> 2:10 4:1       | 40:13,19                    | silt 12:16              |
| 45:16,19                     | 51:3                 | reduction                 | 40:10                     | review 9:25                | samples                 | 41:1,17                     | 28:4 45:13              |
| 46:4,17                      | reached 50:5         | 54:16                     | 42:10                     | Rhymes 2:11                | 10:24 12:9              | 43:5,9                      | silts 12:19             |
| 47:9,14,22                   | 50:12                | reference                 | 57:24                     | 5:11                       | sampling                | 46:16,19                    | 32:15                   |
| 48:14                        | reaching             | 10:14                     | reported                  | <b>right</b> 7:25          | 39:14                   | 47:8 48:7                   | 44:25 45:1              |
| purposes 4:6                 | 54:20                | 62:18                     | 2:25 63:10                | 8:10 11:10                 | save 4:14               | 49:8 50:4                   | 45:6,10                 |
| pursuant 4:7                 | 55:24                | referring                 | Reporter                  | 13:3,6                     | saying 25:2             | 50:10 53:3                  | 55:14 56:3              |
| <b>pushes</b> 33:13          | read 40:9            | 18:1 33:8                 | 4:23 5:17                 | 14:19,25                   | 41:12                   | 53:5,18                     | 56:6,7                  |
| put 29:20                    | 43:7 44:9            | 34:16 35:5                | 62:2                      | 15:7,13,14                 | 55:15                   | 55:11                       | <b>silty</b> 11:6       |
| 36:3 39:5                    | 58:9 61:4            | regarding                 | reporter's                | 15:15,19                   | says 21:17              | selected                    | 12:12                   |
| 39:7 41:21                   | 61:5                 | 8:21                      | 3:5 62:1                  | 17:4,8,14                  | 35:1 40:15              | 40:22                       | similar                 |
| 48:23                        | reading 4:10         | regime 24:24              | 62:13 63:1                | 17:15,24                   | 47:25                   | 41:12,13                    | 18:14,21                |
|                              | 33:20,23             | 28:6 54:11                | reporting                 | 18:13                      | 48:12                   | 46:8                        | 40:2                    |
| Q                            | 36:6                 | related                   | 63:11                     | 20:14,20                   | 49:10,19                | send 10:21                  | simply 39:5             |
| qualitative                  | really 19:18         | 63:20                     | reports 40:1              | 20:21                      | 55:5                    | sent 7:13                   | site 8:22               |
| 45:1                         | 40:8 45:17           | relationship              | REPRESE                   | 21:19                      | scenario                | sentence                    | 13:9 14:23              |
| Quality                      | 54:22                | 13:16                     | 2:3,9                     | 22:10,11                   | 58:3                    | 11:3,15                     | 14:25                   |
| 41:11                        | reasonable           | relationshi               | require                   | 22:14                      | School 10:3             | 12:8 14:13                  | 15:23,24                |
| quantify                     | 18:10 48:1           | 63:17                     | 17:12,17                  | 23:16,20                   | screen 5:5              | 14:15 16:4                  | 16:14,24                |
| 27:3                         | <b>recall</b> 36:6   | relatively                | 53:4 54:7                 | 26:4 27:2                  | 11:22 20:1              | 40:20 41:1                  | 17:23 18:2              |
| quantitati                   | 56:19                | 50:13                     | 54:8                      | 30:2 31:4                  | 34:13,19                | 41:21 42:3                  | 18:2,4,6,9              |
| 27:8                         | <b>RECAP</b> 3:17    | relying                   | required                  | 34:4,10,18                 | 37:21 49:1              | 47:25                       | 18:19,20                |
| quarterly                    | 38:4,4,8,9           | 37:18                     | 58:15,20                  | 35:8,11                    | 56:11                   | 48:11                       | 18:23 19:2              |
| 39:14,20                     | 38:13,18             | remedial                  | 63:15                     | 37:10                      | screened                | separate                    | 19:16                   |
| 40:13 53:6                   | 40:15 41:6           | 40:17,21<br>40:23         | <b>requireme</b><br>49:20 | 38:17,20<br>39:6 11 24     | 11:5,21                 | 7:12,16<br>27:4             | 21:18,24                |
| quarters                     | 41:11                | 40:25 41:14 42:8          |                           | 39:6,11,24<br>40:15 18     | 12:11                   |                             | 22:2,4,13<br>27:23,24   |
