U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

+ + + + +

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

GREAT LAKES AND COASTAL ECOLOGICAL UNUSUALLY SENSITIVE AREAS

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 12, 2019

+ + + + +

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration met in the U.S. DOT West Atrium, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, DC, 20590 at 8:30 a.m., Steve Fischer, Senior Program Manager, PHMSA, presiding.

PRESENT

STEVEN FISCHER, Senior Program Manager, PHMSA
EROL ALAVI, Supervisor, Integrity Engineering,
Plains All American Pipeline, L.P.
HOWARD "SKIP" ELLIOT, PHMSA Administrator
BONNIE FREEMAN, President, FreemanGIS, Inc.
KAREN GENTILE, Community Liaison
LEIGHA GOODING, GIS Coordinator, PHMSA
SAM HALL, Senior Program Manager, PHMSA
ALAN MAYBERRY, Associate Administrator for
Pipeline Safety
CHRISTIE MURRAY, Director of Outreach and

Engagement, PHMSA

JACQUES ROTOLO, Engineer/Pipeline Compliance Specialist, Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Pipeline Division CARL WEIMER, Executive Director, Pipeline Safety

ALSO PRESENT
ELAINE LAN CHAO, Secretary of Transportation
HUNG NGUYEN, PHMSA Staff
ANNEMARIE ROBERTSON, PHMSA Staff

Trust

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

| Welcome, Agenda Overview and Safety Briefing 4 |
|--|
| PHMSA Opening Remarks |
| Background and Strategy in Moving Forward20 |
| PHMSA Drinking Water and Ecological |
| USA Update |
| |
| Questions for Consideration |
| |
| Eco USA Panel Q&A Discussion |
| Leigh Gooding |
| Erol Alavi |
| Bonnie Freeman |
| Carl Weimer |
| Jacques Rotolo 126 |
| |
| Final Remarks and Next Steps |
| |
| Adjourn |

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:30 a.m.

.

MR. FISCHER: If I could ask everyone to take their seats, please? Good morning.

Sorry for the echo, maybe I should turn down my volume a little bit or step further back.

Is that better? Can you hear me okay?

Okay, good. Welcome to everyone that's joining

us here in person as well as all the viewers that

are watching via the webcast.

My name is Steve Fisher and I'm with the U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

And we're glad that we've got probably about 50 or 60 people here in the audience this morning for the USA section.

Sorry about that echo. Is it okay?

We'd like to kick off first by just having a very brief safety introduction here. I know a number of you probably have been at similar kinds of meetings here at USDOT but this is the address of the facility here.

an audible alarm and it will give instructions on what the proper response is. So, if the alarm does go off we'll wait and we'll hear what the response is and what the directions are for how we should respond.

If there's a call for shelter in place, I think we're having good weather today so there shouldn't be any problems with that.

But if we do need to shelter in place and we need to be somewhere that we're not underneath an atrium, we'll move back behind us into the conference center and we'll provide direction on that if something does occur.

If we have a medical emergency, Sam Hall has agreed to call 911 and to work with security to make sure that we're able to get medical personnel in here as soon as possible.

Do we have anyone who is willing to by volunteer who is CPR certified? Okay, well, several of us, our certifications have run out but we will do our best to attend to anyone who's

having any type of medical issue and get someone here as soon as possible.

Hung -- where is Hung, there he is -has agreed to get the AED, which is back behind
us. So, we'll be in good shape with that. And
if we have an evacuation, I've got a map here, in
a second I'll show you, but Christie Murray and I
-- I think everyone probably knows Christie.

Christie, if you could raise your hand back there? Come out? Christie Murray and myself will be leading everyone down to the rally point, which is about a block away at the fountain.

And then Sam Hall and Annmarie will be doing a sweep through the room to make sure that all of our participants have safely made it out of the building and are moving to the rally point.

Actually, it's set up the proper way for this room so we're going to be heading out this way to the Third Street exit and then going to the south, we'll be to the right when you

leave the building.

Everyone should have received this morning a copy of the agenda in the folders that were handed out. Actually, that's fairly visible. Or you could refer to the agenda.

This morning we are focusing our discussion on USA definitions and we'll be getting into those discussions, talking a little bit about the background and how the Agency is looking to move forward regardless addressing those Congressional mandates.

Leigha Gooding will also be providing a number of examples of maps and data that we're considering so she'll be able to show some illustrative maps of what we are considering and discussing internally.

And then also we've shared questions that we're looking to receive input on from the panelists as well as from all of you that are attending here in person, as well as people who are viewing via the webcast.

We will break at about 12:30 p.m.,

we'll go to lunch, and then the afternoon session will be focused on pipeline awareness and engagement.

And I wanted to mention also, for the viewers that are watching the webcast, if -- let me just go back up here for one second.

The email address here on the front, phmsa.pipelinesafety@dot.gov, if you're having difficulties with viewing or hearing the webcast, you can send an email to this email address.

It's being monitored here in the room.

Obviously, we can't address personal issues related to your own individual computers but if you're experiencing any issues, let us know because that might give us the idea that we're having wider issues that we need to address with our excellent IT people that are here.

Also, then, if you have questions, for those would be viewers you can send your questions in as we go through this morning's program, as well as the pipeline awareness and engagement sessions.

You'll be able to send an email to this email address with your questions, comments, concerns. Those are also being monitored and we will try out level best to get through as many of those as we can when we get to the Q&A sessions.

If you haven't found them already, the restrooms are located out behind you on this side down the hallway, it will be on your left-hand side. Everyone should have been issued temporary Ids, it looks like everyone has them.

You need to keep those on while you're in the building and to the degree possible you should have a DOT escort before moving around the building.

So, likely what will happen when we break, if anyone needs to go over to the cafeteria for something to drink, we can have somebody escort a group over there so they can get what they need.

And we'll do the same thing probably at lunch, have some DOT escorts escort a large group over so that we're trying to kind of keep

everyone together.

If you haven't already, please silence your mobile devices and I've already addressed the next point here regarding the webinar participation. Please send us your comments and your feedback, we want to hear from you.

I think we've got a total of about 87 people that have registered for in-person, so obviously not everyone is here this morning which is what we assumed. We probably will have a little bit larger of attendance in person this afternoon.

And then I think we have about 140 people who have registered to view online. And also, as we go through the day, and this is for the people who are watching via the web, you'll see that there are eight different sessions.

So, this morning's session that you're watching now is Session Number 1. After break, there is a Session 2, so when we come back from break and I'll have a queue here.

Actually, it will be on one of the

Leigha's slides, there is a queue and a reminder that when we come back from break you'll want to start viewing the webinar using the Session 2 video screen that you see on the page.

And on the meeting registration page, it contains the agenda and all the pre-reads that we've asked the panelists to review.

So, if you're interested in looking at any of that information, please go out to the meeting registration page to find those documents out there.

We strongly encourage your comments and input and active participation. We're hoping to have a lot of good feedback, both in this morning's session as well as the sessions on pipeline awareness and engagement.

If you would, please hold your comments until we open the floor for Q&A, and we're going to have a couple of our community liaisons that will be walking around with microphones.

So, please wait until they can get to

you. We'll select you, we'll identify you. When you raise your hand, they'll get a microphone to you and then you can ask your question.

That way, everyone here in the room and also importantly, everyone on the video watching the webinar will be able to hear your question.

Please state your name, company, and organization if you have an affiliation with someone. If you're just with the public, that's fine, you're with the public. We ask that you please keep your remarks brief, to about three minutes or so.

We want to make sure that we're able to get through everyone that has comments. If we don't get to all of your questions and there's time, we'll come back and you can remind us and we'll try and get back and make sure that we answer all the questions that you have.

We also ask that you please engage in civil discourse. We're all adults here, we want to have a productive meeting and I'm sure that we

will.

But just so that we're clear, if
there's any disruption, any disruptive
individuals, we will have to ask security to help
and escort you out. So, I don't suspect that's
going to be a problem but just so that we're all
on the same page.

And also, this is the PHMSA docket number for the USA definition that we'll be discussing today. If you have any comments and wish to put them on the docket, this is the docket number that you'll need.

So, at this point, I'd like to ask
Alan Mayberry, Associate Manager for Pipeline
Safety to come up, please.

MR. MAYBERRY: Thanks, Steve, and good morning. I think they've taken care of that echo for the most part. It's not quite like talking on a bad cell phone but thank you for that, for working through that.

Anyway, again, good morning. Thank you for being here and also for those of you on

webcast, thank you for joining us today.

Meetings like this are very important for we at PHMSA as we go through what we call the sausage-making of policymaking. And we find that, and a common theme is, as I talk to many of you, that words matter.

We need to get it right, we need to get it right the first time and so that's what we're after. So, thank you to help us get there, to get it right for your participation.

And like Steve said, it's very important that you do participate and give us your comments. There's no bad comment and so please participate and make your thoughts known.

Some people don't like really raising their question in public. That's not a problem, you can put it on the docket or you can slip the question to one of your neighbors over here.

There are a variety of ways to do that.

But anyway, without further ado, let me introduce my boss, the Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety

Administration. Please join me in welcoming Skip Elliott. Thanks.

(Applause.)

MR. ELLIOT: Well, good morning,
everyone. I promise you two things. One, I will
come in under the three minutes and two, I will
not provide any civil discourse.

But I am glad to see that Steve finally smiled, so that's a good thing to do.

I wanted to add on behalf of my boss, Secretary Elaine L. Chao, our formal welcome to the Federal Department of Transportation Building and, as we affectionately call it, the West Atrium, well-known for its acoustical problems.

But I hope you all have a good and productive day.

I think before I just provide a few formal comments about what we're doing here today, it's only appropriate to pause for a moment and remember that it was 20 years and two days ago that a horrible tragedy occurred in Bellingham, Washington that resulted in the death

of three young men.

I have been on this job coming up on two years and as I told Carl Weimer, if there's one poignant moment in the almost two years I've been here, it was the trip that I took to Bellingham last year and standing in the park and listening to one of the city employees who was there that day 20 years ago talk about the events.

And it's almost every week that for some reason I'm giving a speech or I'm having a discussion with my staff that that conversation, that story that that employee 20 years later, or 19 years later, how that resonated with me.

And it also reminds me each and every day to remember that the primary mission of PHMSA is safety and we will continue to do everything that we can each and every day to improve the safe transportation of energy products and other hazardous materials that we move in this country.

And this forum allows us to do that

because if we're not willing to be open and listen to all stakeholders, then we're never going to be able to keep moving in the direction that's going to help us improve our safety.

I was just looking at my notes here and I think I'm going to kind of skip right to the end here.

So, I'll get to a few bullets that I think are important about how today's meeting is an important step as we determine how to best define and map areas that are identified as ecological, unusually sensitive areas.

And whether you're sitting here in the audience or joining us via the webcast, and hello to you joining us remotely, we appreciate you taking the time out of your busy lives to participate in this important discussion.

All of you, and I want to underscore the fact that it's all of you, will have the opportunity this morning to provide your input, concerns, and maybe even support as we talk today about how PHMSA plans to address this 2016

pipeline's mandate.

And there's one thing that we've just reintroduced -- well, we've just introduced our part of a pipeline reauthorization bill last week.

And getting ready for the introduction of that bill and reauthorization, I had the opportunity to participate in a number of hearings.

And one thing I think was very front and center is that PHMSA needed to do a better job of moving to close our open mandates that go back not only to the 2016 PIPES Act but the 2011 PIPES Act as well, and we've been working hard to do that.

With regards to this meeting, we've also created a docket and I think Steve talked about that. And we encourage you to submit your written comments. We also plan to transcribe this meeting and post the court reporter's notes and all the presentations that you'll see today.

And I think I'm messing up your

computer here so I'll do this. I hope the presentations you'll here today, both from PHMSA staff and external speakers, will be informative.

I also hope that you don't hesitate to share your thoughts and expertise because it will help inform PHMSA decision-making as we work to meet the USA ecological resource mandates in the PIPES Act of 2016 and enhance the safety of our nation's pipeline system.

So, your active participation is critical.

I've been on the road the last three weeks at a number of speaking engagements and one of the things that I have mentioned in each one those speaking opportunities is the importance of public meetings that we hold such as this.

Our federal advisory groups, both the liquid, the gas, we have a new one on the HAZMAT side that's going to deal with lithium batteries.

But again, in my relatively short time as PHMSA administrator I've got one observation that I think by far and away helps us understand,

1 helps us better understand, all the concerns, all 2 the issues, and to hear all the points of views from all stakeholders as we look to do 3 4 rulemaking. 5 So, I can't underscore enough the 6 importance of your participation today and I hope 7 to get back on and off over the next couple days 8 to sit in and listen to that. 9 So, without any further ado, please 10 accept my thanks for your participation today. 11 hope you find that PHMSA Staff will be engaging 12 and helpful as we go through this process, and 13 thank you for your very good work. 14 Thank you, Skip and MR. FISCHER: Sorry, I'm not one to smile a lot when I'm 15 16 doing a presentation so if I look angry, I'm not, 17 just know that. 18 And also, I think that we're going to 19 have index cards. Do we have index cards back 20 here? We do, and over here. 21 So, my experience in over 20 years

working in the pipeline safety industry, I know

that there are a few shrinking violets in the crowd generally.

But if there are and you would prefer submit some written questions as we go through this morning as well as through the remainder of the program this afternoon and tomorrow, we have some index cards back on the back tables if you'd like to grab some, jot down some questions.

You can give those questions to anyone back here at the table here or back on the other side and in the middle.

We've got PHMSA personnel all along the back so you can turn those cards into them, and we will get to those then when we do the Q&A.

So, the session I'd like to talk about next is doing a little bit of a background as well as talking about some of the next steps as we look to address the Congressional mandate.

So, just for some background, as many of you, I know several of you that are here in attendance were at the 2017 public meeting that we had.

That was really an initial discussion to try to understand what is meant by coastal marine waters and coastal beaches.

It was also meant to understand how we might potentially define those, what data may exist that we could use to map those areas, if there were existing definitions that other federal agencies used to define these areas.

Because certainly, we don't want to reinvent the wheel if at all possible.

So, it really was that initial discussion to understand collectively from a various of SMEs, both in the private sector as well as with other federal government agencies, what existing data is out there that we may want to consider.

And so as Skip mentioned, today's meeting really is to follow up on that initial discussion.

We'll lay out for you in several presentations coming up the efforts we have made in analyzing data and sources that were

recommended to the Agency in that 2017 meeting.

And we'll have maps showing what we've been considering.

I think that we have narrowed down in some ways the best data sources that we believe are going to fit the bill. But when you're dealing with GIS data and when you're look at how it's defined in regulations, there's lots of details that have to be worked out and considerations regarding the data, the accuracy and so forth.

So, we'll be talking about those kinds of issues this morning. This has been an ongoing learning process for us. Following the 2017 public meeting, we conducted an internal data pilot project, which we'll talk about a little bit.

And ultimately, it is in trying to understand how best to define these Congressionally-identified, ecologically unusually sensitive areas. This is really sensitive.

And last but not least, it's implementing the plan on moving forward to identify these areas and start mapping them and fulfill the Congressional mandate. So, this is the actual mandate here.

It's from Section 19 of the PIPES Act of 2016 and Congress instructs to the Secretary to explicitly state that the Great Lakes Coastal Beaches and Marine Coastal Waters are USA ecological resources.

As you know, we already have identified ecological USAs. We have drinking water USAs.

The current ecological USAs that are defined in the regulations in 195.6 are very species-focused, looking at threatened endangered species, critically imperiled species.

So, that's really the focus of ecological USAs within the Agency to date, at least what's been defined in the regulations.

So, this is a bit of a different approach to what else may be included as

ecological USAs and that's really what we have been struggling with as well as evaluating the data that we'll be laying out for you this morning.

Some of the input that we received in the 2017 public meeting, there was a lot of discussion about how the Great Lakes are mapped already as commercially navigable waterways.

But when you look at -- we call it CNW, commercially navigable waterways -- that data, when you're dealing with areas that are open waters such as the Great Lakes as well as the Gulf of Mexico, you see a bunch of lines.

And rather than the entire Great Lakes being portrayed as a USA, you instead see a bunch of lines and there is concern, confusion that the Great Lakes possibly are not being represented to the degree they should be in their entirety as a USA.

And so that's one of the things we'll be talking about.

And then when you get into talking

about Coastal Beaches and Marine Coastal Waters, some of the feedback that we received was suggestions, recommendations that we should be including wetlands when we're talking about Marine Coastal Waters.

There's also the question of how far inland should a USA, a coastal area's area USA, how far inland should that come? The other question is how far out should that area be to open waters to sea.

So, these are recommendations but there are also just a lot of additional questions that came up. And that's good because it just means there are additional things that we need to evaluate to determine and define what we mean when we perceive these coastal areas.

There's also quite a bit of discussion from the federal agencies that participated with support for NOAA Environmental Sensitivity Index, ESI data.

And we've been evaluating that information and I think probably even during the

public meeting it came up for discussion.

We certainly have been evaluating the data following the public meeting and there are some concerns about the availability of data because when we're looking at data, we're looking at national data sets.

So that's always a challenge in that that's the requirement that we have, to be able to identify data nationally.

And so often times that limits what information we may have access to because if it's for a specific state, that's not going to help us out when we're charged with providing nationally available HCA information for operators to use for integrity management.

And then the other potential issue with the ESI is that there is the potential for in the future that as NOAA makes modifications to the data, it may come to include additional waterways that may not fit how we've defined a coastal area USA.

Or that it may include additional

areas that don't meet the definition that we've defined or that there are areas that we really don't believe should be included within a marine coastal waters USA.

So, just some issues that we've been discussing based on the feedback that we received at the public meeting.

I've already talked a little bit about the marine coastal waters as far as to what degree should we be including wetlands and marine coastal waters definition as well as to what degree should offshore areas be included in a definition?

Coastal beaches, ESI, there is ESI shoreline data that actually categorizes geographic features as beaches, and it's fairly detailed.

There's a number of types of beaches that are identified within the data but once again, what came out of the public meeting was to what degree should environmentally sensitive areas adjacent to those beaches be included in

that beach-defined geographic area?

And then the other issue is what's the intent of Congress? Was Congress's intent that we should be identifying beaches and marine coastal areas that are primarily for recreational activity?

Or should it be a much broader

definition of these coastal areas to include, and

protecting, a wider variety of coastal beaches

and marine coastal areas in addition to those

that are just used primarily for recreational

purposes?

And then finally, the last issue is should we be looking at limiting mapping of the Great Lakes Coastal Beaches and Marine Coastal Waters to those areas found to be unusually sensitive?

So, is the Great Lakes in their entirety, should that be a USA? Should all coastal beaches be USAs?

Or should it be a subset of those areas that are based on some criteria to be

unusually sensitive and those are the areas that we should specifically focus on?

So, those are some of the questions that came out of that 2017 public meeting and that we have been having ongoing conversations on since then.

In 2018, we conducted an internal pilot project and there were really three primary purposes of this pilot project. One was an effort to create and maintain new GIS data that's going to reflect these potentially new USAs.

And of the data that is available to potentially reflect these geographic areas, what is the quality of the source data, and how well will that data support potential definitions that we may use in defining Marine Coastal Areas and Coastal Beaches?

The other thing that I have focused on given the feedback that we received at the 2017 public meeting was we wanted to compare the ESI shoreline data with the 2018 ecological USA data, which Leigha will be talking about shortly, which

will be coming out this summer.

But we wanted to compare that ESI shoreline data with the 2018, the new 2018, ecological USA data to identify what percent of the shoreline in the ESI is actually classified with this 2018 data as an ecological USA?

So, where is the overlap between the ESI and the 2018 eco data? And the findings are that about 59 percent in the lower 48, there was an overlap between that shoreline currently -- well, with the 2018 data -- being covered by an ecological USA.

And then we factor in Alaska, we're at about 54 percent. So, just slightly over half of that shoreline area will be covered by ecological USAs when we release the 2018 data.

Leigha will have a number of sample maps that she'll be showing during the presentation so I think that'll help once you start seeing some of those sample maps.

And also when we talk about the specific questions I think that it will help in

understanding the challenges that we've been investigating and evaluating.

And then all of this information, just as we used the information from 2017, the information that we receive from this public meeting, from comments that we receive on the docket, we'll be taking all that information into account as we move forward onto the next phase of addressing the Congressional mandate.

And all this just helps to inform our policy decisions. So, the first point is that PHMSA's plan is to update the National Pipeline Mapping System and if the Great Lakes as an ecological USA.

The Great Lakes are a defined, known entity. They're identified by the U.S.

Geological Survey, which is a federal agency, highly regarded for their mapping of geographic features.

So, the Great Lakes aren't such a difficult issue because they're known. You say the Great Lakes, most people know what that

means. But there are still some remaining questions, we'll be getting to these this afternoon, or this morning I mean.

So, as I mentioned previously, we don't want to reinvent the wheel. So, if there's current regulations that define what the Great Lakes are, ideally that's what we want to use.

And so we're looking at 33 U.S.C. 1268 definition of the Great Lakes, which includes the Great Lakes as well as all of the connecting waters. So, all of the rivers as well as I think Lake Sinclair around Detroit.

All those features in where the Great
Lakes water is ultimately running from Lake
Superior all the way through to the Saint
Lawrence Seaway, it includes all of those
features, all those water bodies.

And so the question is should PHMSA be considering both the Great Lakes as well as all the connecting waters when we define the Great Lakes USA?

Or as Congress stated in the 2016

reauthorization, the mandate, they said the five Great Lakes. So, there is the potential that we could define the five Great Lakes and not include connecting waters.

So, that's another question that we'll be getting to as we go through the panel discussion today.

And then the mapping of connecting waters poses a little bit of a challenge because we have been researching and trying to identify national data sources, such as USGS, to map those features.

Because when we have evaluated, and
Leigha will get into this in a little bit, but
when we evaluate the Great Lakes' geospatial data
available from USGS, it is the five Great Lakes.

It's not including these connecting waters and I think it is reasonable that we probably would want to include connecting waters when we're talking about the Great Lakes, given the fact that you have water that, as I said earlier, is going from Lake Superior all the way

through.

So, another question.

So, as we move forward, we'll be taking all the information that we receive today in addition to information on the docket and sort of going through and analyzing and synthesizing the feedback that we receive.

So we're really looking forward to the panelists' discussions this morning.

I know that we'll be having a wide variety of presentations that we've received so I think it will be a good discussion covering a wide array of issues related to both defining these new USAs as well as more on the technical GIS side and actual data sets that exist, and any limitations with those data sets.

So, it should be a good, well-rounded discussion.

So, next steps, like I said, we'll want to map the Great Lakes as USA ecological resources as soon as we settle on exactly what that is to include.

We'll continue investigating and evaluating the data recommendations that we receive out of the input that we get today, as well as what we receive online.

And then we'll move forward with defining and mapping the Coastal Beaches and Marine Coastal Waters as USA ecological resources, and everything that will be related to defining those definitions and incorporating them into the regulations.

So, thank you, that concludes my remarks for everyone who has joined us via the webcast. This is the email address that you can use to submit any questions you may have and we encourage you to do so.

What we're going to do is now go ahead and have Leigha come up, do her presentation, and then we'll entertain all your questions following that.

And we'll have up until the break, which is at 10:00 a.m. for Q&A, so I think we're going to have plenty of time for a good Q&A

1 session after her presentation. 2 Okay, thank you. MS. GOODING: All right, hello, good 3 4 morning, thanks for joining us. I'm Leigha 5 Gooding, I'm the GIS coordinator here at PHMSA. I work specifically with the National 6 7 Pipeline Mapping System and I'm going to go 8 through a couple things today, mainly giving you 9 an update on the newest data that's coming out for drinking water and ecological USAs. 10 11 But I'm going to start with a quick 12 overview of what the NPMS is, what public 13 resources we have available, how you can use our 14 system, and some of the USA/HCA data that we 15 currently have. 16 I'll go into the updates on both the 17 drinking water and the ecological data that's 18 about to come out soon. 19 And then I'll go through a little bit 20 of the existing coastal area coverage comparisons 21 that we did with the new 2018 ecological data.

So, quickly, to start with the NPMS

and what it is, the National Pipeline Mapping
System, the NPMS, I believe most of you here have
probably heard of it but it is a GIS database.

We have a lot more than just pipelines in the NPMS and I'll go over that in a second, and we are part of the PHMSA's Outreach and Engagement Division.

This map here is actually a completely public map that you can download on our website, and I'll point that out in a second.

So, the main data sets that are included in the NPMS include groups of data that we collect from pipeline operators directly, as well as data that we produce here at PHMSA.

We collect Gas Transmission, Hazardous
Liquid Pipelines, and I've listed the regulations
where you can find the requirements for
submitting this data. We also collect Liquefied
Natural Gas Plants.

Breakout Tank point locations are submitted on a voluntary basis at this time.

We also collect and map Accident and

Incident locations, but here at PHMSA we also collect data from other sources other than the pipeline operators to map all the high-consequence areas including the unusually sensitive areas.

We also build a database of pipeline history and we map inspection boundaries to incorporate a lot of our internal inspection records geospatially into our system for some spatial levels of analysis.

This is just a snapshot of the homepage for the NPMS website, you may recognize it. I really want to point out that we have three different types of users broken up on our website.

We have our government officials, the pipeline operators, and then the general public. The green box above and all those green arrows, those are pointing out the resources that are available to absolutely anybody who goes to our website.

This includes the public map viewer

and an iPhone app for the public map viewer. You may be familiar with this.

You pick one county, you can see pipelines for that county, you could zoom into about 1 to 24,000 before the pipelines disappear. You could see some other information, you could search your address, see if there's pipes by your home, et cetera.

We also have a spatialized directory where you can search for operator contact information based on where they operate pipelines, by zip code, county, or state.

And then we have a couple of different types of data and maps that you could just download.

One is that map that I showed you a couple of minutes ago, and then we also have lists of information about pipelines broken down by county, as well as pipelines broken down by offshore areas.

You could read about what the name of those pipelines are, what they carry, the

diameter of those pipelines if that is submitted -- that's a voluntary attribute at this time -- et cetera.

So, we try to distribute information not only in spatial ways but also in tabular ways. You can take that data, put it in Excel and do some of your own analysis.

Below, there's of course the link to the NPMS website and over in the blue box are the resources that are restricted to both the government officials and the pipeline operators, including namely PIMMA, which is Our Pipeline Information Management Mapping Application.

This, instead of allowing the user just to select one county at a time, we actually have vetted you and we've given you access to the pipelines in your jurisdiction, being that your county, your state.

If you're a Federal Government employee and you need to see everything, you see everything. There is an iPhone app for PIMMA.

As well, you can request GIS data to make your

own maps.

And just a little bit more into the HCA/USA data that we already distribute and the data sources that we've used, both the high and other population areas are based on data we collect from the U.S. Census Bureau.

The commercially navigable waterways, that data is the national waterway network that's collected from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

And currently, the ecological USA data and the drinking water USA data, they are produced and the eco USA data is actually produced from a data source from a company called NatureServe.

And the drinking water unusually sensitive data that is produced by both EPA and state data sources, and I'll get into that a little bit more in a minute.

But I've also listed the parts and the regulations here where you can see these definitions if you do want to look into them.

And quickly, just ways that you can currently

access HCA data, three primary ways.

One, GIS data, for those of you who actually use GIS systems out there, I know that's always your preference, both the HPAs and the OPAs, that stands for the high-population, otherpopulation area data, those are public JS data downloads as well as the CNWs.

However, the eco and the drinking water USAs are restricted when it comes to the GIS data. And I'll go through that process in a minute about how to request that.

Next, we have our PIMMA mapping application, that's the one restricted to the Government and pipeline operators.

There you could see the HPAs and OPAs, however, you will no longer be able to see the ecological or USA drinking water data layers on PIMMA once we distribute this newest update that I'll talk about in a second.

And last, the public map viewer, everybody can see the HPAs, OPAs, and CNWs on there as well. I already mentioned that the HL

operators, the Hazardous Liquid operators, are the only ones permitted to request this data.

All right, so now I'll jump into the actual update, the recent update, for the drinking water USA data. This was just delivered to us last week, the final pieces of it. It's been a very large project.

It will be available to all Hazardous Liquid operators who operate hazardous liquid pipelines this summer. And you will be notified through a mass email.

We'll send that out to every Hazardous
Liquid pipeline operator listed as a primary
contact in our NPMS database. So, this email
should be going to your GIS or your mapping
departments.

I do want to stress that consultants cannot initiate a data request, that has to come from an employee of the pipeline operating company. That is not a new requirement.

And we will be continuing to distribute this type of data by state. So, we

will have to validate that you operate hazardous liquid pipelines in the state before that data is released.

So, there will be detailed instructions for how to request the new drinking water USA data. We're calling that the 2019 DW data, it will be on the NPMS website.

This is actually the link where currently the existing procedures are listed and that will be updated very shortly for the distribution this summer. I'll do a quick review of the process.

First, the operator, after you receive the email telling you that the data is ready for distribution, you come to our website and you can see information about how to make the request email.

So, the operator will send the request email, PHMSA will go through an employment verification and verify your applicability for the data.

Next, the operator will need to sign

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and return data-use agreements to PHMSA, and last, PHMSA will deliver that data to you by a secure FTP download.

So, you will not have to wait for data in the mail or anything like that, we will be sending that to you rather quickly.

The drinking water update for 2019 does include data for all 50 states, plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

The metadata about the information that was produced for every one of these states in D.C. and Puerto Rico is actually available to the public and can be pulled from the NPMS website.

And again, this information will not be displayed on PIMMA or the public viewer moving forward.

Since I unfortunately really can't show you maps of the drinking water USA data because of the sensitivity of the data, I did want to tell you a little bit about how it looks and how it's changed.

When we ran some analysis with the 2001 drinking water data, we found about 18,800 miles of hazardous liquid pipes in the NPMS that intersect those areas.

When we ran the same analysis with the 2019 data we just finally completed last week, we're finding out the intersections are only about 11,600.

So, there was a decrease in the mileage but remember that these are intersections. They could affect mileage so those numbers are going to larger when you consider how many miles could affect a drinking water USA.

Some of the reasons for the changes, first of all, back in 2001, the data really came from the EPA and during a data pilot project that was done a few years ago when updating this information, we learned that the EPA data was not maintained in the way necessary and the way that we were hoping in order to update the drinking water USA data.

So, we ended up going directly to the states and pulling data from state databases. Of course, every state may do it a little bit differently so it took some massaging and processing to get the whole national data set.

And we fell back on some EPA data when states did not have available data at the level that we needed.

Moving onto the ecological USA data update, this data was delivered to PHMSA in 2018 and we even started the early distribution pilot in 2018. So, there may be some operators here that already have that data in hand.

Generally, anybody who reached out to us, anybody who we were speaking to, expressed interest, we asked them if they would be interested in being part of our pilot because the data request process for the ecological data is different this time.

There's some specific training that needs to be completed so we really do appreciate those operators who reached out, went through the

bumps of going through that process the first few times, and we shared the data with them already.

But it will be available to everybody, just like the drinking water data, this summer.

Again, there will be an email that goes out to all the NPMS primary contacts, so it will be your GS and mapping departments that are notified.

Consultants cannot initiate the data requests and again, only operators that can be verified to have Hazardous Liquid pipes in that state will receive that data, and that hasn't changed. Detailed instructions will be on the NPMS website.

And just a quick overview of the actual request process. Similar to the drinking water data, the operator sends the email request to PHMSA, however, what's different is that the operator needs to include a list of every single person who's going to use the data.

This is going to include not only the operator employees who actually use the GIS systems, do the analysis, produce the maps, but

also your consultants.

So, PHMSA will be verifying the requester's employment and applicability for the data to determine what states they can receive data for.

And then the operator in every single one of the users listed will have to complete NatureServe's online training and agree to their data policy.

This is video-based training, it is approximately 75 minutes with a quiz, but it can be broken down into about 4 different modules so you don't have to complete it all in one sitting.

But no data will be released to the operator until every listed user completes this step and NatureServe verifies with us that we are now able to release the data to you. And then we'll deliver the data via secure FTP download.

Again, I cannot show you the maps of the 2018 ecological USA data but to give you a little review of what that data looks like, we do not have an update for D.C., Delaware, Hawaii, Ohio, or Puerto Rico.

The data simply was not available in a format and up to date and at a quality that would be any better than the 2001 data. We do have 2001 data for every one of those areas with the exception of Puerto Rico.

So, if you do request access to any of these areas for the 2018 update, you will receive a hybrid data set that will be both the 2001 data as well as a little bit of the 2018 data, the overlap from the surrounding states.

So, if you're requesting Ohio, something that came in from Kentucky in the 2018 update, you will receive that in your Ohio data delivery. Metadata, again, is available for the public.

As well, this data was very cumbersome. It was a very, very large data set that we had a hard time using even on our servers. So, we have dissolved the data down, removed some of the overlap just so it's more useable for the users.

But we have developed additional lists of the eco-unique IDs, if you're familiar with that, so you can still backtrack and go back to NatureServe and identify the exact species that are in those areas.

You'll just have a list of various species that are in that area, and I thank Bonnie for that recommendation, it was a great one.

Okay, and the mileage differences.

So, with the 2001 data, we have over 14,000 miles of Hazardous Liquid pipe that intersected. 2018, just over 9000 miles. Again, this does not include all of the could-affect mileage.

To give you an idea of what that data looks like, we have larger areas of the coast that are covered, then in 2001. And the improved data really did result in more precise and smaller locations being identified inland.

So, it's more coastal areas covered, it looks like less inland area is covered, but really the data did not need to be buffered to the extent before. It's more accurate and we

were able to be more precise.

And last section before we get to Q&A,

I want to talk a little bit about the analysis

and the comparisons we ran between the ESI data

set, which Steve introduced.

It was probably the biggest topic of conversation in our 2017 public meeting, if any of you were there. NOAA's Environmental Sensitivity Index, also called the ESI, they make a number of different products, one of them being an incredibly detailed shoreline.

It follows inlets and everything and you'll see it show up in various maps today. And so like I said, this was the primary GS data source that was discussed in 2017 and it actually categorizes coastal area sensitivity to oil.

So, we see it as a very relevant product to what it is that we're trying to do and it's developed by NOAA, a leading authority in mapping and understanding coastal area.

A quick little review of the ESI shoreline, so in both the Atlantic and the Gulf

together, we ran some overlap analysis with the 2018 ecological USA data and found about 59 percent of this was already overlapped by the 2018 ecological USA data.

The areas on the map that are red are the areas where they had the lack of overlap.

The green covers the overlap. I will point out it looks like Louisiana is not covered. It's not necessarily that Louisiana is not covered at all.

That shoreline down there in that ESI product is very detailed in following all those inlets, as you can imagine if you're familiar with Louisiana.

So, the vast amount, the length of the shoreline down there is very long and it was bopping and weaving in and out of the current eco USA data, as you can imagine.

Next, some analysis of the Pacific Coast, just on the West Coast. This does not include Hawaii or Alaska. About 65 percent of this and Puget Area Sound, everything up north, again very detailed shoreline up there.

Those are definitely some areas that were not completely covered. There were some areas in Southern California as well.

Last, a quick review of Alaska. It was only 30 percent but, of course, there's a lot of coastline in Alaska and only very few areas where pipelines approach coastlines in Alaska.

So, it's not as bad as it sounds but you can see the highlights of the areas that are in red. We do not have the overlap in green, we did have the overlap.

And with that is the end of that presentation, just an introduction to the NPMS and an update on the ecological and drinking water USA data that will be available to you, all the Hazardous Liquid pipeline operators, shortly.

I guess now we can open it up for Q&A.

You can send your questions if you are on the

webcast to the website -- or I'm sorry, the email

address that's listed here.

Somebody in the room will take those questions and pass them up to us, and I will take

questions from the table.

And one last note that after the break when our Q&A is done, make sure that you look at the session number 2 link to continue watching the webcast.

Thank you.

MR. FISCHER: Any questions? Can we get a mic up front, please? Tom, up front?

PARTICIPANT: Hi, so when you were doing the comparison of the 2018 eco USAs to the ESI shoreline, it looks like you used all shoreline types.

Was that true?

MS. GOODING: Yes, that is true. We used all shoreline types, we did not minimize that just to the beach.

We've been recommended to and we're looking at the ESI product to really derive a number of the different definitions.

So, we weren't really doing this analysis with only coastal beaches in mind, but just as a way of considering the entire coastal

area in all the shoreline. 1 2 PARTICIPANT: Okay, and did you ever run a statistic with just the beaches of the 3 actual shoreline, like maybe using the NHD 4 5 coastline? No, I do not have any of 6 MS. GOODING: 7 that information here when we broke it down to 8 just the beaches. I do have some analysis and 9 some maps showing just those areas and how they differ and how much of the coastline is covered. 10 I do not believe I have statistics 11 available with me right now about the portion 12 that is included in the eco USA 22 data, but it's 13 14 something I could look into. PARTICIPANT: Yes, that's what I was 15 16 thinking. The percentages may very well go up if 17 you just limit it to the beach and not --18 MS. GOODING: I don't doubt it. 19 PARTICIPANT: -- all of those inland 20 waterways. 21 MS. GOODING: I agree, that's true. 22 MR. FISCHER: Do we have any other

questions?

MR. HALL: We do have one question from the webcast from Rebecca Craven at the Pipeline Safety Trust.

It's a three-part question. The first question is will PHMSA map could-affect areas or will operators be responsible for that?

MS. GOODING: The quick answer is no, we will not be mapping could-affect areas. In all honesty, anybody familiar with how to determine could-affect areas -- and I am not personally an expert on this.

There are so many different factors that come into play, elevation, slope, types of soil possibly, water features in the areas.

It's depending on exactly where the pipeline is, what the pipeline carries, the size of the pipeline, and so many other factors can determine whether or not a pipeline here or there could affect.

So, we will not be making a blanket, polygon data set that says every single pipeline

| 1 | in this location could affect. That is an |
|----|---|
| 2 | interpretation that is best left to very |
| 3 | individual focused analysis by the operators |
| 4 | themselves. |
| 5 | MR. HALL: Thank you for that. The |
| 6 | second part of the question is when will PHMSA be |
| 7 | enforcing use of the new data? |
| 8 | MR. FISCHER: I'm sorry, when will |
| 9 | PHMSA what? |
| 10 | MR. HALL: When will we, PHMSA, |
| 11 | enforce the use of the new data? When will it be |
| 12 | required that operators use the new data? |
| 13 | MR. FISCHER: Well, it will fall |
| 14 | within the protocols that operators require by |
| 15 | the regulations to incorporate within their |
| 16 | baseline assessments. |
| 17 | So, one year for incorporation I |
| 18 | believe, five years for identification of could- |
| 19 | affect areas. So, it'll be the same. |
| 20 | MR. HALL: Very good, and the last |
| 21 | part is how are you figuring the percent of |
| 22 | coastal areas that are covered when the areas has |

How do you figure the percent of coastal areas that are covered when the area has

not yet been defined?

not yet been defined?

MS. GOODING: Oh, yes, that analysis was done with just the ESI coastline data set and the 2018 update of the ecological USA data. The 2018 update of the ecological USA data has been defined, we have it in hand.

Pilot operators who participated also have that data. The ESI shoreline is also in existence and has been defined.

So, we have not defined the final definitions for the terms in the mandate but we use existing definitions for that analysis.

Anything else?

MR. FISCHER: We have questions up here. To your right.

PARTICIPANT: We had a question about when you're submitting the request for the ecological data. You said that the operator, and the consultants, and anyone within the operating

entity that might be using the data would have to be included on the request.

When you say using it, are you saying anyone that would just be potentially viewing it within your company or actually manipulating the data?

MS. GOODING: Actually that's a really good question. I can provide clarity on that.

When we say users, and this clarity will be explained on the NPMS website when we do get that updated, it will literally be the people using the data in the GIS data system.

So the other people in your operating

-- I know that -- I'm sorry if I caused some fear
there, not my intent. So your GIS analysts, the
people who are actually using the dataset and who
are responsible for the products that are going
to be distributed and displayed for the other
people in your agency to view, so they're in
control of the messaging, so.

MR. FISCHER: It will not become a new training program for your company.

| 1 | MS. GOODING: Unless you want to, no |
|----|--|
| 2 | problem. |
| 3 | MR. FISCHER: Other questions? We |
| 4 | have plenty of time. |
| 5 | MR. HALL: Just as a reminder to the |
| 6 | members of the audience, when you do speak, it |
| 7 | would be very helpful if you could identify |
| 8 | yourself with your name and your company for the |
| 9 | viewers of the webcast and for the record. Thank |
| 10 | you. |
| 11 | MR. FISCHER: Did we do that good of |
| 12 | a job in explaining all of this? |
| 13 | MS. GOODING: I think we're done. |
| 14 | MR. FISCHER: Is there another |
| 15 | question? |
| 16 | MS. GOODING: Yes, I saw this |
| 17 | gentleman in the red tie. |
| 18 | MR. FISCHER: Okay. |
| 19 | MR. MEDINA: Thank you and good |
| 20 | morning, Nick Medina with ExxonMobil Pipeline. |
| 21 | The code effect data, right, I know it's up to |
| 22 | the operator to use analysis to define it, but |
| | |

1 will you provide guidance in how do operators 2 help define that or share examples on what it is that is expected for operators to define that? 3 4 MS. GOODING: Do we provide that 5 quidance? 6 MR. MEDINA: Mm-hmm. MS. GOODING: I know that there are, 7 8 I want to say -- I don't want to speak out of 9 I'm sorry. Do we have an integrity 10 management person who can speak? There is some 11 quidance. 12 MR. FISCHER: Like through FAQs. 13 MS. GOODING: FAQs, thank you, Steve. 14 There are FAQs and there are guidance documents 15 that do exist. 16 MR. MEDINA: Okay. 17 MS. GOODING: And if you need some 18 help identifying those or pointing to those exact 19 resources, we can get those locations for you 20 during the break. MR. FISCHER: But all of this should 21 22 be the same that you've been using for the past,

you know, 20 years or approximately, so no changes with the addition of this new eco and drinking water USA data.

MR. REYNOLDS: Good morning, James
Reynolds with the Enforcement Division here with
the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety
Administration. I just have two questions, one
for Steve and one for you, Leigha.

The question for Steve is once the definitions for the ecological areas and the coastal waterways is defined and agreed upon, and I think you mentioned that there will be some more regulations once those definitions have been in place, do you foresee any economic impact to pipeline operators to comply with those regulations?

MR. FISCHER: That'll be part of, if we go the route of a rulemaking process, that would be part of that process that will, it will have to be analyzed and identified. So I don't have an answer for you now. It will just follow the normal protocol if we take the rulemaking

route in defining those features.

MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you. And Leigha, when you spoke about the, and I apologize if I get my terms mixed up here, you spoke about the drinking water and ecological data from the different states, and I think you mentioned that you didn't have anything from Puerto Rico.

And so my question is, is that important that that information is not available for Puerto Rico and are there any efforts underway to obtain any updated information for Puerto Rico?

And I think you said that there was no data even in 2011 for Puerto Rico, and if you can explain?

MS. GOODING: Yes, the ecological USA data specifically has come from a data source that is produced and maintained by a company named NatureServe, and NatureServe did not have the data in their database available for this, and by recommendation, we did not -- you know, there was no authoritative way to produce data in

that location.

With future updates, we'll certainly try to find Puerto Rico again. We won't stop looking for Puerto Rico data to fulfill that, but there's no effort at this time to do that.

MR. HALL: We have an additional question from the web viewers. This is a question from Nan Gray with Soil Works
Incorporated. She says, "Maps need to include areas to avoid. Unsuitable soils need to be avoided. How are you incorporating the natural resources conservation service soil survey?"

MR. FISCHER: Okay, well, we appreciate the comment. We'll take that into consideration. I certainly recommend for any of the web viewers or anyone in the audience to submit your comments, questions, or concerns to the docket as well so that it's officially included as part of the process.

MR. HALL: She also goes on to state,
"PHMSA needs to require on the ground order one
soil surveys for pipeline routing long before

construction," just a comment, not a question.

MR. FISCHER: Okay, thank you. Yeah,

thank you for that submission.

MR. WEIMER: Can you hear me? Carl Weimer, Pipeline Safety Trust. I was wondering if you can speak a little bit -- I know in the past, local elected officials and government officials can get password entry into the NPMS.

I wonder if this new data is going to be available to those folks and if they're going to have to go through the same certification process that operators are going to have to go through?

MS. GOODING: Yes, that's a good question, and unfortunately, no. The 2018 ecological data and the 2019 drinking water USA data will no longer be available. It's not a decision from PHMSA. It's a limitation from the vendors who produce the data. The data, the ecological data is proprietary.

The drinking water data is highly sensitive, and we went through a lot of

agreements with different states individually just to get the data for use by our pipeline operators, and we are limited in that we are only permitted to distribute this data to the pipeline operators for that purpose.

MR. WEIMER: All right, and how about state regulators? How are they going to be able to access and get certified to look at this data so they can enforce these rules?

MS. GOODING: State partners, I'd have to look into that, but I imagine as state partners of PHMSA, they're working together with us. We are trying to, you know, prepare for inspections in similar ways, so we'll be sharing that under confidentiality agreements for all types of inspectors, I imagine, but I can certainly get a firmed up answer for you during the break.

MR. WEIMER: Okay, you know, the public's kind of in the dark on this stuff, especially the drinking water stuff because we can't see it, so it kind of concerns me that

local government officials that use this information to define their aquifers and protect their aquifers can't see what you're using, so what kind of verification is there that this data is good data with the people that it really means the most to?

MS. GOODING: And I'd say the verification of this data is that it came directly from the states who produced the data, and they all have their own processes for producing these datasets, and I'm sure individual state agencies, which you can learn about in the metadata that is available to the public. The metadata can contact these state agencies and ask them that question because they really truly did develop that data.

Now, in terms of taking that data and processing it into data that meets the USA definition for PHMSA, that was not only done by a contractor who helped develop that definition, but then other contractors were hired to do third hand validation of the data as well, and that's

one of the reasons why we've taken the amount of time we have to create that data. The accuracy of it is very important.

MR. LESNIACK: Good morning, Chuck
Lesniack representing the public. I want to
reiterate what Carl said, that to not have the
eco USA data and particularly the drinking water
data not available to local governments is a real
problem, and if one of the reasons is that it's a
proprietary product, that's also a problem.

This is public -- this is now
government data that should be shared with at
least representatives of the public, the local
governments who are often the people, the
entities that produce the drinking water. We
need to find a better way to get better data.

And then the other thing is just about the accuracy of the data. I was a local government official for 28 years, and my experience in our area is the federal data about ecological resources and drinking water contributing areas and protection source areas at

the federal and state level was often very poor, and it's also true for the ecological data. The state agencies in Texas do a pretty --

The data at the state level was very gross, and so if it's going up to another level to the federal level and being produced by a third-party vendor, I think, I suspect, I believe the data to be highly suspect in terms of it probably is a decent overview, but when you get to the level of where the operator is going to use that data to create their code effect areas, those areas are probably going to --

There's another level of error that they can put into it, and so what we have historically seen at the local level from the operators that rely on national level data is it's often very, very inaccurate.

And so, and then to not be able to share that information with the local governments, much less the public who can actually ground truth this information, that's a real problem.

MS. GOODING: Okay, thank you for your comment.