| 53:2<br>Queen's 6:8          | 49:16<br>57:25       | 43:13 48:2                | <b>requires</b><br>17:14  | 40:15,18<br>41:2,16        | screening<br>50:7       | September<br>57:3           | 31:20                   |
| question                     | receptors            | 43:13 48:2 49:13          | 21:22                     | 41:2,10                    | scroll 9:6              | set 63:9                    | 39:16 40:5              |
| 4:15 15:8                    | 40:8,11              | 53:11                     | 39:23                     | 42:7 45:25 44:2,7          | 48:20,22                | set 03:9<br>sets 12:15      | 40:18,24                |
| 24:7 31:18                   | 54:21                | 57:14,19                  | research                  | 45:25 47:4                 | <b>seal</b> 63:4        | sets 12.15<br>setting 12:18 | 40.18,24                |
| 27.7 31.10                   | JT.21                | 57.17,17                  | i cocai Cli               | <i>чэ.23 т</i> /. <b>т</b> | 5 <b>cai</b> 03.7       | seeing 12.10                | 71.2,17                 |
|                              |                      |                           |                           |                            |                         |                             |                         |



| Pag | P | 7 | $\cap$ |
|-----|---|---|--------|
| Lag |   |   | U      |

| r                         |                               |                             |                     |                          |               |                  | - )           |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| 42:9,20                   | 51:14                         | 58:13                       | 51:5                | <b>test</b> 11:16,23     | 37:16         | 48:5             | understand    |
|                           |                               |                             | 51.5                |                          |               |                  | understand    |
| 44:12                     | south 22:7                    | stronger                    | Т                   | 12:10,11                 | 44:16 45:4    | trial 7:21       | 57:24         |
| 45:14                     | 22:11,14                      | 35:14                       |                     | 13:24                    | 45:21         | Troutman         | understan     |
| 47:18                     | 25:5,14,22                    | strongly                    | <b>T</b> 3:12 4:1,1 | testified 7:4            | 46:10,14      | 2:10 5:10        | 35:7 38:18    |
| 57:16,17                  | 25:24                         | 41:18,23                    | T-O-R-T             | 7:20                     | 46:17         | 5:10 7:14        | unfavorable   |
| 57:21                     | 29:11                         | 42:2                        | 32:12               | testify 5:17             | 50:23 51:2    | 7:16,19,25       | 56:1          |
| site-specific             | southeast                     | subcompo                    | <b>Tab</b> 3:14,15  | 63:8                     | 51:17,21      | 8:3,8            | unitless 13:5 |
| 15:10                     | 22:23                         | 26:23,25                    | 3:16,17             | testimony                | 52:7,20       | 17:25            | 14:1          |
| 32:13                     | southerly                     | subject                     | 6:21 9:1            | 61:5,7                   | 53:4,8        | 19:15            | University    |
| 49:15 55:8                | 25:8                          | 45:18 46:5                  | 19:20,21            | 62:7 63:10               | time-limiti   | 21:25 24:4       | 6:9           |
| sites 18:12               | spatially                     | submission                  | 34:8 38:13          | tests 11:5,15            | 45:14         | 24:13 25:1       | upper 40:4    |
| 23:13 38:2                | 14:23 15:1                    | 7:13,17                     | take 8:20           | Thank 47:4               | timeframe     | 30:3 33:17       | use 13:23     |
| 38:7 40:1                 | speak 19:19                   | submitted                   | 21:1 22:2           | 58:23                    | 40:25 41:7    | 36:15 41:3       | 16:25 17:2    |
| 40:2 52:10                | specifically                  | 49:6                        | 30:15               | they'd 29:10             | 41:15 47:9    | 41:19,25         | 19:4 35:9     |
| 57:16                     | 4:11 25:18                    | suggest                     | 36:25               | thing 27:6               | 47:10,12      | 46:22 47:1       | 37:25 39:4    |
| situation                 | specified                     | 37:13                       | 45:21               | 27:18 31:1               | 48:1,3,10     | 48:20,22         | usually       |
| 40:10                     | 46:18                         | suggested                   | 46:11 57:4          | 43:7                     | 52:25         | 51:9 52:3        | 16:21         |
| six 8:17                  | speculate                     | 15:17                       | taken 1:20          | things 10:1              | times 10:11   | 52:17            | utilizes      |
| 56:25                     | 33:22,25                      | suitability                 | 4:5 35:17           | 20:10 32:4               | 10:12 11:7    | 55:16 56:4       | 13:17,19      |
| slight 25:23              | spell 32:11                   | 16:23                       | 60:24               | 47:17                    | 11:8          | 57:6 58:8        |               |
| slow 27:21                | spelled 62:19                 |                             | 61:25 62:7          | 49:23                    | timescale     | 58:17,23         | V             |
| 28:25                     | sponge 56:9                   | super 8:18                  | takes 9:22          | think 7:14               | 43:11,17      | <b>true</b> 61:6 | valid 63:2    |
| slow-moving               | spontaneous                   | Superfund                   | talk 9:18,23        | 8:25 9:20                | 44:18         | 63:12            | value 13:13   |
| 28:6                      | 62:10                         | 38:1                        | 25:15               | 18:10 27:5               | 45:16         | try 8:1,3        | 14:5 23:13    |
| <b>slower</b> 23:6        | ST 1:2                        | support                     | 36:22               | 27:18,21                 | timescales    | 23:24            | 42:12         |
| slowly 19:18              | standard                      | 29:20                       | talked 12:7         | 28:12                    | 48:16         | trying 7:5,23    | values 11:12  |
| slug 11:5,14              | 42:14                         | 37:18 49:9                  | 40:7 43:21          | 30:25 31:1               | today 5:21    | 8:6 17:9         | 12:10,11      |
| 11:15,23                  | 49:16 50:7                    | 49:22                       | 56:5                | 31:11                    | 6:5 8:15      | 43:11            | 13:24         |
| 12:10,10                  | standing                      | 52:14,21                    | talking             | 33:19,20                 | 33:14         | TUESDAY          | 21:16 23:9    |
| 13:24                     | 23:16                         | 55:8                        | 14:22               | 34:16 40:1               | 35:14         | 1:21             | VanTassell    |
| small 23:17               | start 15:5                    | sure 7:8 9:10               | 15:12               | 41:4 42:12               | topics 37:1   | two 12:13,15     | 2:12 5:11     |
| snapshot                  | 18:4 22:4                     | 15:20                       | 18:24               | 42:15 43:2               | tortuosity    | 16:14            | variable      |
| 20:20                     | 24:5 26:11                    | 29:18 31:2                  | 27:21               | 43:25 46:2               | 32:7,10       | 23:11            | 13:1 14:15    |
| soil 10:19                | 39:16,20                      | 33:11                       | 33:19               | 43.23 40.2<br>50:15 53:5 |               | 37:20            | 15:12 16:1    |
|                           | · · · ·                       |                             |                     |                          | touched       |                  |               |
| 49:12                     | 40:12 53:7                    | 34:12,14                    | 35:13               | 53:7 54:25               | 14:21         | 42:16 46:8       | 17:20,24      |
| solution                  | starting                      | 34:25 36:5                  | talkovers           | 57:3,5,15                | transcribed   | two-minute       | 19:1          |
| 35:25                     | 29:10                         | 37:2,12                     | 62:12               | 58:18                    | 63:12         | 57:4             | variations    |
| somewhat                  | 31:17,21                      | 41:8 56:21                  | Tank 38:2           | thinking                 | transcript    | types 10:1       | 26:15         |
| 40:2                      | 53:6                          | 58:12                       | technical           | 20:15 43:7               | 62:16 63:3    | typical 14:5     | varies 18:24  |
| sorry 19:23               | state 1:3                     | surrounding                 | 50:3                | thought                  | 63:13,14      | 23:13            | vary 14:21    |
| 21:13                     | 4:23 5:24                     | 45:2                        | technologies        | 14:20,22                 | 63:15         | 36:20            | 15:1 16:9     |
| 42:24                     | 62:3,8                        | susceptible                 | 46:8                | 62:12                    | transcripti   |                  | 16:10         |
| 46:24                     | statement                     | 53:16,20                    | <b>tell</b> 12:4,16 | thousands                | 61:6 62:14    |                  | vector 17:11  |
| 48:21                     | 47:24                         | 53:22,24                    | 36:18               | 36:9                     | travel 29:5   | U 4:1            | 17:13         |
| sort 24:23                | stenotype                     | 54:13                       | 37:10               | three 39:23              | traveling     | <b>U.S</b> 37:25 | vectorless    |
| 29:5                      | 63:11                         | suspect                     | 48:11               | 44:10                    | 15:3,5        | ultimate         | 17:11         |
| sought 4:17               | STIPULA                       | 51:25                       | tells 12:20         | 52:10                    | treat 43:5,10 | 45:14            | velocities    |
| sounds 38:21              | 4:3                           | SWANSON                     | tens 36:9           | <b>time</b> 4:16 5:4     | 43:16         | ultimately       | 18:11         |
| 57:6                      | Storage 38:2                  | 2:4                         | term 17:10          | 11:18                    | 44:18         | 44:11            | velocity 13:9 |