MS. CROWNHEIM: Good morning, my name is Patty Crownheim. I'm with Rethink Energy New Jersey and I'd like to echo, I think quite literally, the comments of Carl and Chuck.

In New Jersey, we have seen a great
amount of frustration from municipalities who
want access to comprehensive and accurate
information, and I think that while the
information may come from state sources, it tends
to be fragmented.

There isn't a good place for the municipalities to be able to access it, and they are the entities that the general public goes to first to find out information, so they really are an important partner, I think, in information and engagement for PHMSA.

So the other piece is that the municipalities' ability to access this information, and as Chuck said, fact check it and make sure that it's actually what is happening on

the ground, is important.

And they may be able to have the ecological information, but to be able to have the overlay of the pipeline information, they don't have access to that, so that's what's really missing.

And that would be why it's so valuable and I think crucial that you have some way of interacting with municipalities, whether you create some kind of a program or pathway for certain leaders in municipalities and identify key people in municipalities who can enter into these kinds of information sharing with PHMSA, but there should be able to be a pathway for that to occur. Thank you.

MS. GOODING: And you mentioned these municipalities and these other levels of government, which is good, and not groups that are responsible for pipeline inspections specifically, but more for environmental protection generally?

MS. CROWNHEIM: I'm sorry. I couldn't

hear the last part.

MS. GOODING: Oh, sorry. The municipalities that you're speaking of that should be able to see this information, these are not municipalities that do any, that participate in inspection of pipelines specifically, but they're more interested in general environmental protections and things?

MS. CROWNHEIM: These are municipalities that have miles of pipelines running through them --

MS. GOODING: Yeah.

MS. CROWNHEIM: -- and proposed pipelines as well. These are the people on the ground impacted.

MS. GOODING: And they can absolutely gain access to all of the pipeline locations in the NPMS, not just the public view, but the actual PIMMA and the actual GIS data for the pipeline locations as well, but the point is well taken about the USA data as well. Thank you.

MS. FARRELL: Hi, Linda Farrell,

Pipeline Safety Coalition in Pennsylvania. I would like to also echo.

Chuck made a very, very good point about ground sourcing, and I think many of the conversations we'll have over the next two days will be about public engagement, and the fact that the top down rather than the bottom up approach to information sharing and to information gathering needs to be reexamined is something I hope we'll be discussing in detail.

As Patty said, we see people. The public sees on the ground a lack of communication between the permitting agencies and the local municipalities who have -- municipalities and also actually some of the permitting agencies who have, let's say, conservation districts on the ground, who have better information. Better perhaps is not the right word, but have boots on the ground.

The conservation districts know what's going to happen on a steep slope in their area, and so the information sharing from what we've

just discussed to the entire public awareness and education I think is all very, very tied in and really needs to -- I'm looking forward to how you all address that.

MS. GOODING: Thank you.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you.

MR. HALL: We have two additional questions from our web viewers. The first is a follow-up question from Rebecca Craven at the Pipeline Safety Trust. It's regarding the enforceability of the use of the data.

She says, "Will the one year to incorporate/five years to be enforceable also apply to the new definitions for the Great Lakes once they are defined?" So once the Great Lakes are defined as USA as the coastal areas, will the one year/five year rule still apply?

MR. FISCHER: I believe so. I mean, that information will be -- you know, PHMSA is required to make that information available through the NPMS.

So once we work through that process

and create the data and publish it on the NPMS, and we go through a similar notification process where we notify all of the operators about the availability of that new eco data, then I suspect it should, that the same time frame would apply.

MS. GOODING: And it will be part of

MS. GOODING: And it will be part of the written definition in 195.

MR. FISCHER: 195.6.

MR. HALL: She also says, it's formulated as a question, but I think given your answer, it's more of a comment.

She says, "So from the 2016 date of the mandate, it will be at least four years before the definition is finished, and then an additional five years before operators are held accountable for using those in their identification of code effect areas?"

MR. FISCHER: Okay.

MR. HALL: The second question we got is from Sheila McGinty at Williams. She says,

"The source information for the drinking water and ecological metadata is often a link to a

general website such as a state DEQ. Is there a location that shows who or which agency to contact?"

MS. GOODING: In the newest metadata that's coming out for the 2018 and 2018 data updates, there should be information in there about the state agency and a contact person who is representative of the data source, yes.

MR. HALL: Thank you. That's all of the questions from the web viewers now.

MR. FISCHER: Thanks, Sam.

MS. GOODING: Absolutely, thanks.

MR. FISCHER: Any additional questions? Okay, well, that will conclude the session. It looks like we'll have about a 25-minute break here. We will reconvene at 10:15.

For everyone who is watching the web cast, when we come back at 10:15 Eastern time, you'll need to select the second session on our launch page in order to watch the video for that portion of the meeting. So thank you and we will convene at 10:15 Eastern time.

| 1 | Oh, and we have one other hold on. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. MURRAY: Good morning. Instead of |
| 3 | coming back at 10:15, can we just take a 15- |
| 4 | minute break? |
| 5 | MR. FISCHER: Okay. |
| 6 | MS. MURRAY: And that way we can |
| 7 | advance in our program and possibly wrap up a |
| 8 | little bit earlier for lunch if it affords us |
| 9 | that opportunity? |
| 10 | MR. FISCHER: So you want people back |
| 11 | at 10:05? |
| 12 | MS. MURRAY: 10:05 would be perfect. |
| 13 | MR. FISCHER: So at 10:05 Eastern |
| 14 | time, we'll reconvene session number two. |
| 15 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter |
| 16 | went off the record at 9:50 a.m. and resumed at |
| 17 | 10:10 a.m.) |
| 18 | MS. MURRAY: Okay, if everyone could |
| 19 | take their seats? And if our next panel, if you |
| 20 | could make your way up on the stage, we'll get |
| 21 | started in just a minute. |
| 22 | As everyone is taking their places, I |

do want to circle back around and have Sam Hall read one remaining web cast question we received from Nan Gray on the web cast.

So we're going to kick off with addressing that question from the last conversation, and then we will proceed with our next discussion. Sam?

MR. HALL: This question is a followup question from Nan Gray with Soil Works
Incorporated. She says, "Thank you for this
mapping tool, and not all drinking water and/or
source water is recognized or mapped by our
state."

She says, "How does the drinking water map change the routing or construction of a pipeline? Does the highest integrity pipe, highest class pipe get used in the areas of eco USA or HCA?

"And then ground truthing and water truthing, even ephemeral water truthing needs to be performed. Ecological studies should not be performed by inexperienced or untrained

personnel."

MS. MURRAY: Okay, thank you for that. So we're going to get Karen Gentile one of our mics and she's going to offer some good insight into that question, particularly as to how drinking water may change, the drinking water map may change the landscape of how operators may work to get their pipelines constructed and routed.

MS. GENTILE: So pipeline operators -so PHMSA does not have jurisdiction over sighting
pipelines. However, what would happen is the
construction process would work through the
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and based
on the class location of those pipelines, the
pipeline would have to be designed according to
PHMSA's regulatory requirements, so they would
have to design for the highest location class
pipe for the area.

MS. MURRAY: And the drinking water information, which certainly goes into feeding and helping to define what those locations are,

will inherently, as we refresh the drinking water, it will also fit under the same existing requirements we have.

And operators who may be operating in a state that wouldn't necessarily grant them access to the eco and drinking water data in a particular state, and they may have an interest in planning new construction in a different state, we will be able to work with them on a case by case basis to get them additional information they need to help support those planning purposes. All right, well, thank you, web case viewer Nan Gray for that question.

So let me kick off the next discussion. I'm Christie Murray. I'm the director of our outreach and engagement team here at PHMSA in the Office of Pipeline Safety, and I'm going to be facilitating our discussion for the rest of the afternoon on our ecological USA panel.

And just one thing, in your folders, if you have not already found them, I think it's

on the left side of the folder in the back, you'll find a set of pre-read questions regarding this topic.

Feel free to pull those out as I introduce our next presenter, Leigha Gooding.

She's going to come back up and give a little bit more insight into some of those questions.

If you are participating by web cast, if you go to the meeting registration page, you will also find the pre-read questions there for you to also pull up and follow along with us.

With that being said, I will turn it over to Leigha Gooding, and she's going to share and talk a little bit more about the pre-read questions that we hope you have given some thought to, and we'll hear more from our additional panelists on in just a few minutes.

MS. GOODING: All right, thank you,
Christie. All right, so I'm going to go over
these questions for consideration if you haven't
read through them already.

I'll not only go through the

questions, but I'll display some of the data and some of the maps that we've produced that really led to some of these questions.

These are maps and data that we produced during the data pilot and as a result of the conversations and insight we gained from our last public meeting in 2017.

So I will go through these questions, and this is really what PHMSA -- these are the questions, the second round of questions that we've come up with, discussions that we would like to have to help us evaluate how to best meet this congressional mandate.

They were developed based on feedback from the first public meeting in '17, as well as the data pilot concluded during 2018, and the following slides include the question text as well as some sample maps to support the conversation.

So to get started with question one, this one is focused on the coastal beach definition. Question one is, "Should PHMSA

define and map coastal beaches based on the Environmental Sensitivity Index, ESI, shoreline features that include beach as part of the shore type description?"

We then go a bit further to ask,

"Should PHMSA apply a quarter mile buffer to

these shoreline segments to represent the body of

the beach, or do you suggest another size buffer

and why?"

Next, "Should PHMSA consider all shoreline features regardless of the type description as the basis for defining a coastal beach?" And, "Are there any other various datasets that you would recommend that we consider for this definition?"

Some quick maps from the analysis that we had done internally, the yellow buffer area around the shorelines, that represents about a quarter mile all around the ESI shoreline product. This is only displaying the sections of the ESI shoreline product that are described as beaches.

We had two possible approaches here.

We have both beach as a primary category or beach as one of the categories. There are many segments of shoreline that can be described in more than one way.

And so if any one of the maybe two or three descriptions of that section of shoreline included describing it as a beach, it was included in the data that is red. That is the thicker shoreline that is on the bottom. On top of that, you'll see the orange thinner shoreline.

So you can see that there is more red shoreline than there is orange shoreline, orange being primarily described as a beach, red being definitely described as a beach, but also described as something else.

And we focus on Massachusetts and
Texas for the purpose of this data pilot. So
throughout all of these questions and
definitions, you'll see Texas and Massachusetts
again and again.

Here is just a quick description.

This is the list of descriptions that the ESI uses to describe the different sections of shoreline, so you see how detailed it can get, and those yellow stars are next to the only six that actually describe beaches.

So it's only six out of, what do we have here, 43 different classifications, and the classifications are all ranked from least susceptible to impacts from an oil spill to most susceptible to impacts from an oil spill, most susceptible being the 10F side, least being the 1A, and you see all of the beaches reside right in the 3A through 6B range in the susceptibility index.

Next, I'll review the questions for marine coastal waters. "Should PHMSA include estuaries, swamps, and marshes from the USGS National Hydrography Dataset as part of the definition of marine coastal waters?"

"Should PHMSA reference the extent of US state submerged lands to define the extent of marine coastal waters?"

"Should PHMSA mimic the EPA's definition of coastal waters as defined in the nutrient criteria technical guidance manual for estuarine and coastal marine waters?"

In that document, they define, the EPA defines the marine coastal waters as measuring 20 nautical miles from the shoreline.

And then to go further, "Should we be measuring those not only from the primary shoreline, but also the shoreline of islands?"

"Do you have a recommendation for that shoreline definition that we should use for the purpose of this measurement?"

Next, to C, "Should PHMSA include all coastal waters, all the waters out to the federal/state water boundary?" and we'll have some maps to illustrate these.

First, here we have an example of the marshes, wetlands, and estuaries that we've pulled from the water bodies out of the National Hydrography Dataset. This comes from the USGS.

It can be downloaded at the link that we have

here.

In these maps, this is a result of all of those specific areas, marshes, wetlands, and estuaries, that intersect this quarter mile buffer around the shoreline. So this isn't every single marshland, wetland, or estuary, only those that do intersect that buffer, and it includes the entire wetland.

So if five percent of that wetland happens to be within a quarter mile of the beach, we're showing you the entire wetland, and that's for display purposes and for conversation purposes.

The quarter mile measurement was based on the ESI shoreline, and here are just two examples in both Massachusetts and Texas, and later on when we are having conversation, if we have any other comments, I can come back to these maps if you want to reference them or ask specific questions about them.

Here is an example of the US state submerged lands data both in Massachusetts and

Texas again. I did want to mention we ran some additional 2018 eco USA data intersection analysis with these proposed definitions during the data pilot.

99.9 percent of the data for matching the US state submerged lands definition is already intersecting the 2018 eco USA. When I say intersecting, I mean it's already covered by the 2018 eco USA data. Going over to Texas, it was about 67.2 percent of that area.

And last, the 20 nautical miles from the coast measurement as recommended by the EPA, or used by the EPA, I should say, about 71.9 percent of that area in Massachusetts. You can see that area.

It certainly extends further offshore going around the cape and all, and then about 42 percent of the Texas area was already intersecting the 2018 ecological USA.

And last, just a quick map showing all of the waters that we grabbed. For this example here, we grabbed all of the waters beyond the

boundary of the county from the U.S. Census Bureau.

The U.S. Census Bureau has the county boundaries and state boundaries that we use internally for the NPMS, and so we just took all of the water past the county boundary according to the U.S. Census Bureau out to that fed/state water line. Again, Massachusetts, nearly all of that area is already considered in ecological USA, and about 67 percent of that area for Texas.

A couple of questions here that we don't have reference maps for, "If PHMSA references the beach categorization from the ESI shoreline product, how should the agency define this definition in text or handle potential extensions of the ESI shoreline product further upriver?"

Number four, "Are coastal beaches limited to those along the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, or do the Great Lakes, commercially navigable waters, and other inland water bodies also include coastal

beaches?"

Number five, "Should PHMSA seek to combine coastal beaches and marine coastal waters into existing eco USA resources, or given that these coastal areas are not defined by ecological factors related to species, should the agency seek to define and map a new type of coastal USA?"

Number six, "Does PHMSA need to differentiate between the coastal beaches and marine coastal waters or produce a single coastal areas USA definition and data layer?"

Number seven, "Is shoreline sensitivity the same for all of the different hazardous liquid products subject to Part 195, and how about the impact of those various products on various parts of the shorelines?"

We'd be interested to hear your feedback on that as well.

And number eight, "Do operators currently consider the entire body of the Great Lakes as an HCA or only the representative

shipping channels in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' national waterway network?"

And last, number nine focuses on the Great Lakes. There is a lot of text on this slide here. I don't expect you to be able to read it, so I actually broke it down and included it on separate slides next to the maps to support the conversation.

So question nine, the primary question was, "Should PHMSA define and map the Great Lakes as all water bodies within the Great Lakes watershed based on the boundaries in the USGS National Hydrography Dataset?"

In this map, you can see the watershed boundary actually shows up in yellow, and then we selected a few areas where we focused in closer to the data because it's hard to see at the larger scale, where you can see all of the water bodies in blue within that watershed.

So would this be an appropriate and effective way to define the Great Lakes for the purpose of what we're trying to do?

Nine A, "Should PHMSA reference the extent of the US state submerged lands around the Great Lakes to define the extent of the Great Lakes and their connecting channels?"

Again, zoomed into the area around Lake St. Clair here just to really demonstrate the US state submerged lands not only includes the bodies of the lakes themselves, but it did cover all of the connecting channels, Lake St. Clair, the St. Lawrence Seaway.

So we personally during the data pilot found it to be a consistent single data source that covered all of the areas that we thought should be included as connecting waters potentially.

Nine B, "Should PHMSA consider the Great Lakes definition as found in 33 USC 1268 which defines the Great Lakes to be Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, including Lake St. Clair, Lake Michigan, Lake Superior, and the connecting channels, including St. Mary's River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, and the St.

Lawrence River to the Canadian border, and do you have any recommended data sources for these bodies, not the center lines?"

We know that the center line that comes from the National Waterway Network does not, already does not display the entire body of the lake, and that's what we're looking for, and even for the connecting channels. Instead of a line going through the center of the channel, we really want a polygon showing the entire area.

Nine C, "Should PHMSA define and map the Great Lakes as only the bodies of Ontario, Erie, Huron, Michigan, and Superior without the connecting channels based on the boundaries in the USGS National Hydrography Dataset?"

And this was a conversation we had a lot in 2017. I won't say the prevailing conversation. I don't think anybody disagreed that the nature of these bodies of water, water is flowing from one lake to the next, and those channels that connect them, they consider to be just as important as the bodies themselves, so

we're interested to hear your opinions on that today.

And the last part of D, "Is there a different GIS dataset available at the national level that PHMSA should consider for the basis of defining and mapping the Great Lakes and connecting channels?"

And here I just wanted to make a quick little note that the NHD water bodies, we went through and analyzed that data during our pilot project and we found that it only includes polygons, meaning areas for the St. Lawrence River and Lake St. Clair.

So not all of the connecting waterways were we able to find in a polygon form in the version of the NHD that USGS delivered to us specifically for this data pilot, and even the line data, there were parts of the St. Mary's River missing.

But before I dive too far into those details, I just wanted to review the questions real quick, show you the maps that we have

available to support the discussion. I hope that these questions lead to a good conversation. And with that, we'll introduce our panel of experts to give their opinions. Thanks.

MS. MURRAY: All right, thank you,
Leigha, for teeing up those questions. It's
certainly a mouthful and a lot to digest, so
we're going to talk about them in different
segments and hear from different panelists on
some of those questions.

First up, we have Erol Alavi, who joined Plains All American Pipeline in 2015 where he currently is the engineering supervisor for the integrity technical advisor group.

His areas of specialty include risk assessment, HCA analysis, corrosion management, inspection, engineering critical analysis, and material and failure analysis.

He has held a variety of roles in industry, beginning his career as a manufacturing HSE engineer at Cummins Diesel Engines before working as a consulting engineer working on

offshore oil and gas projects mainly for BP.

So with that being said, I introduce Erol Alavi. Thank you.

MR. ALAVI: Good morning. To the agenda, we have the type of HCAs, type of analysis. Maybe that will answer the question's code effect. We will talk about scheduling and pressure reduction.

We will talk about prioritization of HCA versus non-HCA, the misconception of NICA, the conservatism that's used in the calculation, and recommendation.

As you've seen in earlier presentation, we have five categories based on 195.450, and those are highly populated areas, other populated areas, commercial navigable waterways, drinking water, unusual sensitive area, and ecological unusual sensitive area.

Also, we go above and beyond, and if you look at those HCAs that is not covered under this, for example, if you build a new subdivision, it is not covered under these five

categories. We create polygons and we input inside our model.

So how do we do the analysis? We look at two different things. We look at pipeline rupture, worst-case volume that comes from pipeline rupture, and then we create flow lines and we try to figure out how far it can go.

Also we look at span analysis. We look at orifice size and then angle from a puncture, and again, we figure out how far it can reach. And the figure of these two, a buffer zone is going to be used in analysis.

So the analysis type of five different type of analysis in there, and I'm going to go through each of them. Direct is where your pipeline go inside an HCA. It's called direct.

Indirect, where your HCA overlap with your pipeline buffer zone. It's called indirect. Direct watershed, this is when any NHD can cross from the pipeline. Where it hits the pipeline, we calculate 32 miles downstream of that to see if in that area it passes inside any HCAs.

Indirect watershed, because of the terrain, because of the sloping it comes inside the HCA. Again, we look at 32 miles that it can travel.

And terrain flow, if it is not covered by any of these top four, then we look at the terrain and we create flow lines to make sure that, if it's going to reach any type of HCA or not.

So one of the concerns that we have is scheduling and pressure reduction. As you understand, if any anomalies concern and they are inside HCAs, then they are a type of condition change. They become either immediate, or 60 days, or 180 days.

For example, I'll give you an example.

If you have any corrosion with dent, it will be immediate regardless of the percentages.

So this will create some impact on the anomaly repair schedule because say that you have stabilized 50 percent of corrosion, or a non-injurious dent, or a non-injurious metal loss

with indents, or corrosion along, but not impacting the long seam, all of these anomalies that really are not injurious, now because they are under the HCA, we have to go dig it up and we have to repair them.

There is another way that we can do engineering critical analysis, but unfortunately, most of them become immediate and filling the exception for engineering critical analysis is not practical.

Another thing is unnecessary pressure reduction. If, giving you an example again, if you have corrosion with dent regardless of size or shape, even if they are not injurious, we have to pressure reduct. We have to a reduction in pressure, and by that, it's going to upset our delivery time and it will upset the business.

The other thing, that tool tolerance is incredibly sensitive now days. Like in earlier time, they wouldn't pick up anything less than one percent. Now they can pick up 0.5 percent of dents and read metal loss less than 10

percent. So because regulation says any depth, any size, now we have to put that in the same criteria.

So why prioritization in HCA and non-HCA is important, because imagine we have a line, right, and we are going to repair all of the concern anomalies. First, we prioritize the one in HCAs and we are going, usually we go and repair them first.

In the case of this proposed USAs become a rule, then there will be confusion of which one we are going to repair first. Now you have a high populated area and then you have these proposed HCAs, and in this case, like if there is an immediate in both sites, how are you going to define which one is going to be first repaired?

The other thing that we are concerned is original HCAs, all of these five categories that we explained, they are justified by scientific data, and it is my understanding that these new proposed ones is not.

The other thing is misconception of non-HCA. There is a misconception in the industry that operators do not repair the anomalies. That is not true. We actually do, and as a matter of fact, we repair in the same similar manner. The only major differences is prioritization and repair scheduling.

And one more key point is conservatism in calculations. When we calculate dispersed pressure, such as like B31, modified B31, RSTRENG, LnSec, they actually don't fail based on calculation. We assume that they are going to fail.

By saying that, we also add tool tolerance on top of this calculation and we make extremely conservative. Also we use that conservative approach for HCA analysis.

We assume that worst-case scenario rupture volume is going to happen at the same time where maximum flow rate is there, also maximum respond time when considering this analysis, and we will assume during a rainy day,

et cetera, and, I mean, the list goes on.

So by saying that, if release happens, it will not reach what we find based on these like, based on these analyses, so we go above and beyond that.

So there's a recommendation, we believe. HCA can be considered in other priority tiers such as medium consequence areas, not high consequence areas. We can utilize the same repair criteria and we need to provide additional time to prepare and make repairs.

Also, we believe more time and discussion is needed with operators as main operators are not aware of the proposed change.

Another feedback or recommendation that we can give is more attention should be given in research, also engineering critical analysis such as PHMSA enrollment with dent assessment has been very constructive. That's all I have.

MS. MURRAY: All right, great, thank you for that presentation. What we'll do is

likely take questions after we have heard from all of the panelists, and then we'll go into a more robust discussion on many of these questions.

Next, I want to introduce Bonnie

Freeman who is the president of FreemanGIS, Inc.

Bonnie Freeman has worked with geographic

information systems in the pipeline and

environmental engineering industries for over 30

years.

In 1999, Ms. Freeman took on the job of project manager and lead programmer of a joint U.S. DOT and API pilot to identify areas unusually sensitive to environmental damage from a hazardous liquid pipeline release.

In addition, she launched her company, FreemanGIS, in 2007, and continues to provide support to the pipeline industry by updating HCAs with current data and assessing risk to the sensitive resources that they identify. So please welcome Bonnie Freeman.

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you, Christie.

Thanks, Christie. Thanks, Steve. I've been working with high consequence areas since their inception 20 years ago.

Using GIS, I helped develop a methodology to map them, and I've pretty much been babysitting them ever since. I'm really happy to be here and appreciate the invitation to speak to you today on this important topic.

I'd like to start by underlining some important facts about high consequence areas. First and foremost, they are a valuable tool for industry because they prioritize work by putting the health and safety of environment first. The HCAs we have today already cover much of our nation's most sensitive ecological resources.

Ecological USAs are species that are in danger of becoming extinct. Drinking water USAs are the sources that supply water to our homes. Populated areas are where people live, work, and play, and commercially navigable waterways are vitally important to our nation's commerce and defense.

Operators currently use these existing HCAs to prioritize resource allocation when responding to anomalies. It's important to note that HCAs do not drive spill response. A spill is of the highest priority whether it's in an HCA or not.

HCAs do drive the repair scheduling of anomalies, but they are not used to avoid repairing an anomaly. Every anomaly is addressed. If it's on a pipeline segment that could affect a high consequence area, it's addressed first. If you consider the 2.4 million miles of pipeline we have in the U.S., it's easy to see why prioritization is very important.

The definitions for the current, for the existing HCAs are based in science.

Ecological USAs are places where a sensitive species has been seen. They are not areas where there is potential habitat for a sensitive species because this can become mired in controversy, so it's a very scientific observation with a time and a place.

Drinking water USAs are the source water protection areas defined and mapped by state agencies. These areas take into consideration time and travel of groundwater to a well and the location of intakes in the lakes and streams they draw water from.

Populated areas are mapped by the Census Bureau. Commercially navigable waterways are crucial to our nation's commerce and defense. They are mapped by the U.S.A. Army Corps of Engineers.

It's important to remember the congressional mandate, and that was to include the Great Lakes, coastal beaches, and marine coastal waters as USA ecological resources.

USA stands for unusually sensitive areas, an area that is unusually sensitive to environmental damage from a hazardous liquid pipeline release.

That is, and this is in the Code of Federal Regulations, defined as an area where a pipeline rupture would likely cause permanent or

long-term environmental damage.

It's important that we maintain the scientific basis for new HCAs. Since Congress mandates they be ecological resources, they should have something to do with protecting life, flora, fauna, people. To honor the intent of Congress, we must keep these concepts front and center when formulating a definition.

The HCAs must be objectively grounded in science and they must remain useful as a prioritization tool. If everything is high consequence, then the norm becomes high consequence and nothing rises above it. We must resist painting the world in HCA. It will not improve pipeline safety. It simply depreciates a valuable tool that we already have.

Formulating a new HCA definition should not be taken lightly. Our nation is vast and covers many types of shoreline from the rugged cliffs of northern California, to the broad, flat beaches of South Carolina, to the retreating coast of Louisiana.

These new HCAs are important and the GIS data that will define them are complex.

Further research is needed to review the available GIS data for our varied shorelines.

With the limited time I have left, I
will address some of PHMSA's questions for
consideration using Louisiana as an example. I
wish I could have done the same thing for the
Great Lakes and other areas, but I got Louisiana,
so that's what we're going to do.

All right, question number one, in Louisiana, when all ESI features that include beach are selected, gaps appear along the shoreline. So the green areas are what are defined as beach in the ESI dataset, okay.

When the NHD flow line features, that's the USGS National Hydrography Dataset, when they're selected for coastline, this is continuous. That's the red, and it actually goes underneath the green on this map.

Question 1A, a quarter mile buffer to represent the body of coastal beaches sounds

reasonable, but the widths should be tested to make sure it captures the majority of beaches along representative shore types from the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean, the Gulf, and the Great Lakes.

Question 1B, including all ESI shoreline types regarding of shore types, and not just beach, but anything that's considered a shoreline in the ESI dataset would extend coastal beaches 15 to 50 miles inland in Louisiana, including all of the coast along, all of the shoreline along the Mississippi River from the Gulf to the Mississippi state border.

And that's -- here is the Mississippi right here. And I didn't zoom out enough, but it goes straight up to the border. This area seems to stretch far beyond what we typically think of as coastal beach.

Question two, including all NHD features marked as estuaries, swamps, and marshes would extend marine coastal waters over 100 miles inland in Louisiana.

Marine coastal waters are typically thought of as areas of open ocean and unprotected coastal habitats characterized by exposure to wave action, tidal fluctuation, and ocean currents, and by the absence of trees, shrubs, and emergent vegetation.

The area in green, and look, it's going all the way up to Alexandria here, is far beyond what we typically think of as a marine system, which is usually considered to be at or near the full salinity of seawater.

Question 2A, US state submerged lands extend about three nautical miles offshore except for Texas and west Florida which are three marine leagues offshore. That's about nine miles.

Applying their extent to the offshore side of marine coastal waters makes sense. It's a band of water that accurately represents the interface between land and ocean. The extent also coincides with the extent of marine species that are currently mapped by existing ecological USAs.

And while you don't see that in the 2001 version of ecological USAs, you will see that in the refreshed versions that are coming out this summer.

Jumping ahead for a moment to question 2C, what if the full extent of US state submerged lands became the marine coastal waters? That's everything in purple you see here. It goes all the way up to the border of Louisiana and Mississippi.

Paired against all ESI shoreline

features, that's in green, the purple lines of

state submerged waters extend farther inland than

one would expect of waters associated with open

ocean and unprotected coastal habitats.

Returning to question 2B, the extent of EPA's coastal waters, and that's 20 nautical miles offshore, is a much wider band that is more representative of open water than the land/ocean interface covered by the offshore extent of state submerged lands.

So the bright purple here is the state

submerged lands, and then the softer purple is the 20 nautical miles offshore. I'm almost done.

Touching on question four, do inland water bodies include coastal beaches? We return again to the mandate. In and of themselves, inland shorelines will not suffer permanent or long-term damage from a hazardous liquid release. It's the life on the shorelines that would suffer and that is what we're trying to protect.

In fact, we're already doing this through the ecological USAs we currently have, and like I said, you'll see that much more coastline is covered by the eco USAs when the updates come out.

Questions five and six speak of combining the definition of coastal beaches and marine coastal waters with existing ecological USAs. Not only do the definitions need to remain separate, but they must be distinct from one another.

These new USAs will be mapped with jurisdictional boundaries that are based in

policy which can change over time. It's important to be specific about why we're calling them out as high consequence areas.

And to end, we did a great job with the definitions of the existing HCAs. They are grounded in science and have been protecting our nation's most sensitive environments for 20 years.

They do need to be updated, which is happening, and when you see the new updates, you will see they cover much more of our nation's coastlines than before because most environmental datasets are digital now and they weren't 20 years ago, and that's the reason why we had the absence of eco USAs along our coastlines.

Let's think these new HCAs through carefully so we can keep up the good work and continue to protect these important areas for future generations. Thank you very much for your time.

MS. MURRAY: Okay, thank you, Bonnie, for sharing those insightful points. Next up we

have Mr. Carl Weimer, who is the Executive

Director of the Pipeline Safety Trust. Many of
you know who he is.

In that capacity, he has served as a member of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Technical Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety
Standards Committee And also the Canadian Energy
Pipeline Association's External Advisory Panel and the Governor appointed Washington Citizen
Committee on Pipeline Safety.

Carl has been called upon to testify to the U.S. House and Senate multiple times as a witness by the National Transportation Safety Board and was honored in 2015 as a champion of change by the White House for his pipeline safety efforts.

He has organized 12 National Pipeline Safety Conferences, pushed for stronger pipeline safety legislation on the national and state level and regularly serves as an independent source of pipeline safety information for news, media, local government and citizens across the

country. I'm certainly looking forward to 1 2 hearing what Carl has to say. Good morning. 3 MR. WEIMER: Is it still morning? I'm from the West Coast so I'm 4 5 time zoned challenged right now. Well now for a totally different 6 7 perspective. I thank PHMSA for inviting me to 8 represent the public, one idea from the public. 9 Just a few comments. You know, it's 10 been three full years since the PIPES Act was signed so it's a little confusing to us why PHMSA 11 12 is still asking the public in this meeting where it can find GIS datasets. It seems from what 13 14 we've heard they already have the datasets. Ιt seems like we just need to be moving forward. 15 16 There was a previous workshop in 2017 17 that basically asked and discussed many of these 18 same questions. So I'm not quite sure why we're 19 doing it again later. 20 And also we'd just like to point out 21 that the maps that have been discussed weren't a 22 part of the pre-read. The agenda in the prereads of the meeting were not up for the public to review and comment on until just the last couple of days. So, you know, we're kind of at a disadvantage to make legitimate comments at this workshop.

It's also difficult for the public to comment because we're commenting on all of this USA stuff with blinders on because the public is not allowed to see where the majority of the HCAs are.

We're not allowed to see most of the USA designations. So we're kind of guessing what it is we're talking about. And as I already mentioned, none of the maps were provided beforehand so we could compare what PHMSA is considering.

One of the things we certainly hope
PHMSA does is avoid repeating past mistakes in
defining and mapping USAs. Maps and definitions
should look like and define what is commonly
meant.

Congress mandated commonly understood

areas as USAs. They said include riverine and estuarine systems. They said include National Parks. They said include wilderness areas, wildlife preservation areas and wildlife refuges and wild and scenic rivers.

Those are things that the public understands. When you go and look at what PHMSA has turned into USAs, none of those things are defined and used.

So if you're defining and describing an elephant -- I stole this picture from Dr.

Murray -- if you're describing an elephant, your picture should be a complete and recognizable elephant, not some weird piece of an elephant.

PHMSA's implementation has been tortured and not followed and perhaps included the Congressional mandated intent. We don't know if National Parks of wildlife refuges are included in USAs because we can't see those. We have those other definitions, and we don't know where the overlap is.

For example, we were very surprised

when Congress thought they had to mandate the Great Lakes as an unusually sensitive area. You know, everybody -- I grew up in Michigan. Everybody knows that lives in Michigan that the Great Lakes are an unusually sensitive area. So why the need for a mandate?

When you hear that the waters where a substantial likelihood of commercial navigation exists, we think, wow, the Great Lakes are already unusually sensitive areas because commercial navigation exists throughout the Great Lakes. But, no. Substantial likelihood of commercial navigation turned into commercially navigable waters which then turned into a map of actual freighter and tanker routes.

So what was included as USAs for the Great Lakes are just those dark lines where freighters and tankers go, not the whole Great Lakes themselves.

Now we don't know as the public whether this makes any difference because the rules say, could affect. It's hard for me to

imagine how a pipeline company thinks they could spill oil into the light blue areas and not affect the dark blue areas.

So perhaps from an individual company standpoint, there's no real difference because anything in that water could affect something else.

You know, this tortured definition of commercial waters left out commercial fishing.

It left out treaty reserved tribal and commercial subsistence fishing. It left out charter and pleasure boats, all of which provide massive commercial benefits to the Great Lakes.

But Congress in 2016, sensing that

PHMSA hadn't done a very good job of defining

these things did an unusually explicit directive.

They said you shall revise this section to

include the Great Lakes coastal beaches and

marine coastal waters.

To take it one step further, while we're all arguing today about where the actual HCAs are and what are USAs, the real meat of the

integrity management rule is the could affect part of the rule.

So you can define the lake, but then the industry has to define where a spill could happen that could affect that lake, which is a much larger area.

There is a number of issues to resolve. We need to come up with regulatory definitions. We need to figure how those are defined in USAs and mapped. And we need guidance on the could affect area and how operators will be held accountable for these things.

For the Great Lakes in the marine coastal waters, we suggest the well-defined scientifically understood and inclusive watershed base method to show both the defined USAs and to provide the guidance for the could affect areas.

Agencies like local storm water
districts, local watershed protection districts,
state environmental agencies and the EPA for
years now have been harking on the public like us
to make sure we tune up our car because a drip of

oil from our car will end up in the watershed, which will end up in the local waters.

We need to worry about where our dogs take a crap because it will end up in the local waters. Farmers have been getting dinged all over the place for fertilizers hundreds of miles upstream because it ends up in the local waters.

So you can use this same thing for defining the Great Lakes. Use a watershed approach. Here's a watershed approach. The Great Lakes are in blue. Any sixth grader that grew up in the Great Lakes will know that.

The green area is the Great Lakes watershed. Anything you spill in the green area could affect the blue area. So this is the type of approach that should be used. This then puts the onus on the operator of the pipeline segment based on the regulations in their integrity management plan to demonstrate if they have a pipeline anywhere in the green area that could have a spill, whether it will affect those blue areas or not.

The same could be done for coastal marine waters using the watershed approach. And some of these watersheds are huge. So if you own a pipeline in Montana that might spill into the Yellowstone River and you know you're not going to recover all that oil, you could affect the marine coastal waters of Louisiana.

The Clean Water Act seems like a logical possibility, the use for marine coastal water designations, along with some others.

There's maps that were included in there, if you followed the links, that show all the stuff.

But our main comment is we've spent three years fussing over the details of this, trying to pick the GIS layers, when in the reality the could affect part of the rule is broad enough to include all of the concerning details.

So pick a GIS layer and let's move forward. Pick a layer that's used for other purpose. Pick GIS that avoids confusion and conflicts with regulatory schemes. Pick some

options. Put them out there to interested folks to comment on and get an explanation and put out a proposed rule so we can get this done so the time will start ticking on when the industry has to put this.

Adopt a rule, enforce it, hold the operators accountable and make the USAs and HCA designations publicly available on NPMS so the public has a sense of whether PHMSA, the operators, are doing a good job of defining those things. Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: All right. Thank you very much, Carl. We look forward to some robust conversations over the Q&A part. Lots of great points so far from the panelists made. And we'll move on to our next panelist, our final panelist, and then we'll have Q&A.

Jacques Rotolo is an engineer and pipeline compliance specialist with the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Pipeline Enforcement Division, where he is the lead inspector for integrity management.

Jacques has been with the Department for more than 13 years. Prior to that, his employment with the State of Louisiana, he's had a successful career as an engineer for a natural gas distribution company and a compliance specialist for a hazardous liquid and gas transmission gathering company.

So with that, please welcome Mr. Rotolo.

MR. ROTOLO: Good morning. I'm glad to be invited here. Although we did not see each other's presentations so mine may be a little redundant. Of course, we're here for unusually sensitive areas, USAs.

There are existing USAs and other high consequence area drivers for hazardous area pipelines in Louisiana. My presentation is going to be more directly just for Louisiana. I'd say not just for Louisiana, but how it affects Louisiana.

Of course, high consequence areas means ecological USAs, drinking water USAs,

populated areas as high and other and commercially navigable waterways.

In Louisiana, we have numerous
existing ecological USAs in our coastal zone.
And these ecological USA candidates include
imperiled species, ecological communities,
threatening endangered species, depleted marine
mammals and migratory water birds concentration.

We also have numerous drinking waters.

And these are from the NPMS, National Pipeline

Mapping System. The drinking waters include

public water systems, source water protection

areas and source aquifers.

Also, as mentioned in the previous presentations, we have highly populated areas and other populated areas. And this map here is also from the NMPS depicting these areas.

Of course, the highly populated areas are areas with 50,000 or more people, with a concentration of at least 1,000 people per square mile and the other populated areas, such as cities, towns and villages or other defined

areas.

Also part of the HCAS are commercially navigable waterways. And this is also from the NMPS, and it shows the navigable waterways within the Louisiana coastal zone.

This is just a general map found on the internet showing the Louisiana coastal zone lined out in the white and black dotted lines.

And it indicates the existing pipelines on the Louisiana coast. As you can see, we have a few pipelines.

This is from the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources. And it just shows the coastal boundary, just without the -- a little simpler view illustrating the coastal area.

And then this is the previous snap showing the coastal zone again. And when you put the coastal zone, you see all the navigable waterways and the other USAs. You see that the pipelines cover most of the coastal zone and therefore, what we have as far as the effect of the pipelines on the USAs and HCAs -- excuse me.

This is what we think would be the effects of the new marine coastal water definition in Louisiana. Because of the existing HCA drivers and the possible water transport of hazardous liquids in southern Louisiana, we expect a minimal increase in pipeline companies new to the integrity regulations, if any, and a minimal to a marginal increase in actual pipelines that would be new to the integrity regulations, but a definite increase in the assessment mileage that these current pipelines assess on the integrity management regulations.

And this is dealing with some of the questions that were generated, the marine coastal water definitions. We feel that estuary swamps and marshes should be included in the marine coastal waters definition as they are habitats with diverse wildlife species. They traverse by pipelines frequently and are difficult to cleanup, restore and mitigate.

Also for coastal beaches and marine waters, we would say combine the coastal beaches

and marine waters into the existing USA
ecological resources since they are all
considered ecological and produce a single
coastal area USA definition and that they include
both coastal waters and marine coastal waters.

And for shoreline sensitivity, of course, shoreline sensitivity would differ by shoreline type. And the effects of a shoreline type would differ by hazardous products such as crude oil, refined products and highly volatile liquids.

And for better or worse, that concludes my presentation, and this is my contact information. Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: All right. I want to say thank you to all of our panelists. Let's give them a round of applause.

so what I'll be doing is facilitating an open discussion and questions regarding any of the topics you've heard, talked about from the panelists, certainly anything that you may have thought from looking at and previewing the

preview questions as well.

And to kind of tee up the discussion,

I want to first go back and just draw a few

common themes myself.

So from the various panelists there were some discussions earlier around this can be complicated. Let's no oversimplify it to I think we're complicating it too much. Let's get on with it already. And I'm paraphrasing.

And so I guess with the panel -- and then there was some questions regarding the coastal beaches and marine waterways where combining them doesn't make good sense. And then other sentiment where there may be some situations where it may be more appropriate to combine it.

So I just want to tee that back up to the panel and just kind of talk through somewhere meeting in the middle. And that's the essence of these kind of public meetings is to talk through some of those things.

Any thoughts? Any additional

thoughts?

MS. FREEMAN: All right. To address the first one about GIS data is complex but hurry up. Let's get on with it. I get that. It's been years coming. And the GIS data is complex.

So I think we've just finally reached the point where you guys are doing pilot tests, and we're really looking at this information. I did get the preview questions only about a week ago, so I was only able to do a limited amount of research and just picked Louisiana out of the hat.

So I do think that we need to pick some representative states and look at their shoreline types. I did mention a couple, you know, from California to South Carolina and Louisiana, these are completely different shoreline types.

We run a pilot test on the data we have discussed. We are discussing now. And, you know, come up with some solid, solid options here. And, yes, that will take time. Hopefully,

it won't take too much time.

And then secondly about making these definitions distinct, so my concern is moving forward we want to make sure that future generations -- you know, as we get older, we retire and new people come onboard. The idea of these new high consequence areas is grounded in science and is as solidly understood, commonsense-wise, as the high consequence areas and unusually sensitive areas we have today.

I don't want that knowledge to disappear as, you know, we retire and move on.

And so I do think they need to be distinct definitions that specifically call out why they are of high consequence, why they are unusually sensitive. And then when datasets are developed in the future because, I mean, I'm thinking 20 years out -- I've been doing this for 20 years -- everything still holds.

MS. MURRAY: Okay. Okay, Carl?

MR. WEIMER: Yes, I think one of the things that perhaps could help the public

understand this better is if we could see some graphic descriptions of how pipeline companies interpret this data.

I mean, there's a number of pipeline companies that operate in the Great Lakes,
Enbridge, Marathon, Wolverine. We don't know how they interpret the data and how they define their could affect areas.

You know, if those companies are already including all of their pipelines in the Great Lakes states as HCAs because of the could affect rule, then worrying about the definition really is not as important.

But we never get to see that information. So perhaps it would be good to get some companies to share that with us because I suspect that some of those companies are doing that.

And it would also be very interesting to know if Marathon does the could affect interpretation the same way that Enbridge does, the same way that Wolverine does or if they're

all interpreting it differently. And that ought to tell PHMSA something about the need for clarifying that could affect definition.

MS. MURRAY: Thanks, Carl. That's a point well taken that while operators are applying some of this data to their integrity management programs and determining their could affects, having more insight into how that's done and implemented could be very helpful in terms of understanding how to move this forward.

So that's something that we can certainly take back and can elaborate with operators to find out how that can be done. I think that's a point well taken.

What I do want to offer, too, I know Carl made a good point about we've talked about this in 2017. We're here in 2019, and we're still having conversations. A point well taken.

And I do want to add to that, PHMSA, when we held our public meeting back in 2017 we were scratching our heads wanting to work and collaborate to understand what information and

data was existing and possibly available and definitions as well and also having an opportunity to do some pilot testing on some of the data sources that came out of that, emerged from that conversation. And that emerged some of the questions that we're teeing up here for today.

So with that being said, Sam, are there any questions from the webcast viewers from the panel? There are none. Okay. Thank you.

Well, I will open it up to the floor.

Are there any questions from any of our in-person participants?

MR. LESNIACK: Chuck Lesniack, CL3
Consulting, representing the public. I think
mainly I've just got some comments about where
we're at. I would agree with Carl. I think we
are overcomplicating it.

I think that the idea that we're going to split shorelines into different classifications and think about going 5 miles out, 10 miles out, 20 miles out from a shoreline

to define HCAs or USA, you know what? I think ecological science tells you that shorelines and water/land interfaces are some of the most ecologically sensitive areas that we have regardless of location, regardless of shoreline type. And I think that any shoreline should be designated as an HCA just because of that.

Spills are very difficult to clean up in those kind of areas. Twenty miles out while you do start to get more of an offshore, open sea kind of environment, it's that 20 mile zone.

And we could split hairs. Is it 15 miles? Is it 20 miles? Is it 30 miles? It will vary somewhat by location. But that's the area where you've got critical fisheries. All around the country, if you have a spill within that 20 mile zone, it's highly likely to impact the beaches and shoreline because it's very difficult to contain in those areas.

To me it's a no brainer that we designate 100% of our shoreline as an unusually sensitive area because it meets the definition of

likely having permanent or long-term damage.

I've been all up and down the Texas coast. There's not a location hardly anywhere in the Texas coast that you can't walk today and find evidence of a past oil spill, not anywhere.

And you will see tar balls all along the coast.

And so I think that that's a no brainer. I think we're making this a lot more difficult than it has to be.

And while we do have to have pipelines cross through these areas and it will impact existing pipelines, it will encourage pipeline operators to avoid these areas with new pipelines.

And even though we can't totally avoid them, we ought to be trying to avoid them where we can. And I think designating them as HCAs and USAs will encourage operators to do that where possible rather than have a pipeline in an area that we damage it and make it more sensitive by harming the habitat that may be close to pristine today. Well, later it does have imperiled

species because we damaged it by placing the 1 2 pipeline there. Thank you. Any comments 3 MS. MURRAY: 4 from the panel on anything Chuck has mentioned? MS. FREEMAN: I just I -- whoops. 5 That killed my Air Book. 6 MS. FARRELL: It's all right. It's still good. Sorry. 7 Yes, 8 did that wake everyone up? Sorry about that. 9 Linda Farrell, Executive Director of Pipeline Safety Coalition. So to follow-up on 10 11 that, you know, and what Carl has stated, what I 12 think we the public are saying is yes. move forward instead of getting stuck in the 13 14 minutia of what's this federal agency's definition of unusually sensitive area? 15 16 PHMSA agree? Does another agency agree? 17 And the consideration of whether or 18 not to have coastal beaches or the numbers of 19 considerations, as Chuck said, I think there's 20 got to be a consensus scientifically that our 21 coasts are unusually sensitive areas.

And I'm not sure that we've even

discussed whether or not the considerations have included existing social impacts, human infrastructure pipeline. And I'm getting into minutia that I say I don't want to get into, but it's in support of the fact that there are so many layers that if we keep trying to pull back layers, we're going to be where we were in 2017 and where we are today.

One of the things that we've noticed with the public is that they are paying attention to what's coming out of PHMSA. They're paying attention to things like the advisories, the 2014 advisory, that PHMSA published for warning about repurposing pipelines. And this is just an example, in 2019 for putting pipelines into unusually sensitive areas, topography considerations.

And the public is realizing that these are great initiatives. These are great advisories from PHMSA, but they don't have any teeth. The operators don't have to even read these let alone follow these advisories.

And so you have a public who is seeing a lot of talk, a lot of inaction. And I think

Carl is spot on. We need to stop talking and reevaluating and re, re, re, re and give them what we talked about earlier today.