| source 32:21              | strategy                      | switching                   | 17:11               | 14:22 15:1               | 45:16,19      | 47:19            | 17:10,10      |
|                           |                               | 37:1                        | 28:11               | 16:10,11                 | 46:5,17       | unaccepta        | 18:8,19,20    |
| 51:25 52:8                | 16:24                         |                             |                     |                          |               |                  |               |
| sources 31:4              | 37:14                         | sworn 5:16                  | 44:25               | 16:12,13                 | 47:9,14,22    | 54:21            | 20:18,24      |
| <b>sources</b> 31:4 49:25 | 37:14<br><b>Street</b> 2:5,12 | <b>sworn</b> 5:16 62:7 63:7 | terms 43:10         | 20:20                    | 48:14         | Undergro         | 21:6,11,18    |
| sources 31:4              | 37:14                         | sworn 5:16                  |                     |                          |               |                  |               |



| 22:25           | 10.5 22.15                 | 52:18                    |                                    | 19 10.24                | 4 2.16 17                             |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                 | 18:5 23:15                 |                          | Z                                  | <b>18</b> 19:24         | 4 3:16,17                             |
| 23:12 24:1      | 25:19                      | 55:17 56:5               | zero 26:19                         | <b>18TH</b> 1:1         | 11:9 19:21                            |
| 24:6,10,16      | 28:16 36:3                 | 58:9,18                  | <b>Zoom</b> 5:3                    | <b>1987</b> 34:3        | 19:21 20:4                            |
| 24:18           | 36:8,20                    | 60:23                    | 34:12                              | <b>1999</b> 37:22       | 23:9 25:19                            |
| 26:14,19        | 42:13                      | WITNESS'                 |                                    | 37:25                   | 34:8 38:14                            |
| 26:19           | 50:13                      | 61:1                     | 0                                  | 2                       | 38:15                                 |
| 27:21           | way 15:8                   | word 15:20               | <b>0.005</b> 13:19                 |                         | 54:19                                 |
| 28:13,16        | 16:2,3                     | 16:11 28:8               | <b>005</b> 13:2                    | <b>2</b> 3:15 7:7       | <b>4.0</b> 10:11                      |
| 29:2,7          | 19:6 22:15                 | 32:9                     | 14:2                               | 8:25 9:2                | <b>4.6</b> 11:7                       |
| 33:5 40:6       | 27:4 29:20                 | words 12:19              |                                    | 49:5 50:5               | <b>43</b> 7:11                        |
| verified        | 41:21 43:1                 | 15:25                    | 1                                  | 51:3                    | <b>440</b> 42:12                      |
| 51:23 52:1      | 43:1,2                     | 28:13 33:5               | 1 3:14 6:22                        | <b>2.16</b> 38:19       | 5                                     |
| 62:17           | we'll 6:21                 | 35:13                    | 6:23 32:22                         | <b>2.16.1</b> 48:19     |                                       |
| verify 8:18     | 8:1,5,8                    | 37:15                    | 33:3 49:25                         | 49:5,9                  | <b>5</b> 3:3,18 11:8                  |
| 51:21           | 37:13                      | 50:20                    | 50:19                              | <b>2.4</b> 13:10,14     | 23:10                                 |
| version         | 38:14                      | 51:16                    | <b>1.4</b> 10:12                   | 13:22 14:4              | 25:19 55:2                            |
| 40:19           | 56:13                      | 54:16                    | 11:8                               | 14:8 15:3               | 56:13,15                              |
| 48:25           | we're 8:9,15               | 62:15,17                 | <b>10</b> 10:11,12                 | 15:5 21:19              | <b>56</b> 3:18                        |
| versus 1:8      | 20:4 22:12                 | work 9:25                | 11:7,8                             | 23:5,12                 |                                       |
| 12:3 42:2       | 30:5 33:19                 | 17:7 22:15               | 37:2                               | <b>20</b> 3:16          | 6                                     |
| vertical        | 36:11 37:4                 | worked 9:14              | 10:12 37:8                         | <b>2003</b> 38:4        | <b>6</b> 3:14                         |
| 10:10 11:2      | 52:11 57:7                 | working                  | 10:42 57:8                         | <b>2015</b> 20:20       | 601 2:5                               |
| 12:3,6          | 57:10 59:1                 | 47:15                    | 10:42-10:52                        | 25:4,12                 | <b>63</b> 3:5 63:9                    |
| viable 8:22     | we've 10:21                | works 25:25              | 57:9                               | 28:22 33:7              | <b>69</b> 47:25                       |