You know, six years from now we're still going to be talking about the same thing if we don't change the way we communicate and the way we perhaps communicate with our legislators and Congress about how regulations are and are not codified.

MS. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you for that. We have another commenter.

MS. CROWNHEIM: Hi. Patty Crownheim,
Rethink Energy New Jersey. I also serve on the
board of the Watershed Institute. So this is
fascinating to me, the conversation about how one
uses science to determine these USAs.

And I have to say that, you know, to look at this from a watershed perspective, and there is a lot of wonderful watershed mapping in the country, it makes a lot of sense from a

scientific basis for me because it includes, you know, you have to look at the entire shed from source to end. And that includes a lot of times the C1 streams and the other issues.

But I have to say that in seeing a lot of pipeline infrastructure come through and exist in New Jersey, I have never seen, and maybe New Jersey is unusual, but I have never seen an operator not be aware of a sensitive area. And perhaps and in their proposals say, yes, we're going to up our class location or treat it as such. I haven't seen that.

What I unfortunately also haven't seen is the follow through on that. So that's why that language could affect, as Carl mentioned, is so troublesome. You know, where, it's the enforcement piece, and it's the follow through. And that's what the public doesn't see also.

So I think the definition parts, I mean, and I certainly appreciate the work that went into all of this mapping and making this accessible and having it be overlaid with

pipeline so people can see it. But it's really what do you do with it, right? And how is it enforced? How is it used by the operators? And that's something that the public really wants to see more of and have more transparency.

MS. MURRAY: Hey, Patty, while you still have the microphone, I'm putting you on the spot. Carl mentioned, particularly with the Great Lakes, that there was an area he had a good visual of an area where there's a watershed boundary around the Great Lakes.

Do you have any thoughts on that since you said you, you know, have some watershed experience that you support, some of his points regarding include that, the watershed area surrounding the Great Lakes?

MS. CROWNHEIM: Well, I'm not familiar with the Great Lakes. My focus is on the State of New Jersey primarily. But I would certainly encourage PHMSA and anyone working on this to reach out to the Great Lakes watersheds. I'm sure they exist and they're there. I would be

happy to answer that.

I know in New Jersey, absolutely, you want to look at entire watersheds and especially the most critical. Even within the watersheds, there are areas that are more critical than others, especially the source areas, the cleanest streams.

But I have to disagree with that we don't want to call something an eco-USA area if there's no endangered species or threatened species there yet because we have seen a comeback of species.

For instance in the Raritan Bay, there are a comeback of species. We have whales now, you know, North Atlantic Right whales, right now, playing in the Raritan Bay. And that's miraculous, a species that has so few left that we've given most of them names. So we're really excited about that.

MS. FARRELL: Christie, could I jump in here again? Linda Farrell. And this speaks to both what Patty and Carl talked about. And I

refer to earlier with the bottom-up approach conservation districts. And Carl mentioned farmers have traditionally been very restricted as to what they can and cannot put into a watershed.

And so there are best management practices that require, require farmers to act in a certain way. And from our experience, we have not seen that pipeline infrastructure development is required in these unusually sensitive areas to follow best management practices.

Frankly, they are not held to the same standards in our experience that farmers are.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you.

MR. LESNIACK: Christie, Chuck

Lesniack. I can speak to the watershed question.

I've spent 30 years doing watershed protection

and surface water protection.

And what Carl is talking about is absolutely spot on that if you're only protecting the actual water body itself, that just flies in the face of water quality protection science and

best management practices. That it ought to be being looked at on a watershed basis and that the science is there, the engineering is there to do the kind of analysis pretty easily.

And PHMSA doesn't have to do this.

They could make this a best practice required of the operator that says for every segment of your pipeline that's in a drainage area -- you know, the Great Lakes are a little different because their drainage areas are huge.

But you can take that even to a local level to a smaller lake or river and take those - - you're trying to protect a water body. You need to be looking at the watersheds that drain into it and the pipelines that are in those watersheds.

And we did an analysis in Austin -- or an analysis was done in Austin for a spill from a pipeline that we have there in Austin. The spill was predicted to be able to get into a creek within minutes before responders could ever be there and move four miles an hour.

And so if you're not managing on a watershed basis to protect surface water then you're missing the point.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you for that. Are there other comments or questions that we can help answer? Otherwise I'll tee up a few more.

Oh, yes, Chuck has another point.

MR. LESNIACK: Chuck Lesniack. I've got a question for Leigha and maybe for you,
Christie. So the data, I like what you all are doing with looking at this data and pulling the dataset. But as I mentioned in the earlier session, you know, a lot of this is pretty gross level data when you're looking at this kind of scale.

And I don't think that should slow down the adoption of trying to make it more accurate. But as the operators, as local governments, as state governments, develop more accurate data, say an operator does their could affect analysis. And they go into an area into a watershed. And they do some on the ground

surveying, find out that the data that PHMSA has got is actually off quite a bit and maybe in one direction or another.

Will operators or local governments or other sources that you all can rely on, will they be able to submit corrected data and so that PHMSA over time develops a more accurate dataset on kind of a hyper-local basis or will we continue to rely on sort of this generic gross level data?

MS. GOODING: What I can say to that is that the -- excuse me? I think it's on. Yes. You can hear me, correct? Yes.

All right. I know the process to develop the data that specifically adheres to this incredibly complicated definition that's in the regs, it is very complicated, justifiably so. It is science and science is never that clear or never that easy or straightforward I will say.

Taking all of these data sources, these national heritage programs that bring together all of this data and give it to

NatureServe, who then uses that data and other datasets to kind of adhere to that very specific definition.

It's been a large process where we don't have the personnel or expertise inside of PHMSA to take on that project ourselves. We hire experts in that specific field to do that process.

So there has been no plan to date to start accepting opinions or anything on a much smaller scale and changing the data from, like, a crowd source type of approach. There has been no plan. I appreciate the comment. And I think it's something to consider. But to date that is not the way that we have been building the data. We don't have that plan yet.

MS. MURRAY: And it's certainly something to consider to your point, Chuck. If there's an opportunity for us to think about that a little bit more and figure out how that could work with some level of validation to it to make sure that we have some reliability and comfort

around what is being submitted if we were to accept changes based on actuals that they, you know, have the experience working with. That's something that we should definitely keep talking about and see how that could work.

Thank you. Yes, two commenters from our panel.

It might be MR. WEIMER: Yes. interesting to Chuck's point to know if there's any of the pipeline companies that actually do outreach to local and state governments to try to define their own HCAs and their could affect areas. Because, you know, they have that liaison function with local governments. And they could reach out to governments and say here's what we're using as our could affect areas. Do you agree? And I don't know if companies do that or not.

MS. FREEMAN: I can address that.

Yes, they do. So not only do they go out into their operating areas and collect current data and define operator identified high consequence

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

areas and unusually sensitive areas, but I

personally on behalf of several operators have

submitted updated information about specific

plants and animals that we have found out in the

field to confirm that, yes, they are still there,

and this is where they're located.

And so the best way at this point in time because PHMSA is limited in resources is to actually submit that information to the source agencies. And they incorporate that into their datasets.

And so I have been successful in doing that with species in Utah to NatureServe and also the commercially navigable waterways cleaning that up around Fairbanks.

So right now even though you can't submit it to PHMSA, and I'm glad there's a crowdsourcing way to do it, there is a way to get that information updated. And then when PHMSA updates their layers, that information comes in.

I also wanted to address just to clear up a bit of a misconception about the watershed.

So watersheds are considered by operators when their determining could affect pipeline segments.

They run spill models. Okay? So they can see where product would go should it escape the pipe, downhill, down slope and downstream.

Okay? These downstream traces can go very far.

You are picking up all of your downstream waters in a watershed downstream from your pipeline, not necessarily all. So even though it's not the entire watershed, the watershed is being looked at through these spill models and any HCAs that are downstream from you could be impacted.

And so I just wanted to make sure that that was clear that that is definitely something that is being done and has been done for the last 20 years.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you. So I'm going to tee up a question for our PHMSA staff and talk a little about the complexities over defining these unusually sensitive areas and how that impacts the overall definition of HCAs.

Is it as simple as it sounds to just pick some alternatives and to get those mapped?

Or are there other considerations, legal, technical and so forth that have to be factored into the discussion?

MS. GOODING: Sure. I can summarize that pretty quickly. In public service, it's not what Leigha says. There are a lot of different procedures and different people and different authorities to speak with.

And what at first sounded very simple to me as a geographer to define what could be a coastal beach or what would be the Great Lakes?

It did sound very simple until we opened that can of worms.

And you've got a couple different voices in the room. And you can consider the actual legal rulemaking process and who all is going to be looking at what you're proposing and picking it apart and questioning why you did this going through various levels at PHMSA. Going through all of our public meetings. Going

through the OMB and the whole rulemaking process.

And it became very un-simple very quickly.

As much as I do personally agree, pick something and move on. Let's actually make an effect. I completely hear what you're saying.

But we're really held to a standard in our process that makes us question things a lot deeper. And that has certainly complicated what seems like a very simple thing.

MS. MURRAY: And is there a correlation between how you define it, finding data sources to be able to map it? Can you talk a little bit about the correlation between the definition and the data that supports mapping it?

MS. GOODING: Absolutely. First of all we at PHMSA are not ecological scientists by trade. We should not try to assume that we know the answers to these very scientific water-based questions better than the actual scientists out there from, say, NOAA, USGS, work that Bonnie does and other agencies who are actually experts in this field.

So we do look for authoritative and existing definitions from ideally other agencies because we do need it at a national scale. It can't just be what's in the Florida Panhandle.

And it needs to be covered and consistent for the entire United States, the entire coastline.

And one of the complications that we come across in other datasets and other HCAs and USAs is how detailed and how scientific the definition can get and then how do you create that data?

trying to look at was to look at the data that has been produced by these expert agencies, the definitions that they have. And back into a definition and a dataset from that approach to almost look at the data that's available because I think spatially. So when they spatially show what they consider to be a beach or what they consider to the Great Lakes, it's almost more descriptive to me than the words of what is the Great Lakes?

So we started with that spatial 1 2 approach and are thinking of trying to back into a definition by starting with the mapping data. 3 4 I hope that helps. That's very helpful. 5 MS. MURRAY: And I know Alan mentioned earlier that words matter. 6 So to your point, the definition --7 8 They both matter. MS. GOODING: 9 MS. MURRAY: -- and the mapping, they 10 need to closely integrate with each other. 11 I heard a couple of sentiments 12 regarding -- one sentiment was HCAs must be 13 grounded in science, which really resonated with 14 And then, I think, Linda, you mentioned having a scientific conscience or at least 15 16 consensus around some of these topics we've 17 discussed. 18 So in terms of defining some of these 19 USA and, you know, ecologically sensitive and USA 20 sources, how does that currently -- and Bonnie, 21 this is for anybody on the panel.

How does the simplicity and then the

complementary scientific and making sure that it 1 2 is grounded in science, how do those interrelate? MS. FREEMAN: You mean the common 3 4 understanding of a phrase versus the scientific 5 interpretation of it? 6

MS. MURRAY: Yes.

MS. FREEMAN: You know, that does take a bit of back and forth. It does take conversation. I know some people are tired of talking about it, but it does take some back and It takes pilot tests. It takes looking at forth. what is available there.

You know, one of the things that tied our hands back when we first defined high consequence areas was that not all the datasets that we wanted to use were digital yet. Many of them were hard copy. That's why you see the coastlines that do not have eco-USAs from the 2001 data.

You know, it's finding these areas. We're much more fortunate now. A lot, much of the environmental data, is digital.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think it takes a back and forth. It takes a lot 1 2 of conversations. It's not a one-to-one mesh. 3 So you have to work to get it. 4 MS. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you. Sam? MR. HALL: We have a couple of 5 comments and one question from our web viewers. 6 The first is from Ed Langraf, who is the chairman 7 of CAMO, which is a consortium of pipeline 8 9 operators. CAMO stands for coastal and marine 10 pipeline operators. 11 Ed says a comment. Our pipeline 12 member operators already understand the sensitivity of marine areas either inland or 13 coastal or offshore. I don't think a lot of work 14 needs to occur in that regard. 15 16 Many employees of our member operators 17 live in those USA areas and their right-of-way 18 staff work there. At CAMO we take a proactive 19 approach to close gaps in marine pipeline safety 20 engagements and damage prevention. CAMO has over five environmental and 21 22 NGO partners who are continually educating on

marine pipelines and having a simple, realistic definition we can relate to all of our stakeholders will be strongly advised.

The edges and interface of water and land is the most important to habitat and to protect pipelines from erosion, subsidence, et cetera. Again, I agree the simpler the definition the better. It will help us in our outreach as well. The next question.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Ed.

MS. HALL: Thank you, Ed, for your comment. The next question is from Morgan Powell. The question is if this whole conversation is about affecting water bodies, why are offshore pipelines not included in the HCA rules? This is from Morgan Powell with Genesis Energy, a GIS supervisor.

The question again, if this whole conversation is about affecting water bodies, why are offshore pipelines not included in the HCA rules?

MS. FREEMAN: I can take a stab at

that. So offshore pipelines are included in the HCA rules if they could affect an HCA.

And the first time around with the existing HCA definitions, it was mainly on land is where our high consequence areas are.

So now, 20 years later, we're trying to do the land interface. So we're getting a little further offshore. But, yes, offshore pipelines if they can effect a current existing high consequence area are under the integrity management rule.

MR. HALL: One last comment from Nan Gray with the Soilworks Incorporated. We've heard several comments from Ms. Gray. It's simply a comment not a question. She says the issue of a regional no-build zone for pipeline construction is appropriate for the natural, undisturbed areas that ought to be avoided.

Many of those undisturbed areas are in steep land in the Appalachian Mountains and our national forest. Just a comment.

MS. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you, Nan,

for that comment as well. Are there other comments or questions from the audience, from the webcasters? One question in the audience.

MR. REYNOLDS: Thank you. James
Reynolds with the Office of Enforcement, Pipeline
Hazards Material Safety Administration.

My question is to Mr. Erol. In response to something that Mr. Jacques said. Mr. Jacques indicated that he doesn't believe that redefining these definitions of USAs would post any serious economic impact on the pipeline industry. I just wondered whether you concur with that analysis, and Mr. Jacques feel free to respond to Mr. Erol.

And also a question for Mr. Carl. I understand that you're saying a lot of this information is not shared with the public. And I wonder if you can appreciate the sensitivity of some of this information should it fall in the hands of unscrupulous characters. Thank you.

MR. ROTOLO: First, I'd like to clarify that I didn't say it wouldn't have any

impact. But what was said was not impact as far as new pipelines per se. But it will have an impact on the number of miles that would have to be assessed.

So it would have an impact, but just not very many new pipelines we don't think would be introduced in Louisiana into the integrity system. But it would definitely have an impact on the amount of mileage that has to be assessed.

MR. ALAVI: Could you repeat the question, please?

MR. REYNOLDS: Whether or not you believe a redefining of USAs would have an economic impact on the pipeline industry, your particular company?

MR. ALAVI: Okay. Economic impact.

So if you define everything as an HCA, it becomes a different priority in scheduling. So basically they become immediate over 60 days or 180 days.

And if they are immediate, then you need to shut down your pipeline, and you need to go fix to this location and fix the repair.

But most of the cases those -- and I'm not the least bit concerned because the regulation didn't spell like what is upper boundary, what is down boundary. There are some gray areas that most of the un-injurious. So they don't really fail.

When we do our analysis, it is basically finding an element of our analysis, we find out that their life of asset is, like, 500 years based on those anomalies and where we need to go now shut down the line and need to go repair them immediately.

MR. WEIMER: I think the second question was for me about whether there was stuff that shouldn't be publicly available. And certainly we agree with that.

I think sometimes it's overblown and too much stuff is not publicly available. I think often people think that a terrorist or people that want to do harm have to be complete morons because for the most part you can find that stuff anyway. And there's probably better

targets than pipelines and those types of things.

So I think more information should be publicly available. But there's certainly clearly things, you know, culturally sensitive sites, you can't make those available. So certain drinking water sources probably make sense.

Certain pipeline attributes, you know, we had a big fight. We were on the opposite side of the press in Washington State because we didn't think that, you know, the exact location of farm taps and valves should be publicly available on mapping sites.

So, you know, it's a fine line to draw. But for the most part, I think a lot of the USA type information, population areas, some of those are already available.

We would benefit by making those more available so people that really understand those areas, local governments in particular, could verify that they are being defined correctly.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you for that. We

have another comment.

MR. LESNIACK: This is kind of an overarching comment and it follows on what Carl is saying. You know, my experience as a local government official is that, you know, for example, the population data that the companies use is based on census data.

Well, that can be as much as 10 years or more out of date. And, for example, there's a pipeline that's being proposed for Central Texas. Well, they didn't know that in this county where they're going through, there's 5,000 new homes permitted within a mile of that pipeline. They didn't know that. And they didn't come and ask.

And I think this is true also for the ecological data, the drinking water protection data that the regulations should require that the operators confirm the data with local government officials where that's appropriate.

And I think population data is one.

Drinking water protection zone data is one. In a
lot of cases, the ecological data is one. And I

don't think that that would be overly burdensome for a pipeline that's going to be in place for 50 to 100 years for it to have an operator to contact the people on the ground that will have much more accurate data, especially the population data. In rapidly growing areas, ten year old data is useless.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you.

MS. FARRELL: Linda Farrell, Pipeline Safety Coalition. To follow-up on what Chuck said, we had a technical assistance grant through PHMSA in Chester County, Pennsylvania. And what we did was we created a protocol that we recommended for operators who wanted to come through Chester County with proposed new infrastructure.

And in this case, the operator had a proposed plan that would have gone through a part of Valley Forge National Park that had been extended. And the operator didn't know that that part of Valley Forge Park had been extended as a federal landmark.

By coming to our county planning commission, they had, as Chuck said, they had the data from the ground up. And we showed them a map and said, hey, this is a really bad idea for you to come here because this is now National Park territory.

They thanked us. It saved them a lot of money. It saved them a lot of time. So I put that out as an example of what can very easily be done on a local basis to address a lot of the issues that we're discussing today.

MS. CROWNHEIM: I agree with what you said. Patty Crownheim, ReThink Energy NJ. I have a question. We've been talking about hazardous liquid pipelines, and I'm just wondering what are PHMSA's plans with the new high consequence areas for gas pipelines, natural gas pipelines?

MS. MURRAY: And our plans in general or as it relates to -- I'm sorry. Can you give her back the microphone? I'm sorry.

MS. CROWNHEIM: All of the above.

MS. MURRAY: Well, we have a lot of plans that are currently in the works. I don't know if it's necessarily the context of the conversation around USAs and ecologically, you know, sensitive areas and drinking water, but there's a lot of things currently underway.

We have some rulemakings that are underway that address more of the integrity management concerns around gas pipelines as well. So there's distinctly different but important requirements that we're taking a look at.

MS. CROWNHEIM: And the reason I raise the question is because it seems a lot of times that we understand the massive downstream of potential consequences of hazardous liquid pipelines. But there is a real feeling with people who work with drinking water issues that any natural gas incidents would also have devastating impact on waterways, especially since so many of them run through so many tributaries and areas.

And we would like to see -- how to put

this. We would like to see a broader understanding of those cumulative impacts and impacts of incidents with natural gas pipelines on drinking waters and on ecological areas.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you. I appreciate that. Sam, any other questions? No questions from the webcast group? Any final questions for our panelists?

Okay. Without seeing any hands, one,

I want to thank the panelists again. Let's give

them a round of applause for all their feedback

and their expertise and thank you for sharing

that with us and the PHMSA staff who also did the

same.

In terms of a wrap-up, one I want to say that all of your comments are well taken. We certainly plan to take some of the things we've heard, whether it was keep it simple, make sure we understand the complexities, how to get others involved. Even the sentiment that even at the local government level there's a lot of information that help can inform how HCAs are

defined and the data that's used to make sure it's validated and it's based on what's actually in different areas.

We'll take all that feedback to heart, and we'll go back and look at some of the sentiments from the transcription so that we can help to move this along and really pick up some momentum from this point.

I think we're close and we've heard a number of things here today that will certainly help us to be able to do that.

I will say that all of the presentations that you've heard today and the conversation, including the transcript, will be available on the meeting registration page because I think there's a lot of things that we certainly want to go back and reflect on and think about and maybe do a little bit more research on and understand a bit better.

With that being said, thank you very much for your time today. Just a few logistics. If you're planning to stay for the second part,

which we will move into the pipeline awareness and engagement public meeting and you're just needing to go to lunch, we have folks in the back who are standing who can help to escort you either to my left, your right, to our cafeteria area in the east building. Or, if you're not planning to stay, we have individuals who can help you get back to security and exit appropriately. In either case, we appreciate it.

If you are a webcast viewer, when we return from lunch we will be moving into, at 1:30, our Session 3 discussion. So please be prepared to click on your Session 3 link to start that particular forum.

MS. GOODING: I will make one last recommendation. Since the PowerPoints will all be on display, as Christie had said, the PowerPoints that I put together that reviewed the questions for consideration today have the links

Anything else I'm leaving out?

for downloading a lot of the GIS data that we

talked about.

| 1 | And I think for all the GIS folks in |
|----|--|
| 2 | the room or on the webcast or if you know one, I |
| 3 | encourage them to download that data and take a |
| 4 | look at it. And we would really love to hear the |
| 5 | comments on those specific datasets and |
| 6 | definitions because that is the direction that |
| 7 | we're looking at going in right now. And |
| 8 | specific comments after you have some time to |
| 9 | look into that data would be very helpful. |
| 10 | MS. MURRAY: All right. Well, thank |
| 11 | you very much, everyone. And we will resume here |
| 12 | at promptly 1:30 for the second part of our |
| 13 | public meeting. Enjoy the rest of your day. |
| 14 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter |
| 15 | went off the record at 11:58 a.m.) |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| | |

| A |
|---|
| a.m 1:14 4:2 36:21 |
| 79:16,17 172:15 |
| ability 72:20 |
| able 5:17 7:14 9:1 12:6 |
| 12:14 17:3 27:8 43:16 |
| 50:17 53:1 68:7 71:18 72:14 73:2,3,14 74:4 |
| 82:9 93:5 96:15 |
| 132:10 146:20 148:6 |
| 154:12 170:11 |
| above-entitled 79:15 |
| 172:14 |
| absence 112:5 115:15 |
| absolutely 39:20 74:16 |
| 78:12 144:2 145:20 |
| 154:15 |
| accept 20:10 150:2 |
| accepting 149:10 access 27:11 41:16 |
| 43:1 51:7 68:8 72:9 |
| 72:14,20 73:5 74:17 |
| 82:6 |
| accessible 142:22 |
| Accident 38:22 |
| account 32:8 |
| accountable 77:16 |
| 122:12 125:7 |
| accuracy 23:10 70:2,18 accurate 52:22 72:9 |
| 147:18,20 148:7 |
| 166:5 |
| accurately 112:18 |
| acoustical 15:14 |
| act 18:13,14 19:8 24:6 |
| 117:10 124:8 145:7 |
| action 112:4 |
| active 11:13 19:10 |
| activity 29:6 |
| actual 24:5 35:15 44:4 49:15 57:4 74:19,19 |
| 120:15 121:21 129:8 |
| 145:21 153:18 154:19 |
| actuals 150:2 |
| add 15:10 103:14 |
| 135:19 |
| addition 29:10 35:5 |
| 64:2 105:16 |
| additional 26:12,14 27:19,22 52:1 66:6 |
| 76:7 77:15 78:13 |
| 82:10 83:17 90:2 |
| 104:10 131:22 |
| address 4:21 8:7,10,12 |
| 8:16 9:2 17:22 21:18 |
| 36:13 40:7 55:20 76:4 |
| 110:6 132:2 150:19 |

П

addressed 10:3 107:10 107:12 addressing 7:10 32:9 80:5 **adhere** 149:2 adheres 148:15 adjacent 28:22 Adjourn 3:20 Administration 1:3,13 4:13 15:1 64:7 161:6 administrator 1:18,20 14:21 19:21 ado 14:20 20:9 Adopt 125:6 adoption 147:17 adults 12:21 advance 79:7 advised 159:3 advisor 97:14 advisories 140:12,20 140:22 advisory 19:17 116:8 140:13 **AED** 6:4 affect 47:11.13 58:20 59:1.19 107:11 120:22 121:3,6 122:1 122:5,11,17 123:15 123:21 124:6,16 134:8,12,20 135:3 142:15 147:21 150:12 150:16 152:2 160:2 affectionately 15:13 affiliation 12:9 affords 79:8 **afternoon** 8:1 10:12 21:6 33:3 82:19 agencies 22:8,14 26:18 69:12,14 71:3 75:13 75:15 108:3 122:18 122:20 151:10 154:21 155:2,14 agency 7:9 23:1 24:19 32:17 61:19 78:2,7 91:14 92:6 139:16 agency's 139:14 agenda 3:2 7:3,5 11:6 98:5 117:22 **ago** 15:21 16:8 40:17 47:18 106:3 115:14 132:10 agree 50:8 57:21 136:17 139:16,16 150:17 154:3 159:7 163:16 167:12 agreed 5:16 6:4 64:11 agreements 46:1 68:1 68:15

ahead 36:16 113:5 **Air** 139:6 **Alan** 1:20 13:14 20:15 156:6 alarm 5:2,3 **Alaska** 31:13 54:20 55:4,6,7 Alavi 1:17 3:13 97:11 98:3,4 162:10,16 Alexandria 112:8 allocation 107:2 allowed 118:9,11 allowing 41:14 allows 16:22 alternatives 153:2 American 1:17 97:12 amount 54:14 70:1 72:8 132:10 162:9 analyses 104:4 **analysis** 39:10 41:7 47:1,5 49:22 53:3 54:1,18 56:21 57:8 59:3 60:5,15 62:22 85:16 90:3 97:16,17 97:18 98:6 99:3,8,12 99:13.14 101:7.9 103:17,22 104:18 146:4,17,18 147:21 161:13 163:7,8 **analysts** 61:15 analyzed 64:20 96:10 analyzing 22:22 35:6 and/or 80:11 angle 99:9 angry 20:16 **animals** 151:4 **ANNEMARIE** 2:5 Annmarie 6:14 anomalies 100:12 101:2 102:7 103:4 107:3,8 163:10 anomaly 100:20 107:9 107:9 answer 12:19 58:8 64:21 68:17 77:11 98:6 144:1 147:6 **answers** 154:18 anybody 39:20 48:14 48:15 58:10 95:18 156:21 anyway 13:21 14:20 163:22 apart 153:20 **API** 105:13 apologize 65:3 app 40:1 41:21 Appalachian 160:20 appear 110:13

applause 15:3 130:17 169:11 applicability 45:20 50:3 application 41:13 43:13 **apply** 76:14,17 77:5 85:6 applying 112:16 135:6 appointed 116:9 appreciate 17:15 48:21 66:14 106:7 142:20 149:13 161:18 169:5 171:9 approach 24:22 55:7 75:8 103:17 123:10 123:10,16 124:2 145:1 149:12 155:16 156:2 158:19 approaches 86:1 155:12 appropriate 15:19 93:20 131:15 160:17 165:19 appropriately 171:9 approximately 50:11 64:1 aguifers 69:2.3 127:13 area 26:7,9 27:21 29:1 31:15 37:20 43:6 52:7 52:20 53:16,20 54:21 57:1 60:3 70:20 75:21 81:19 85:17 90:10,14 90:15,18 91:9,10 94:5 95:10 98:18,18 99:22 102:13 107:11 108:17 108:21 111:16 112:7 120:2,5 122:6,11 123:13,14,15,20 126:16,16 128:15 130:4 137:14,22 138:19 139:15 142:9 143:9,10,15 144:9 146:8 147:21 160:10 171:6 area's 26:7 arguing 121:21 **Army** 42:9 93:1 108:10 array 35:13 arrows 39:18 asked 11:7 48:16 117:17 asking 117:12 assess 129:12 **assessed** 162:4,9 assessing 105:19 assessment 97:16 104:19 129:11 assessments 59:16 asset 163:9

151:21 167:10 168:8

assistance 166:11 **Associate** 1:20 13:14 associated 113:14 Association's 116:8 assume 103:12,18,22 154:17 **assumed** 10:10 **Atlantic** 53:22 91:20 111:4 144:15 atrium 1:13 5:12 15:14 attend 5:22 attendance 10:11 21:21 attending 7:20 attention 104:16 140:10 140:12 attribute 41:2 attributes 164:8 audible 5:2 audience 4:15 17:14 62:6 66:16 161:2,3 **Austin** 146:17,18,19 authoritative 65:22 155:1 authorities 153:10 authority 53:19 availability 27:4 77:4 available 27:14 30:12 34:16 37:13 39:20 44:8 46:12 48:7 49:3 51:2,15 55:15 57:12 65:9,20 67:10,17 69:13 70:8 76:20 96:4 97:1 110:4 125:8 136:1 155:17 157:12 163:15,18 164:3,5,13 164:17,19 170:15 Avenue 1:13 avoid 66:10 107:8 118:18 138:13,15,16 avoided 66:11 160:18 avoids 124:21 aware 104:14 142:9 awareness 8:2,21 11:16 76:1 171:1

B 94:16 **B31** 103:10,10 babysitting 106:6 back 4:6 5:12 6:4,10 8:6 10:20 11:2 12:17,18 18:13 20:7,19 21:7,7 21:10,10,13 47:16 48:6 52:3 78:18 79:3 79:10 80:1 83:1,6 89:18 131:3,17 135:12,20 140:6 155:15 156:2 157:8

157:10,14 158:1 167:21 170:5,17 171:3,8 background 3:4 7:9 21:16,19 backtrack 52:3 **bad** 13:19 14:13 55:8 167:4 **balls** 138:6 band 112:18 113:18 base 122:16 based 28:6 29:22 40:11 42:5 81:14 84:14 85:1 89:14 93:12 95:14 98:14 103:11 104:3,4 107:16 114:22 123:18 150:2 163:10 165:7 170:2 baseline 59:16 **basically** 117:17 162:18 163:8 basis 38:21 82:10 85:12 96:5 109:3 142:1 146:2 147:2 148:8 167:10

batteries 19:19 **Bay** 144:13,16 beach 56:16 57:17 84:21 85:3,8,13 86:2 86:2,8,14,15 89:10 91:13 110:13,15 111:8.18 153:13 155:19

beach-defined 29:1 beaches 22:3 24:9 26:1 28:14,16,18,22 29:4,9 29:15,20 30:17 36:6 56:21 57:3,8 85:1,22 87:5,12 91:18 92:1,3 92:10 108:14 109:21 110:22 111:2,10 114:4,16 121:18 129:21,22 131:12 137:18 139:18 becoming 106:17 beginning 97:20

behalf 15:10 151:2 believe 23:5 28:3 38:2 57:11 59:18 71:7 76:18 104:7,12 161:9 162:13

Bellingham 15:22 16:6 benefit 164:18 **benefits** 121:13 **best** 5:22 9:4 17:10 23:5,19 59:2 84:12 145:6,11 146:1,6 151:7

better 4:7 18:11 20:1 51:4 70:16,16 75:17 75:17 130:12 134:1 154:19 159:8 163:22 170:19 beyond 90:22 98:19 104:5 111:17 112:9 big 164:9 biggest 53:6 bill 18:4,7 23:6 **birds** 127:8 bit 4:6 7:9 10:11 21:16 23:17 24:21 26:17 28:8 34:9,14 37:19 42:2,18 46:21 48:3 51:10 53:3 67:6 79:8 83:6,14 85:5 148:2 149:20 151:22 154:13

157:8 163:2 170:18 170:19 **black** 128:8

blanket 58:21 blinders 118:8 **block** 6:12

blue 41:9 93:19 121:2.3 123:11.15.21 board 116:14 141:16 boats 121:12

bodies 33:17 88:20 91:22 93:11,19 94:8 95:3,12,19,22 96:9 114:4 159:14,19 body 85:7 92:21 95:6

110:22 145:21 146:13 **Bonnie** 1:18 3:14 52:7 105:5,7,21 115:21 154:20 156:20

Book 139:6 **boots** 75:18 **bopping** 54:16 border 95:1 111:13,16 113:9

boss 14:21 15:10 **bottom** 75:7 86:10 **bottom-up** 145:1 **boundaries** 39:7 91:4,4 93:12 95:14 114:22 boundary 88:16 91:1,6

93:15 128:14 143:11 163:4.4

box 39:18 41:9 **BP** 98:1

brainer 137:20 138:8 break 7:22 9:16 10:19 10:21 11:2 36:20 56:2 63:20 68:18 78:16 79:4

Breakout 38:20

brief 4:19 12:12 Briefing 3:2 **bright** 113:22 **bring** 148:21 **broad** 109:21 124:17 **broader** 29:7 169:1 **broke** 57:7 93:6 broken 39:14 40:18,19 50:12 buffer 85:6,8,17 89:5,7 99:11,18 110:21 buffered 52:21 build 39:6 98:21 **building** 6:17 7:1 9:12 9:14 15:12 149:15 171:6 bullets 17:8 **bumps** 49:1 bunch 25:13,15 burdensome 166:1 **Bureau** 42:6 91:2,3,7 108:8 **business** 101:17 **busy** 17:16

C

C 88:14 95:11 C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S 3:1 **C1** 142:4 cafeteria 9:17 171:5 calculate 99:21 103:9 calculation 98:11 103:12,15 calculations 103:9 California 55:3 109:20 132:16 **call** 5:7,16 14:3 15:13 25:9 133:14 144:9 called 42:13 53:9 99:16 99:18 116:11 calling 45:6 115:2 **CAMO** 158:8,9,18,21 Canadian 95:1 116:7 candidates 127:5 capacity 116:4 cape 90:17 captures 111:2 car 122:22 123:1 cards 20:19,19 21:7,13 care 13:17 career 97:20 126:4 carefully 115:17 Carl 2:2 3:15 16:3 67:4

70:6 72:6 116:1,11

135:4,16 136:17

117:2 125:13 133:20

139:11 141:3 142:15

143:8 144:22 145:2

145:19 161:15 165:3 Carolina 109:21 132:16 **carries** 58:17 carry 40:22 case 82:10,10,13 102:10,14 166:17 171:9 cases 163:1 165:22 cast 78:18 80:2,3 83:8 **categories** 86:3 98:14 99:1 102:19 categorization 91:13 categorizes 28:15 53:16 category 86:2 cause 108:22 **caused** 61:14 **cell** 13:19 census 42:6 91:1,3,7 108:8 165:7 center 5:13 18:11 95:3 95:4,9 109:8 **Central** 165:10 certain 73:11 145:8 164:6.8 certainly 22:9 27:2 66:2 66:15 68:17 81:21 90:16 97:7 117:1 118:17 130:21 135:12 142:20 143:19 149:17 154:8 163:16 164:3 169:17 170:10.17 certification 67:11 certifications 5:21 **certified** 5:20 68:8 cetera 40:8 41:3 104:1 159:7 chairman 158:7 **challenge** 27:7 34:9 challenged 117:5 challenges 32:1 champion 116:14 change 80:15 81:6,7 100:14 104:14 115:1 116:15 141:8 changed 46:22 49:12 **changes** 47:15 64:2 150:2 changing 149:11 channel 95:9 channels 93:1 94:4,9 94:21 95:8,14,21 96:7 **Chao** 2:4 15:11 characterized 112:3 characters 161:20 charged 27:13 **charter** 121:11 check 72:21

Chester 166:12.15 **Christie** 1:21 6:7,8,9,10 82:15 83:19 105:22 106:1 144:20 145:15 147:10 171:18 Chuck 70:4 72:6,21 75:3 136:14 139:4,19 145:15 147:7,8 149:18 166:10 167:2 Chuck's 150:9 circle 80:1 cities 127:22 **Citizen** 116:9 **citizens** 116:22 city 16:7 civil 12:21 15:7 **CL3** 136:14 Clair 94:6,10,19,21 96:13 **clarify** 161:22 clarifying 135:3 **clarity** 61:8,9 class 80:17 81:15,18 142:11 classifications 87:7,8 136:21 classified 31:5 clean 124:8 137:8 cleanest 144:6 cleaning 151:14 **cleanup** 129:20 **clear** 13:2 148:18 151:21 152:15 **clearly** 164:4 click 171:13 cliffs 109:20 **close** 18:12 138:21 158:19 170:9 closely 156:10 closer 93:16 **CNW** 25:10 CNWs 43:7,21 Coalition 75:1 139:10 166:10 coast 52:15 54:19,19 90:12 109:22 111:11 117:4 128:10 138:3,4

138:6

coastal 1:5 22:2,3 24:8

24:9 26:1,1,5,7,16

27:21 28:4,9,11,14

29:5,8,9,10,15,15,20

30:16,17 36:6,7 37:20

52:19 53:16,20 56:21

56:22 59:22 60:3

64:11 76:16 84:21

85:1,12 87:16,19,22

88:2,4,6,15 91:18,22

92:3,3,5,7,10,11,11 108:14,15 110:22 111:9,18,21 112:1,3 112:17 113:7,15,17 114:4,16,17 121:18 121:19 122:14 124:1 124:7,9 127:4 128:5,7 128:14,15,17,18,20 129:2,14,17,21,22 130:4,5,5 131:12 139:18 153:13 158:9 158:14 coastline 55:6 57:5,10 60:6 110:18 114:13 155:6 coastlines 55:7 115:12 115:15 157:18 coasts 139:21 code 40:12 62:21 71:11 77:17 98:7 108:20 codified 141:11 coincides 112:20 collaborate 135:22 **collect** 38:13,15,18,22 39:2 42:6 150:21 collected 42:9 collectively 22:12 Columbia 46:9 combine 92:3 129:22 131:16 combining 114:16 131:13 come 6:10 10:20 11:2 12:17 13:15 15:6 26:8 27:19 36:17 37:18 44:18 45:15 58:14 65:17 72:11 78:18 83:6 84:11 89:18 114:14 122:8 132:21 133:6 142:6 155:8 165:14 166:14 167:5 comeback 144:11,14 comes 43:9 88:21 95:5 99:5 100:2 151:20 **comfort** 149:22 coming 16:2 22:21 31:1 37:9 78:5 79:3 113:3 132:5 140:11 167:1 comment 14:13 66:14 67:1 72:2 77:11 118:2 118:7 124:13 125:2 149:13 158:11 159:12 160:12,15,21 161:1 165:1,3 commenter 141:13 commenters 150:6 commenting 118:7

11:12.18 12:15 13:10 14:13 15:18 18:19 32:6 66:17 72:6 89:18 117:9 118:4 136:16 139:3 147:5 158:6 160:14 161:2 169:16 172:5,8 **commerce** 106:22 108:9 commercial 98:16 120:8,11,13 121:9,9 121:10,13 commercially 25:8,10 42:7 91:21 106:20 108:8 120:13 127:2 128:2 151:14 commission 81:14 167:2 **Committee** 116:7,10 **common** 14:5 131:4 157:3 commonly 118:20,22 commonsense-wise 133:9 communicate 141:8.9 communication 75:12 communities 127:6 community 1:19 11:19 **companies** 129:6 134:2 134:5,9,16,17 150:10 150:17 165:6 company 12:8 42:13 44:20 61:5,22 62:8 65:18 105:16 121:1,4 126:5,7 162:15 compare 30:20 31:2 118:15 comparison 56:10 comparisons 37:20 53:4 complementary 157:1 **complete** 50:7,13 119:13 163:20 completed 47:6 48:21 **completely** 38:8 55:2 132:17 154:5 completes 50:15 complex 110:2 132:3,5 complexities 152:20 169:19 compliance 2:1 125:19 126:5 complicated 131:7 148:16,17 154:8 complicating 131:8 complications 155:7 comply 64:15 comprehensive 72:9

comments 9:2 10:5

computer 19:1 computers 8:13 concentration 127:8,20 concepts 109:7 **concern** 25:16 100:12 102:7 133:3 concerned 102:18 163:2 concerning 124:17 concerns 9:3 17:21 20:1 27:4 66:17 68:22 100:10 168:9 conclude 78:14 concluded 84:16 concludes 36:11 130:13 concur 161:12 condition 100:13 conducted 23:15 30:7 conference 5:13 Conferences 116:18 confidentiality 68:15 confirm 151:5 165:18 conflicts 124:22 confusing 117:11 confusion 25:16 102:11 124:21 Congress 24:7 29:3 33:22 109:3,7 118:22 120:1 121:14 141:10 Congress's 29:3 congressional 7:11 21:18 24:4 32:9 84:13 108:13 119:17 Congressionally-ide... 23:20 connect 95:21 **connecting** 33:10,20 34:4,8,17,19 94:4,9 94:14,20 95:8,14 96:7 96:14 conscience 156:15 consensus 139:20 156:16 consequence 39:4 104:8,9 106:2,10 107:11 109:12,13 115:3 126:16,21 133:7,9,15 150:22 157:15 160:5,10 167:17 consequences 168:15 conservation 66:12 75:16,20 145:2 conservatism 98:11 103:8 conservative 103:16,17 consider 22:16 47:13

85:10,15 92:21 94:16 95:21 96:5 107:12 149:14,18 153:17 155:19,20 consideration 3:9 66:15 83:20 108:4 110:7 139:17 171:20 considerations 23:10 139:19 140:1,17 153:3 considered 91:9 104:7 111:8 112:10 130:3 considering 7:14,15 23:3 33:19 56:22 103:21 118:16 consistent 94:12 155:5 consortium 158:8 constructed 81:8 construction 67:1 80:15 81:13 82:8 160:17 constructive 104:19 **consultants** 44:17 49:8 50:1 60:22 consulting 97:22 136:15 contact 40:10 44:14 69:14 78:3,7 130:13 contacts 49:6 contain 137:19 contains 11:6 context 168:3 continually 158:22 continue 16:17 36:1 56:4 115:18 148:9 continues 105:17 continuing 44:21 continuous 110:19 contractor 69:20 contractors 69:21 contributing 70:22 control 61:20 controversy 107:21 convene 78:22 conversation 16:12 53:7 80:6 84:19 89:12 89:17 93:8 95:16,18 97:2 136:5 141:17 157:9 159:14,19 168:4 170:14 conversations 30:5 75:5 84:6 125:14

135:18 158:2

copy 7:3 157:17

coordinator 1:19 37:5

Corps 42:9 93:1 108:10

correctly 164:21 correlation 154:11,13 corrosion 97:16 100:17 100:21 101:1,13 could-59:18 could-affect 52:13 58:6 58:9.11 country 16:21 117:1 137:16 141:22 county 40:3,4,12,19 41:15,18 91:1,3,6 165:11 166:12,15 167:1 couple 11:19 20:7 37:8 40:13,17 91:11 118:3 132:15 153:16 156:11 158:5 course 41:8 48:3 55:5 126:13,21 127:18 130:7 court 18:20 **cover** 94:9 106:14 115:11 128:20 coverage 37:20 covered 31:11,15 52:16 52:19,20 54:8,9 55:2 57:10 59:22 60:3 90:8 94:13 98:20,22 100:5 113:20 114:13 155:5 covering 35:12 covers 54:7 109:19 **CPR** 5:20 crap 123:4 Craven 58:3 76:9 create 30:10 70:2 71:11 73:10 77:1 99:1,6 100:7,19 155:10 created 18:17 166:13 creek 146:20 criteria 29:22 88:3 102:3 104:10 critical 19:11 97:17 101:7,9 104:17 137:15 144:4,5 critically 24:17 cross 99:19 138:11 crowd 21:2 149:12 crowdsourcing 151:18 Crownheim 72:3,4 73:22 74:9,13 141:14 141:14 143:17 167:12 167:13,22 168:12 crucial 73:8 108:9 **crude** 130:10 culturally 164:4 cumbersome 51:18

correct 148:13

corrected 148:6

Cummins 97:21 cumulative 169:2 current 24:14 33:6 54:16 105:19 107:15 129:11 150:21 160:9 currently 31:10 37:15 42:10,22 45:9 92:21 97:13 107:1 112:21 114:11 156:20 168:2 168:6 currents 112:5

D 96:3 D.C 46:12 50:22 damage 105:14 108:18 109:1 114:7 138:1,20 158:20 damaged 139:1 danger 106:17 dark 68:20 120:17 121:3 data-use 46:1 database 38:3 39:6 44:14 65:20 databases 48:2 dataset 61:16 87:18 88:21 93:13 95:15 96:4 110:15,17 111:9 147:12 148:7 155:16 datasets 69:11 85:14 115:13 117:13,14 133:16 149:2 151:11 155:8 157:15 172:5 date 24:19 51:3 77:12 149:9,14 165:9 day 10:15 15:16 16:8,16 16:18 103:22 172:13 days 15:21 20:7 75:5 100:15,15 101:19 118:3 162:19,19 **DC** 1:14 deal 19:19 dealing 23:7 25:11 129:13 death 15:22 decent 71:9 decision 67:18 decision-making 19:6 decisions 32:11 decrease 47:9 **deeper** 154:8 defense 106:22 108:9 define 17:11 22:5,8