| video 5:5       | 18:24                      | wouldn't                 | 10:52 57:11                        | <b>2016</b> 10:14       | 7                                     |
| VIDEOC          | 27:20                      | 53:12                    | <b>10:55</b> 59:2,3                | <b>2022</b> 1:21        |                                       |
| 1:20            | weak 23:18                 | write 10:9<br>11:1 12:23 | 110 44:5                           | 5:4 56:18               | 7 3:15 9:1                            |
| VIDEOED<br>2:24 | weight 32:3<br>well-establ | 13:8                     | 110,000                            | 60:24                   | 10:13                                 |
| VIDEOG          | 13:16                      | written                  | 42:17,18                           | 61:25<br><b>22</b> 1:21 | <b>70130</b> 2:6<br><b>70507</b> 2:13 |
| 5:1 20:5        | wells 11:5                 | 39:25                    | 42:21                              | 60:24                   | <b>78953</b> 1:5                      |
| 34:6,24         | 12:11 23:4                 | wrote 38:9               | 43:24 44:2                         | 61:25                   | <b>79</b> 38:23                       |
| 37:4,7          | 39:5,8                     | wrote 56.7               | 44:6,13                            | <b>22nd</b> 5:4         | 19 30.23                              |
| 57:7,10         | went 10:19                 | X                        | 53:10                              | <b>24</b> 25:20         | 8                                     |
| 58:25           | west 9:12,13               | <b>X</b> 3:1,12,12       | 58:19                              | <b>250</b> 30:16        | <b>8</b> 10:11 34:1                   |
| videotaped      | 9:18,22                    | A 5.1,12,12              | <b>12</b> 9:15                     | 42:14                   | <b>822</b> 2:12                       |
| 1:18 5:2        | 15:3 22:5                  | Y                        | <b>12,000</b> 24:22                | 43:20 44:4              | <b>87</b> 34:17                       |
| 1.10 5.2        | 22:16 23:7                 | year 13:10               | 29:23                              | 44:17                   | 07 54.17                              |
| W               | 24:25                      | 13:14,22                 | 30:14                              | 45:22                   | 9                                     |
| waived 4:12     | western                    | 14:4,8                   | 31:18                              | <b>2655</b> 2:6         | 9 3:14,15                             |
| want 9:15       | 22:12                      | 15:2,4,5,6               | <b>12,400</b> 36:12                | <b>28</b> 25:20         | 6:21 34:8                             |
| 15:10           | 28:20                      | 16:13                    | 50:15                              | 62:4                    | <b>9:00</b> 1:21                      |
| 16:11           | witness 4:5                | 21:19 23:5               | <b>124</b> 43:18                   | 02.1                    | <b>9:02</b> 5:5                       |
| 25:15 29:9      | 4:25 18:1                  | 23:12 29:6               | 44:3,17                            | 3                       | <b>9:58</b> 37:5                      |
| 32:1 33:22      | 19:16,25                   | 39:13,14                 | 46:11                              | <b>3</b> 3:16 10:6      | 9:58-10:12                            |
| 33:24           | 22:1 24:5                  | 39:17,18                 | <b>13</b> 3:17                     | 20:5,6,8                | 37:6                                  |
| 39:17,18        | 24:14 25:2                 | 39:20                    | 20:20                              | 34:2 49:5               | 9200.4-17P                            |
| 42:25 43:4      | 30:4 33:18                 | 40:13 53:3               | 38:13                              | 53:15,23                | 38:3                                  |
| 44:17           | 34:3 36:16                 | 53:7                     | <b>139</b> 8:4                     | <b>31st</b> 56:18       | <b>97018</b> 62:25                    |
| 47:20           | 36:24 41:4                 | years 7:22               | <b>13th</b> 25:4,12                | <b>32</b> 52:5          | 63:25                                 |
| wanted          | 41:20 42:1                 | 9:15 39:19               | 28:22                              | <b>37:2554</b> 63:8     | 03.23                                 |
| 19:22           | 46:23 47:4                 | 39:23                    | <b>1434</b> 63:19                  | <b>38</b> 3:17          |                                       |
| water 11:16     | 48:25                      | 47:15 52:5               | <b>1434(B)</b> 62:5                |                         |                                       |
| 11:16,18        | 51:10 52:4                 |                          | <b>16</b> 19:23<br><b>17</b> 19:23 | 4                       |                                       |
| - , -           |                            |                          |                                    |                         |                                       |
|                 |                            |                          | 1719.23                            |                         |                                       |
|                 |                            |                          | 17 19.25                           |                         |                                       |