23:19 26:15 33:6,20

69:2 81:22 85:1 87:21

88:5 91:14 92:7 93:10

34:3 62:22 63:2,3

| 93:21 94:3 95:11 | | 1 | İ | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| 122:3.4 134.7 137.1 departments 44:16 defined 238 24:15.20 27:20 28:2 32:15 60:1 depicting 127:17 definite 128:12 describle 87:2.5 describle 85:2 1 86:4 86:41.4 15.16 describle 85:2 1 86:4 86:41.4 15.16 describle 85:2 1 86:4 describle 85:2 1 86:2 describle 85:2 1 86:4 describle 85:2 1 86:2 describle 85:2 1 86:4 describle 85:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 | 93:21 94:3 95:11 | 4:12 15:12 116:5 | 117:6 132:17 136:20 | distribution 45:11,15 |
| 122:3.4 134.7 137.1 departments 44:16 defined 238 24:15.20 27:20 28:2 32:15 60:1 depicting 127:17 definite 128:12 describle 87:2.5 describle 85:2 1 86:4 86:41.4 15.16 describle 85:2 1 86:4 86:41.4 15.16 describle 85:2 1 86:4 describle 85:2 1 86:2 describle 85:2 1 86:4 describle 85:2 1 86:2 describle 85:2 1 86:4 describle 85:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 86:2 1 | 102:16 110:2 118:20 | 125:20 126:1 128:12 | 146:9 153:8,9,9,16 | 1 |
| 150-12,22 153-12 152-17 152-17 152-18 | | | | |
| defined 38 24:15, 20 | | - | | districts 75:16.20 |
| defined 23.8 24.15.20 | | depending 58:16 | | , |
| 27:20 28:2 32:15 60:1 depleted 127:7 depreciates 109:15 depth 102:1 176:15,16 88:2 92:5 108:2,21 110:15 119:91 22:10,16 127:22 157:14 164:21 170:1 170:17 | | | _ | • |
| Continue | | | | |
| Total Tota | | | I | Division 2:2 38:7 64:5 |
| 108:2.21.110:15 | | | difficulties 8:9 | |
| 119.9 122-10,16 127-72 157-14 164-21 164-21 170- | • | - | | _ |
| 1277:22 157:14 164:21 describe 87:2,5 described 85:21 86:4 86:14,15,16 defining 30:16 35:13 36:6,9 65:1 85:12 96:6 118:19 119:10 192:1 192:2 122:15 123:9 125:10 152:20 156:18 definition 139:28:1,11 28:13 29.8 33:9 69:19 descriptive 155:21 design 81:18 designated 137:21 designated 137:7 designations 118:12 29:0 6 9:15 9:21 29:0 77:7,14 84:22 39:14 161:10 179:8,17 114:16 121:8 129:3 129:17 130:4 134:12 135:3 137:22 139:15 142:19 148:16 149:3 152:22 154:14 155:10 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 definitions 7:7 22:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133: 133:14 136:2 155:2 develope 52:1 53:19 delivered 44:5 48:10 96:16 delivered 52:2 10:13 104:18 dents 10:122 described 85:21 88:28 87:2,7 92:14 dents 10:122 described 85:21 88:28 87:2,7 92:14 described 85:21 48:14 133:19 dents 10:122 describing 86:8 119:10 difference 120:21 121:5 distinct 14:14:21 discoussion 3:14 42:3 distinct 14:14:23 distinct | | derive 56:18 | | |
| defines 88:6 94:18 defining 30:16 35:13 36:6,9 65:1 85:12 96:6 118:19 119:10 121:15 123:9 125:10 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 128:13 29:8 33:9 60:19 69:20 77:7,14 84:22 85:15 87:19 88:2,12 90:6 91:15 92:12 94:17 109:8,17 114:16 121:8 129:3 129:17 130:4 134:12 135:3 137:22 139:15 definition 7:7 22:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 155:18 66:37,159:2 159:8 77:7 22:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 159:18 64:13 76:48 62:0 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 129:19 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 delegree 9:12 25:18 28:10 122:15 delegree 9:12 25:18 28:10 122:15 delegree 9:12 25:18 delivered 44:5 48:10 172:6 delegree 9:12 25:18 delivered 44:5 48:10 172:6 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 123:19 dent 100:17,22 101:13 104:18 dents 101:22 description 85:4,12 description 86:4,12 description 85:4,12 description 85:4,12 description 86:4,12 description 85:4,12 description 86:4,12 description 86:7 87:1 description 86:4,12 description 86:7 87:1 description 86:7 87:1 description 86:4,12 description 86:7 87:1 description 86:7 87:1 description | | | | |
| defines 88.6 94.18 describing 86.8 119.10 dinged 123.5 documents 11:10 63:14 36.9, 65.1 85.12 96.6 118.19 119:10 describing 86.8 119:10 119:12 direct 91:15,16,19 direction 5:14 17:3 doing 6:15 15:18 20:16 direction 5:14 17:3 doing 6:15 15:18 20:16 doing 6:15 15:18 20:16 direction 5:14 17:3 doing 6:15 15:18 20:16 doing 6:15 15:18 20:16 doing 6:15 15:18 di | | | | document 88:5 |
| defining 30:16 35:13 describing 86:8 119:10 direct 99:15, 16,19 dogs 123:3 dogs 123:3 36:6, 9 65:1 85:12 96:6 118:19 119:10 19:12 description 85:4,12 direction 5:14 17:3 doing 6:15 15:18 20:16 21:16 56:10,20 21:16 56:10,20 114:10 117:19 125:10 21:16 56:10,20 114:10 117:19 125:10 114:10 117:19 125:10 21:16 56:10,20 114:10 117:19 125:10 114:10 117:19 125:10 21:16 56:10,20 114:10 117:19 125:10 114:10 117:19 125:10 21:16 56:10,20 114:10 117:19 125:10 115:11 13:19 125:10 114:10 117:11 17:11 116:2 139:9 114:10 117:11 17:11 115:12 116:2 139:9 116:2 139:9 116:2 139:9 116:2 139:9 118:10 | | | dinged 123:5 | |
| 36:6.9 65:1 85:12 96:6 118:19 119:10 12:115 123:9 125:10 152:20 156:18 definite 129:10 definitely 55:1 86:15 150:4 152:15 162:8 definitition 13:9 28:1,11 28:13 29:8 33:9 69:19 69:20 77;7,14 84:22 85:15 87:19 88:2,12 90:6 91:15 92:12 94:17 109:8,17 144:16 121:8 129:3 129:17 130:4 134:12 135:3 137:22 139:15 142:19 148:16 149:3 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 definitions 77: 72:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 56:19 60:14,15 65:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:20:16 21:16 65:10,20 114:10 117:19 125:10 directions 5:5 directive 12:1:6 directive 12:1:6 directive 12:1:6 directory 40:9 directory 40:9 directory 40:9 directory 40:9 disagreed 95:18 disagreed | | | | |
| 96:6 118:19 119:10 152:20 156:18 definite 129:10 definitely 55:1 86:15 134:2 designate 137:21 | | | | |
| 121:15 123:9 125:10 | | | | |
| 152:20 156:18 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 definite 129:10 descriptive 155:21 design 81:18 designate 137:21 designate 137:21 designated 137:7 designations 118:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 141:16 121:8 129:3 129:17 130:4 134:12 135:3 137:22 139:15 detail 75:10 detaile 28:17 45:4 designed 81:16 designed 95:18 disagree 40:5 133:12 disagree 140:5 133:12 designed 95:18 disagree 40:5 133:12 disagree 140:5 133:12 disagree 140:5 133:12 disagree 140:5 133:12 designed 95:18 disagree 40:5 133:12 downloads 38:9 40:15 downloads 43:7 discussion 37:15 70:1 171:17; 172:1 132:20 140:1 155:15 133:12 details 23:9 96:21 150:13 30:19 131:2 150:13 30: | | _ | | |
| definite 129:10 definitely 55:1 86:15 descriptive 155:21 design 81:18 disadvantage 118:4 down 10:25:18 | III | | | |
| definitely 55:1 86:15 descriptive 155:21 design 81:18 design ate 137:21 | | | | |
| design 81:18 design 81:18 design 81:18 designated 137:21 designations 118:12 28:13 29:8 33:9 69:19 69:20 777:7,14 84:22 85:15 87:19 88:2,12 90:6 91:15 92:12 124:10 125:8 designated 137:7 designations 118:12 124:10 125:10 1 | III | | | |
| definition 13:9 28:1,11 28:13 29:8 33:9 69:19 69:20 77:7,14 84:22 85:15 87:19 88:2,12 90:6 91:15 92:12 90:6 91:15 92:12 124:10 125:8 designated 137:21 designated 137:7 designated 137:7 designating 138:17 designated 137:7 designating 138:17 designated 137:7 designated 13:14 disagreed 40:5 133:12 discourse 12:21 15:7 discussed 53:15 76:1 discussing 7:16 13:10 28:6 75:10 132:20 167:11 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 152:15 133:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 152:15 13:15 14:11 discussion 3:11 7:7 discussing 7:16 13:10 28:6 75:10 13:22 developed 52:1 53:19 3:15 36:9 42:21 152:2 Detroit 33:12 94:22 developed 52:1 53:19 48:11 13:5 developed 52:1 53:19 48:11 13:5 developed 52:1 53:19 discussion 57:8 25:4 displayed 40:15 discussed 53:15 76:1 discussion 3:11 7:7 dis | II - | • | | - |
| 28:13 29:8 33:9 69:19 69:20 77:7;14 84:22 90:6 91:15 92:12 94:17 109:8,17 114:16 121:8 129:3 124:10 125:8 designated 81:16 designated 28:17 45:4 49:12 53:11 54:11,22 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 detailer 17:10 26:15 159:8 determiner 17:10 26:15 159:8 determiner 17:10 26:15 159:8 determiner 17:10 26:15 159:8 determiner 17:10 26:15 159:5 16 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 develop 69:16,20 106:4 172:6 develop 69:16,20 106:4 172:6 develop 69:16,20 106:4 172:6 develop 69:16 97:21 deliver 46:2 50:18 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 dent 100:17,22 101:13 dent 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 designating 138:17 designating 138:17 designation 138:10 | | | | 1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 69:20 77:7,14 84:22 85:15 87:19 88:2,12 90:6 91:15 92:12 24:10 125:8 disagree 144:8 disagree 144:5 discourse 12:21 15:7 discourse 13:12 discourse 12:21 15:7 discourse 12:21 15:7 discourse 1 | • | | | |
| 85:15 87:19 88:2,12 90:6 91:15 92:12 124:10 125:8 designations 118:12 124:10 125:8 designed 81:16 descurse 12:21 15:7 discussed 53:15 76:1 171:77; 13:220 140:1 156:17 discussing 7:16 13:10 28:6 75:10 132:20 167:11 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 descussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 develope 69:16,20 106:4 17:16 14:15 develope 69:16,20 106:4 17:16 14:15 develope 69:16,20 106:4 17:16 14:15 develope 69:16,20 106:4 17:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 develope 148:7 develope 14 | | | | |
| 90:6 91:15 92:12 94:17 109:8,17 114:16 121:8 129:3 129:17 130:4 134:12 135:3 137:22 139:15 142:19 148:16 149:3 155:22 154:14 155:10 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 definitions 7:7 22:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 1229 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 155:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 172:6 172:6 172:6 172:6 172:6 172:6 172:6 172:7 172:6 172:7 172:6 172:1 172:7 172:1 172:7 172:1 172:7 172:1 172:7 172:1 172:1 172:7 172:1 172 | | | | |
| 94:17 109:8,17 | | _ | | |
| 114:16 121:8 129:3 129:17 130:4 134:12 135:3 137:22 139:15 49:12 53:11 54:11,22 87:3 155:9 140:1 156:17 140:1 156:17 150:22 154:14,18 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 159:8 159:8 159:8 159:8 159:9 129:15 133:3 13:14 136:2 155:2 124:14,18 133:14 136:2 155:2 159:15 15:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 172:6 128:10,12,21 128:19 129:12 129:18 129:12 150:18 128:10,12,21 128:19 19:20 140:1 136:19 130:20 167:11 152:5,6,8,8,12 168:14 17:17 22:1,12 152:5,6,8,8,12 168:14 15:5,10 132:20 167:11 15:5,6,8,8,12 168:14 15:5,10 132:20 167:11 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 15:5,6,8,8,12 168:14 15:5,10 132:20 167:11 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 15:2,19 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 15:3,18 80:7 16:12 17:19 148:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 147:19 148:15 147:19 148:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 169:40 148:10 172:6 169:40 149:4 155:14 133:16 172:16 1 | | | | |
| 129:17 130:4 134:12 135:3 137:22 139:15 49:12 53:11 54:11,22 87:3 155:9 140:11 156:17 156:17 156:17 156:17 130:20 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 159:8 124:14,18 159:8 159:8 159:9 156:9 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 147:19 148:15 149:12 155:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 155:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 160:00 state of the object of | • | _ | | |
| 135:3 137:22 139:15 142:19 148:16 149:3 152:22 154:14 155:10 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 definitions 7:7 22:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 155:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 degree 9:12 25:18 28:10,12,21 Delaware 50:22 delivery 46:2 50:18 delivery 46:2 50:18 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 123:19 dent 100:17,22 101:13 104:18 dents 101:22 49:12 53:11 54:11,22 87:3 155:9 87:3 155:9 87:3 155:9 140:1 156:17 discussing 7:16 13:10 128:6 75:10 132:20 140:1 156:17 discussing 7:16 13:10 128:6 75:10 132:20 140:1 156:17 discussing 7:16 13:10 167:11 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 23:15,18 97:1 104:13 105:3 130:19 131:2 155:5 171:12 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 46:7 5:10 132:20 167:11 drain 146:14 drainage 146:8,10 draw 108:6 131:3 164:15 drink 9:17 drinking 3:6 24:12 37:10,17 42:11,15 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 46:7 5:10 132:20 167:11 drain 146:14 drainage 146:8,10 draw 108:6 131:3 164:15 drink 9:17 drinking 3:6 24:12 37:10,17 42:11,15 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 46:7 5:10 132:20 167:11 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 21:19 25:7 6:47 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 6:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 21:19 25:7 6:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 6:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 23:13 80:7 82:15,18 97:1 104:13 105:3 130:19 131:2 155:5 6,8,8,12 168:14 Dr 119:11 drain 146:14 drainage 146:8,10 draw 108:6 131:3 164:15 drink 9:17 drinking 3:6 24:12 37:10,17 42:11,15 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 distinct 114:19 133:3 133:13 distinct 114:19 133:3 133:13 distinct 114:19 133:3 133:13 distinct 114:19 133:3 43:18 44:22 68:4 | | | | |
| 142:19 148:16 149:3 152:22 154:14 155:10 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 definitions 7:7 22:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 degree 9:12 25:18 28:10,12,21 Delaware 50:22 delivery 64:2 50:18 delivery 64:2 50:18 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 123:19 dent 100:17,22 101:13 104:18 dents 101:22 87:3 155:9 details 23:9 96:21 124:14,18 determine 17:10 26:15 50:4 58:11,19 141:18 determine 17:10 26:15 50:4 58:11,19 141:18 determining 135:7 152:2 Detroit 33:12 94:22 develope 69:16,20 106:4 develope 69:16,20 106:4 developed 52:1 53:19 developed 52:1 53:19 developed 52:1 53:19 developed 148:7 discussion 3:11 7:7 discussion 3:1 7:7 discussion 3:11 7:7 discussion 3:1 7:7 discussion 3:1 7:7 discussion 3:1 7:7 discussion 3:1 7:0 dis | | | | |
| 152:22 154:14 155:10 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 159:8 determine 17:10 26:15 159:8 determine 17:10 26:15 50:4 58:11,19 141:18 determining 135:7 152:2 152:1 152:2 Detroit 33:12 94:22 develope 69:16,20 106:4 17:16 13:10 172:6 17:17 29:17 159:11 141:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 develope 69:16,20 106:4 133:14 136:2 155:2 155:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 developement 145:9 developement 145:9 developes 148:7 devices 10:3 dispersed 103:9 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 discoveration 10:17 24:21 39:14 40:13 48:19 dent 100:17,22 101:13 104:18 determine 17:10 26:15 124:14,18 determine 17:10 26:15 125:5,6,8,8,12 168:14 152:5,6,8,8,12 168:14 152:5,6,8,8,12 168:14 drain 146:14 drain 146:14 drain 146:8,10 dra | | | | |
| 155:16 156:3,7 159:2 124:14,18 determine 17:10 26:15 50:4 58:11,19 141:18 determining 135:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 develope 69:16,20 106:4 147:19 148:15 develope 69:16,20 106:4 147:19 148:16 develope 69:16,20 106:4 147:19 148:15 153:5 171:12 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 7:7:12 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 82:15,18 97:1 104:13 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 7:7:1 164:15 drink 19:13 44:12 5:5 44:12 37:10,17 42:11 47:19 148:15 44:11 131:6 44:15 14 44:13 48:16 44:11 131:6 44:15 14 44:13 48:16 44:11 131:6 | | | | |
| 159:8 definitions 7:7 22:7 30:15 36:9 42:21 50:4 58:11,19 141:18 determining 135:7 15:22 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 37:10,17 42:11,15 develop 69:16,20 106:4 172:6 develop 69:16 25:18 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 123:19 dent 100:17,22 101:13 104:18 dents 101:22 deliver 40:25 3:19 dent 100:17,22 101:13 104:18 determining 135:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 discussion 3:11 7:7 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 driw 108:6 131:3 164:15 driw 108:10 driw 108:10 driw 108:6 131:3 164:15 driw 108:10 driw 108:6 131:3 | | | | |
| definitions 7:7 22:7 50:4 58:11,19 141:18 discussion 3:11 7:7 drainage 146:8,10 30:15 36:9 42:21 152:2 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 16:12 17:17 22:1,12 draw 108:6 131:3 64:13 76:14 86:20 Detroit 33:12 94:22 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 drink 9:17 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 devastating 168:19 32:15,18 97:1 104:13 drink 9:17 122:9 129:15 133:3 147:19 148:15 122:9 129:15 133:3 147:19 148:15 153:5 171:12 37:10,17 42:11,15 133:14 136:2 155:2 developed 52:1 53:19 84:14 133:16 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 172:6 developed 52:1 53:19 44:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 28:10,12,21 devices 10:3 dispersed 103:9 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 28:10,12,21 devices 10:3 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 70:7,15,21 77:21 28:10,12,21 Diesel 97:21 displayed 46:16 61:18 82:16,6 98:17 106:17 39:14 40:13 48:19 difference 120:21 121:5 displaying 85:20 108:1 126:22 127:9 49:14 5:51 39:14 40:13 48:19 dissolved 51:20 169:4 49:17 50:12 53:10 distr | III | | | |
| 30:15 36:9 42:21 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 152:2 152:2 22:19 25:7 26:17 27:1 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 34:15 5 118:19 119:20 4evelope 69:16,20 106:4 155:5 118:19 119:20 4evelope 69:16,20 106:4 147:19 148:15 147:19 148:15 4eveloped 52:1 53:19 33:14 136:2 155:2 4eveloped 52:1 53:19 34:11 131:6 4eveloped 52:1 53:19 34:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 15:5 17:11 10:1 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:4,15 55:14 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:4,15 55:14 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:4,15 55:14 65:5 67:16,21 | definitions 7:7 22:7 | | discussion 3:11 7:7 | drainage 146:8,10 |
| 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 155:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 degree 9:12 25:18 28:10,12,21 Delaware 50:22 deliver 46:2 50:18 delivered 44:5 48:10 96:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 dents 101:22 dents 101:22 152:2 Detroit 33:12 94:22 devastating 168:19 develop 69:16,20 106:4 147:19 148:15 develope 69:16,20 106:4 147:19 148:15 147:19 148:15 153:5 171:12 153:5 171:12 153:5 171:12 153:5 171:12 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 46:7,19 47:2,13,21 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 | | | | |
| 64:13 76:14 86:20 90:3 107:15 114:18 33:12 94:22 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 drink 9:17 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 147:19 148:15 105:3 130:19 131:2 37:10,17 42:11,15 133:14 136:2 155:2 147:19 148:15 147:19 148:15 153:5 171:12 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 155:15 160:4 161:10 84:14 133:16 84:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 172:6 development 145:9 development 145:9 develops 148:7 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 28:10,12,21 devices 10:3 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 70:7,15,21 77:21 Delaware 50:22 devices 10:3 displayed 46:16 61:18 80:11,14 81:6,6,20 delivered 44:5 48:10 differ 57:10 130:7,9 difference 120:21 121:5 disruption 13:3 127:11 164:6 165:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 120:22 121:5 dissolved 51:20 169:4 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 33:13 distinctly 168:10 drivers 126:16 129:4 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | 56:19 60:14,15 64:10 | | | 164:15 |
| 90:3 107:15 114:18 115:5 118:19 119:20 122:9 129:15 133:3 133:14 136:2 155:2 155:15 160:4 161:10 172:6 develop 69:16,20 106:4 147:19 148:15 developed 52:1 53:19 84:14 133:16 developement 145:9 developement 145:9 developes 148:7 developes 10:3 developes 148:7 developed 52:1 53:19 84:11 131:6 developes 148:7 developed 52:1 53:19 84:11 131:6 developes 148:7 developes 148:7 developes 148:7 developes 148:7 developes 148:7 developes 148:7 developed 52:1 53:19 84:11 131:6 dispersed 103:9 displays 84:1 89:12 95:6 171:18 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 disruption 13:3 disruption 13:3 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 displaying 85:20 displaying 85:20 displaying 85:20 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 displaying 85:20 displaying 85:20 displaying 85:20 displayed 46:16 61:18 displayed 46:16 61:1 | - II | Detroit 33:12 94:22 | 34:7 35:12,18 80:7 | |
| 115:5 118:19 119:20 develop 69:16,20 106:4 105:3 130:19 131:2 37:10,17 42:11,15 122:9 129:15 133:3 147:19 148:15 developed 52:1 53:19 discussions 7:8 35:9 46:7,19 47:2,13,21 155:15 160:4 161:10 84:14 133:16 development 145:9 discussions 7:8 35:9 46:7,19 47:2,13,21 172:6 development 145:9 development 145:9 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 28:10,12,21 devices 10:3 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 70:7,15,21 77:21 Delaware 50:22 diameter 41:1 displayed 46:16 61:18 82:1,6 98:17 106:17 delivered 44:5 48:10 differ 57:10 130:7,9 disruption 13:3 127:11 164:6 165:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 120:21 121:5 dissolved 51:20 169:4 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 133:13 distinctly 168:10 diver 107:4,7 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | | | | drinking 3:6 24:12 |
| 122:9 129:15 133:3 147:19 148:15 153:5 171:12 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 133:14 136:2 155:2 46eveloped 52:1 53:19 84:14 133:16 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 172:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:10 13:16 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:10 13:16 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 49:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 70:7,15,21 77:21 49:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 49:11 131:6 49:11 13 49:11 13 65:11 8 40:11 14 81:6,6,20 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 60:11 8 </td <td>115:5 118:19 119:20</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | 115:5 118:19 119:20 | | | |
| 155:15 160:4 161:10 84:14 133:16 84:11 131:6 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 172:6 development 145:9 dispersed 103:9 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 degree 9:12 25:18 develops 148:7 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 70:7,15,21 77:21 28:10,12,21 devices 10:3 171:18 80:11,14 81:6,6,20 Delaware 50:22 diameter 41:1 displayed 46:16 61:18 82:1,6 98:17 106:17 deliver 46:2 50:18 differ 57:10 130:7,9 disruption 13:3 108:1 126:22 127:9 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 120:21 121:5 dissolved 51:20 169:4 demonstrate 94:6 different 10:17 24:21 39:14 40:13 48:19 133:13 distinct 114:19 133:3 104:18 49:4,15 55:14 64:3 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 70:7,15,21 77:21 80:11,14 81:6,6,20 82:1,6 98:17 106:17 106:17 106:17 108:1 126:22 127:9 108:1 126:22 127:9 disruptive 13:3 165:21 168:5,17 169:4 169:4 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 133:13 133:13 dents 101:22 49:17 50:12 53:10 13:18 44:22 68:4 108:11,14 41:3 | | | 153:5 171:12 | 43:8,17 44:5 45:5 |
| 172:6 development 145:9 dispersed 103:9 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 degree 9:12 25:18 develops 148:7 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 70:7,15,21 77:21 28:10,12,21 devices 10:3 171:18 80:11,14 81:6,6,20 Delaware 50:22 diameter 41:1 displayed 46:16 61:18 82:1,6 98:17 106:17 delivered 44:5 48:10 differ 57:10 130:7,9 displaying 85:20 108:1 126:22 127:9 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 120:21 121:5 disruption 13:3 127:11 164:6 165:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 52:9 103:6 dissolved 51:20 distinct 114:19 133:3 169:4 drip 122:22 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distinctly 168:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | 133:14 136:2 155:2 | developed 52:1 53:19 | discussions 7:8 35:9 | |
| degree 9:12 25:18 28:10,12,21 develops 148:7 devices 10:3 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 171:18 70:7,15,21 77:21 80:11,14 81:6,6,20 Delaware 50:22 deliver 46:2 50:18 delivered 44:5 48:10 96:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 demonstrate 94:6 123:19 Diesel 97:21 difference 120:21 121:5 difference 52:9 103:6 different 10:17 24:21 39:14 40:13 48:19 49:17 50:12 53:10 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 display 84:1 89:12 95:6 171:18 displayed 46:16 61:18 displaying 85:20 disruption 13:3 disruptive 13:3 dissolved 51:20 distinct 114:19 133:3 133:13 127:11 164:6 165:16 165:21 168:5,17 169:4 drip 122:22 drive 107:4,7 drivers 126:16 129:4 DW 45:6 | 155:15 160:4 161:10 | | 84:11 131:6 | |
| 28:10,12,21 devices 10:3 171:18 80:11,14 81:6,6,20 Delaware 50:22 diameter 41:1 displayed 46:16 61:18 82:1,6 98:17 106:17 deliver 46:2 50:18 differ 57:10 130:7,9 displaying 85:20 108:1 126:22 127:9 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 120:21 121:5 disruption 13:3 127:11 164:6 165:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 52:9 103:6 dissolved 51:20 169:4 demonstrate 94:6 39:14 40:13 48:19 distinct 114:19 133:3 drive 107:4,7 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distinctly 168:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 104:18 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | | | | 65:5 67:16,21 68:21 |
| Delaware 50:22 diameter 41:1 displayed 46:16 61:18 82:1,6 98:17 106:17 deliver 46:2 50:18 differ 57:10 130:7,9 displaying 85:20 108:1 126:22 127:9 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 120:21 121:5 disruption 13:3 127:11 164:6 165:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 52:9 103:6 dissolved 51:20 distinct 114:19 133:3 169:4 demonstrate 94:6 39:14 40:13 48:19 133:13 distinct 114:19 133:3 distinctly 168:10 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 | degree 9:12 25:18 | | display 84:1 89:12 95:6 | |
| deliver 46:2 50:18 Diesel 97:21 displaying 85:20 108:1 126:22 127:9 delivered 44:5 48:10 differ 57:10 130:7,9 disruption 13:3 127:11 164:6 165:16 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 120:21 121:5 disruptive 13:3 dissolved 51:20 demonstrate 94:6 different 10:17 24:21 distinct 114:19 133:3 drip 122:22 123:19 49:17 50:12 53:10 distinctly 168:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 dent 100:17,22 101:13 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 39:14 40:13 48:19 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | | | | |
| delivered 44:5 48:10 differ 57:10 130:7,9 disruption 13:3 127:11 164:6 165:16 96:16 difference 120:21 121:5 disruptive 13:3 165:21 168:5,17 delivery 51:15 101:17 difference 52:9 103:6 dissolved 51:20 distinct 114:19 133:3 123:19 39:14 40:13 48:19 133:13 distinctly 168:10 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 distribute 41:4 42:3 104:18 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | | | | • |
| 96:16 difference 120:21 121:5 disruptive 13:3 165:21 168:5,17 delivery 51:15 101:17 differences 52:9 103:6 dissolved 51:20 dissolved 51:20 demonstrate 94:6 39:14 40:13 48:19 distinct 114:19 133:3 drip 122:22 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distinctly 168:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 104:18 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | II | | | |
| delivery 51:15 101:17 differences 52:9 103:6 dissolved 51:20 169:4 demonstrate 94:6 different 10:17 24:21 distinct 114:19 133:3 drip 122:22 123:19 39:14 40:13 48:19 133:13 distinctly 168:10 distinctly 168:10 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | | | | |
| demonstrate 94:6 different 10:17 24:21 distinct 114:19 133:3 drip 122:22 123:19 39:14 40:13 48:19 133:13 drive 107:4,7 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distinctly 168:10 drivers 126:16 129:4 104:18 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 DW 45:6 | | | | |
| 123:19 39:14 40:13 48:19 133:13 drive 107:4,7 dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distinctly 168:10 drivers 126:16 129:4 104:18 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 | | | | |
| dent 100:17,22 101:13 49:17 50:12 53:10 distinctly 168:10 drivers 126:16 129:4 104:18 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 49:17 50:12 53:10 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 | | | | |
| 104:18 56:19 58:13 65:6 68:1 distribute 41:4 42:3 DW 45:6 dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 | | | | |
| dents 101:22 82:8 87:2,7 92:14 43:18 44:22 68:4 | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | | | DW 45:6 |
| Department 1:1 2:1 96:4 97:8,9 99:4,13 distributed 61:18 | | * | | |
| | Department 1:1 2:1 | 96:4 97:8,9 99:4,13 | distributed 61:18 | |
| | | I | I | I |

earlier 34:22 79:8 98:13 101:20 131:6 141:5 145:1 147:12 156:6 early 48:11 easily 146:4 167:9 east 171:6 Eastern 78:18,22 79:13 easy 107:13 148:19 echo 4:5,17 13:17 72:5 75:2 eco 3:11 31:8 42:12 43:8 54:16 56:10 57:13 64:2 70:7 77:4 80:17 82:6 90:2,7,9 92:4 114:13 115:15 eco-unique 52:2 eco-USA 144:9 **eco-USAs** 157:18 ecological 1:5 3:6 17:12 19:7 24:10,12 24:14,19 25:1 30:21 31:4,6,12,15 32:14 35:20 36:7 37:10,17 37:21 42:10 43:17 48:9.18 50:20 54:2.4 55:14 60:7,8,21 64:10 65:5,16 67:16,20 70:21 71:2 73:3 77:22 80:21 82:19 90:19 91:9 92:5 98:18 106:15.16 107:17 108:15 109:4 112:21 113:2 114:11,17 126:22 127:4,5,6 130:2,3 137:2 154:16 165:16,22 169:4 ecologically 23:20 137:4 156:19 168:4 economic 64:14 161:11 162:14,16 **Ed** 158:7,11 159:10,11 edges 159:4 educating 158:22 education 76:2 effect 62:21 71:11 77:17 98:7 128:21 154:5 160:9 effective 93:21 effects 129:2 130:8 effort 30:10 66:5 efforts 22:21 65:10 116:16 eight 10:17 92:20 either 100:14 158:13 171:5,9 elaborate 135:12 **Elaine** 2:4 15:11 elected 67:7

element 163:8 elephant 119:11,12,14 119:14 elevation 58:14 **ELLIOT** 1:18 15:4 Elliott 15:2 email 8:7,10,10 9:1,2 36:13 44:11,14 45:14 45:17,19 49:5,16 55:19 **emerged** 136:4,5 emergency 5:1,15 emergent 112:6 **employee** 16:13 41:20 44:19 **employees** 16:7 49:21 158:16 **employment** 45:19 50:3 126:3 **Enbridge** 134:6,21 encourage 11:12 18:18 36:15 138:12,18 143:20 172:3 endangered 24:16 127:7 144:10 ended 48:1 ends 123:7 energy 16:19 72:4 81:14 116:7 141:15 159:17 167:13 **enforce** 59:11 68:9 125:6 enforceability 76:11 enforceable 76:13 enforced 143:3 enforcement 64:5 125:21 142:17 161:5 enforcing 59:7 engage 12:20 engagement 1:22 8:3 8:22 11:16 38:7 72:18 75:6 82:16 171:2 engagements 19:13 158:20 engaging 20:11 engineer 97:21,22 125:18 126:4 Engineer/Pipeline 2:1 **engineering** 1:17 97:13 97:17 101:7,9 104:17 105:9 146:3 **Engineers** 42:9 108:11 Engineers' 93:2 **Engines** 97:21 enhance 19:8 **Enjoy** 172:13

enrollment 104:18

enter 73:12

entertain 36:18 entire 25:14 56:22 76:1 89:8,11 92:21 95:6,10 142:2 144:3 152:10 155:6.6 entirety 25:18 29:19 **entities** 70:15 72:15 entity 32:16 61:1 entry 67:8 environment 106:13 137:11 environmental 26:19 53:8 73:20 74:7 85:2 105:9,14 108:18 109:1 115:12 122:20 157:22 158:21 environmentally 28:21 environments 115:7 **EPA** 42:16 47:17,19 48:6 88:5 90:12,13 122:20 **EPA's** 88:1 113:17 ephemeral 80:20 **Erie** 94:19 95:13 **Erol** 1:17 3:13 97:11 98:3 161:7.14 erosion 159:6 **error** 71:13 **escape** 152:4 escort 9:13,18,21 13:5 171:4 escorts 9:21 **ESI** 26:20 27:17 28:14 28:14 30:20 31:2,5,8 53:4,9,21 54:10 56:11 56:18 60:6,11 85:2,19 85:21 87:1 89:15 91:13,16 110:12,15 111:6,9 113:11 especially 68:21 144:3 144:6 166:5 168:19 **essence** 131:19 estuaries 87:17 88:19 89:4 111:20 **estuarine** 88:4 119:2 **estuary** 89:6 129:15 et 40:8 41:3 104:1 159:6 evacuation 6:6 evaluate 26:15 34:15 84:12 evaluated 34:13 evaluating 25:2 26:21 27:2 32:2 36:2 **events** 16:9 everybody 43:21 49:3 120:3,4 evidence 138:5 exact 52:4 63:18 164:11

exactly 35:21 58:16 **example** 88:18 89:21 90:21 98:21 100:16 100:16 101:12 110:7 119:22 140:15 165:6 165:9 167:9 **examples** 7:13 63:2 89:16 **Excel** 41:6 excellent 8:17 **exception** 51:6 101:9 **excited** 144:19 **excuse** 128:22 148:12 **Executive** 2:2 116:1 139:9 exist 22:6 35:15 63:15 142:6 143:22 existence 60:12 existing 22:7,15 37:20 45:9 60:15 82:2 92:4 107:1,16 112:21 114:17 115:5 126:15 127:4 128:9 129:3 130:1 136:1 138:12 140:2 155:2 160:4,9 exists 120:9.11 exit 6:21 171:8 expect 93:5 113:14 129:6 expected 63:3 **experience** 20:21 70:20 143:14 145:8,13 150:3 165:4 experiencing 8:14 **expert** 58:12 155:14 **expertise** 19:5 149:5 169:12 **experts** 97:3 149:7 154:21 **explain** 65:15 **explained** 61:10 102:20 explaining 62:12 explanation 125:2 explicit 121:16 explicitly 24:8 exposure 112:3 expressed 48:15 extend 111:9,21 112:13 113:13 **extended** 166:20,21 **extends** 90:16 extensions 91:16 extent 52:22 87:20,21 94:2,3 112:16,19,20 113:6,16,20 **external** 19:3 116:8 **extinct** 106:17 extremely 103:16

| ExxonMahil 60:00 | figure 60:2 00:7 40 44 | folder 93:4 | function 150:14 |
|--|--|--|---|
| ExxonMobil 62:20 | figure 60:2 99:7,10,11 122:9 149:20 | folder 83:1 folders 7:3 82:21 | function 150:14 further 4:6 14:20 20:9 |
| F | figuring 59:21 | folks 67:10 125:1 171:3 | 85:5 88:8 90:16 91:16 |
| face 145:22 | filling 101:8 | 172:1 | 110:3 121:20 160:8 |
| facilitating 82:18 | final 3:18 44:6 60:13 | follow 22:18 64:21 | fussing 124:14 |
| 130:18 | 125:16 169:7 | 83:11 140:22 142:14 | future 27:18 66:2 |
| facility 4:22 | finally 15:9 29:13 47:6 | 142:17 145:11 | 115:19 133:4,17 |
| fact 17:19 34:21 72:21 | 132:6 | follow- 80:8 | |
| 75:6 103:5 114:10 | find 11:10 14:4 20:11 | follow-up 76:9 139:10 | G |
| 140:5 | 38:17 66:3 70:16 | 166:10 | gain 74:17 |
| factor 31:13 | 72:16 83:2,10 96:15 | followed 119:16 124:12 | gained 84:6 |
| factored 153:4 | 104:3 117:13 135:13 | following 23:14 27:3 | gaps 110:13 158:19 |
| factors 58:13,18 92:6 | 138:5 148:1 163:9,21 | 36:18 54:11 84:17 | gas 19:18 38:15,19 98:1 |
| facts 106:10 | finding 47:7 154:11 | follows 53:12 165:3 | 126:5,6 167:17,18 |
| fail 103:11,13 163:6 | 157:20 163:8 | foremost 106:11 | 168:9,18 169:3 |
| failure 97:18 | findings 31:8 | foresee 64:14 | gathering 75:9 126:7 |
| Fairbanks 151:15 | fine 12:11 164:14 | forest 160:21 | general 39:17 72:15 |
| fairly 7:4 28:16 | finished 77:14 | Forge 166:19,21 | 74:7 78:1 128:6 |
| fall 59:13 161:19 | firmed 68:17 | form 96:15 | 167:19 |
| familiar 40:2 52:2 54:12 | first 4:18 14:8 32:11 | formal 15:11,18 | generally 21:2 48:14 |
| 58:10 143:17 | 45:13 47:16 49:1 58:5 | format 51:3 | 73:21 |
| FAQs 63:12,13,14 | 72:16 76:8 84:15 | formulated 77:10 | generated 129:14 |
| far 19:22 26:6,8,9 28:9 | 88:18 97:11 102:7,9 | formulating 109:8,17 | generations 115:19 |
| 96:20 99:7,10 111:17 | 102:12,16 106:11,13 | forth 23:11 153:4 157:8 | 133:5 |
| 112:8 125:15 128:21 | 107:12 131:3 132:3 | 157:11 158:1 | generic 148:9 |
| 152:6 162:1 | 153:11 154:15 157:14 158:7 160:3 161:21 | fortunate 157:21 forum 16:22 171:14 | Genesis 159:16 |
| farm 164:12 farmers 123:5 145:3,7 | Fischer 1:14,16 4:3 | forward 3:4 7:10 24:2 | Gentile 1:19 81:3,10 gentleman 62:17 |
| 145:13 | 20:14 56:7 57:22 59:8 | 32:8 35:3,8 36:5 | geographer 153:12 |
| Farrell 74:22,22 139:6,9 | 59:13 60:17 61:21 | 46:17 76:3 117:1,15 | geographic 28:16 29:1 |
| 144:20,21 166:9,9 | 62:3,11,14,18 63:12 | 124:20 125:13 133:4 | 30:13 32:18 105:7 |
| farther 113:13 | 63:21 64:17 66:13 | 135:10 139:13 | Geological 32:17 |
| fascinating 141:17 | 67:2 76:6,18 77:8,18 | found 9:6 29:16 47:2 | geospatial 34:15 |
| fauna 109:6 | 78:11,13 79:5,10,13 | 54:2 82:22 94:12,17 | geospatially 39:9 |
| fear 61:14 | Fisher 4:11 | 96:11 128:6 151:4 | getting 7:8 18:6 33:2 |
| features 28:16 32:19 | fisheries 137:15 | fountain 6:13 | 34:6 123:5 139:13 |
| 33:13,17 34:12 58:15 | fishing 121:9,11 | four 77:13 91:18 100:6 | 140:3 160:7 |
| 65:1 85:3,11 110:12 | fit 23:6 27:20 82:2 | 114:3 146:22 | GIS 1:19 23:7 30:10 |
| 110:16 111:20 113:12 | five 34:1,3,16 59:18 | fragmented 72:12 | 35:15 37:5 38:3 41:22 |
| fed/state 91:7 | 77:15 89:9 92:2 98:14 | frame 77:5 | 43:2,3,10 44:15 49:21 |
| federal 15:12 19:17 | 98:22 99:13 102:19 | Frankly 145:12 | 61:12,15 74:19 96:4 |
| 22:8,14 26:18 32:17 | 114:15 158:21 | free 83:4 161:13 | 106:4 110:2,4 117:13 |
| 41:19 70:20 71:1,6 | fix 162:21,22 | Freeman 1:18 3:14 | 124:15,19,21 132:3,5 |
| 81:14 108:21 139:14 | flat 109:21 | 105:6,7,11,21,22 | 159:17 171:21 172:1 |
| 166:22 | flies 145:21 | 132:2 139:5 150:19 | give 5:2 8:15 14:12 21:9 |
| federal/state 88:16 | floor 11:18 136:11 | 157:3,7 159:22 | 50:20 52:14 83:6 97:4 |
| feedback 10:6 11:14 | flora 109:6 Florida 112:14 155:4 | FreemanGIS 1:18 105:6 105:17 | 100:16 104:16 130:16 |
| 26:2 28:6 30:19 35:7 84:14 92:18 104:15 | flow 99:6 100:5,7 | freighter 120:15 | 141:4 148:22 167:20 169:10 |
| 169:11 170:4 | 103:20 110:16 | freighters 120:18 | given 30:19 34:20 |
| feeding 81:21 | flowing 95:20 | frequently 129:19 | 41:16 77:10 83:15 |
| feel 83:4 129:15 161:13 | fluctuation 112:4 | front 8:7 18:10 56:8,8 | 92:4 104:17 144:18 |
| feeling 168:16 | focus 24:18 30:2 86:17 | 109:7 | giving 16:11 37:8 |
| fell 48:6 | 143:18 | frustration 72:8 | 101:12 |
| fertilizers 123:6 | focused 8:2 30:18 59:3 | FTP 46:3 50:18 | glad 4:14 15:8 126:10 |
| field 149:7 151:5 | 84:21 93:16 | fulfill 24:4 66:4 | 151:17 |
| 154:22 | focuses 93:3 | full 112:11 113:6 | Gooding 1:19 3:12 7:12 |
| fight 164:9 | focusing 7:6 | 117:10 | 37:3,5 56:14 57:6,18 |
| | l | | |

half 31:14 honor 109:6 57:21 58:8 60:5 61:7 20:2 67:4 74:1 83:16 62:1,13,16 63:4,7,13 **Hall** 1:20 5:16 6:14 58:2 92:18 96:1 97:9 120:7 honored 116:14 hope 15:15 19:1,4 20:6 63:17 65:16 67:14 59:5,10,20 62:5 66:6 148:13 154:5 172:4 66:20 76:7 77:9,19 heard 38:3 105:1 68:10 69:7 72:1 73:16 20:11 75:10 83:15 74:2,12,16 76:5 77:6 78:9 80:1,8 158:5 117:14 130:20 156:11 97:1 118:17 156:4 78:4,12 83:5,13,18 159:11 160:12 160:14 169:18 170:9 Hopefully 132:22 148:11 153:6 154:15 hallway 9:8 hoping 11:13 47:21 170:13 hand 6:9 12:2 48:13 156:8 171:16 hearing 8:9 117:2 horrible 15:21 government 22:14 60:9 69:22 hour 146:22 hearings 18:9 39:16 41:11,19 43:14 handed 7:4 heart 170:4 House 116:12.15 67:7 69:1 70:12,19 **HOWARD** 1:18 **handle** 91:15 held 77:15 97:19 hands 157:14 161:20 122:12 135:20 145:12 73:18 116:22 165:5 **HPAs** 43:4,15,21 165:18 169:21 169:9 **HSE** 97:21 154.6 governments 70:8,14 happen 9:15 75:21 hello 17:14 37:3 huge 124:3 146:10 71:20 147:19,19 81:12 103:19 122:5 help 13:4 14:9 17:4 human 140:2 148:4 150:11,14,15 19:6 27:12 31:19,22 hundreds 123:6 happening 72:22 164:20 115:10 63:2,18 82:11 84:12 Hung 2:5 6:3,3 Governor 116:9 happens 89:10 104:2 133:22 147:6 159:8 **Huron** 94:19 95:13 grab 21:8 happy 106:7 144:1 169:22 170:7,11 hurry 132:3 hard 18:14 51:19 93:17 grabbed 90:21,22 171:4,8 **hybrid** 51:9 grader 123:11 120:22 157:17 helped 69:20 106:4 **Hydrography** 87:18 **harking** 122:21 helpful 20:12 62:7 88:21 93:13 95:15 grant 82:5 166:11 graphic 134:2 harm 163:20 135:9 156:5 172:9 110:17 gray 66:8 80:3,9 82:13 **harming** 138:21 helping 81:22 hyper-local 148:8 160:13,14 163:5 hat 132:12 **helps** 19:22 20:1 32:10 green 39:18,18 54:7 Hawaii 50:22 54:20 156:4 55:10 110:14.20 hazardous 1:3.12 4:13 heritage 148:21 idea 8:15 52:14 117:8 112:7 113:12 123:13 14:22 16:20 38:15 hesitate 19:4 133:6 136:19 167:4 44:1,8,9,12 45:1 47:3 **hey** 143:6 167:4 123:14,20 ideally 33:7 155:2 grew 120:3 123:12 49:10 52:11 55:16 Hi 56:9 74:22 141:14 identification 59:18 gross 71:5 147:13 64:6 92:15 105:15 high 42:4 102:13 104:8 77:17 148:9 108:18 114:7 116:6 106:2,10 107:11 identified 17:11 24:12 ground 66:21 71:21 126:6,16 129:5 130:9 109:11,12 115:3 28:19 32:16 52:18 73:1 74:15 75:4,12,17 167:15 168:15 126:15,21 127:1 64:20 150:22 75:19 80:19 147:22 **Hazards** 161:6 133:7,9,15 150:22 identify 12:1 24:3 27:9 166:4 167:3 **HAZMAT** 19:18 157:14 160:5,10 31:4 34:10 52:4 62:7 grounded 109:9 115:6 **HCA** 27:14 43:1 80:18 167:17 73:11 105:13,20 133:7 156:13 157:2 92:22 97:16 98:10 high- 39:3 identifying 29:4 63:18 groundwater 108:4 99:16,17 100:3,8 high-population 43:5 lds 9:10 52:2 group 9:18,22 97:14 101:4 102:4,5 103:17 highest 80:16,17 81:18 illustrate 88:17 169:7 104:7 107:5 109:14 107:5 illustrating 128:15 109:17 125:7 129:4 groups 19:17 38:12 highlights 55:9 illustrative 7:15 highly 32:18 67:21 71:8 73:18 137:7 159:15,20 imagine 54:12,17 68:11 98:15 127:15,18 68:16 102:5 121:1 **growing** 166:6 160:2.2.4 162:17 **GS** 49:7 53:14 **HCA/USA** 42:3 130:10 137:17 immediate 100:14,18 **HCAs** 98:5,20 99:22 hire 149:6 101:8 102:15 162:19 guess 55:17 131:10 hired 69:21 **guessing** 118:12 100:13 102:8,14,19 162:20 105:18 106:14 107:2 historically 71:15 immediately 163:12 quidance 63:1,5,11,14 88:3 122:10.17 107:4,7,16 109:3,9 history 39:7 impact 64:14 92:16 Gulf 25:13 53:22 91:19 110:1 115:5,16 118:9 hits 99:20 100:19 137:17 138:11 111:4,13 121:22 128:2,22 **HL** 43:22 161:11 162:1,1,3,5,8 134:11 137:1 138:17 hold 11:17 19:16 79:1 162:14,16 168:19 Н 150:12 152:12,22 125:6 impacted 74:15 152:13 habitat 107:19 138:21 155:8 156:12 169:22 holds 133:19 impacting 101:2 home 40:8 heading 6:20 **impacts** 87:9,10 140:2 159:5 heads 135:21 habitats 112:3 113:15 homepage 39:12 152:22 169:2,3 129:17 health 106:13 homes 106:19 165:12 imperiled 24:17 127:6 hairs 137:12 hear 4:7 5:1,4 10:6 12:6 honesty 58:10 138:22

| п | |
|----|--|
| | implementation 119:15 |
| | implemented 135:9 |
| | implementing 24:2 importance 19:15 20:6 |
| | important 14:2,12 17:9 |
| | 17:10,17 65:9 70:3 |
| | 72:17 73:1 95:22 |
| | 102:5 106:8,10,21 |
| | 107:3,14 108:12 109:2 110:1 115:2,18 |
| | 134:13 159:5 168:10 |
| | importantly 12:5 |
| | improve 16:19 17:4 |
| | 109:15 improved 52:16 |
| | in-person 10:8 136:12 |
| | inaccurate 71:17 |
| | inaction 141:2 |
| | inception 106:3 Incident 39:1 |
| | incidents 168:18 169:3 |
| | include 27:19,22 29:8 |
| | 34:3,19 35:22 38:12 |
| | 46:8 49:18,20 52:13 |
| | 54:20 66:9 84:17 85:3 87:16 88:14 91:22 |
| | 97:15 108:13 110:12 |
| | 114:4 119:1,2,3 |
| | 121:18 124:17 127:5 |
| | 127:11 130:4 143:15 |
| | included 24:22 28:3,12 28:22 38:12 57:13 |
| | 61:2 66:19 86:8,9 |
| | 93:6 94:14 119:16,19 |
| | 120:16 124:11 129:16 |
| | 140:2 159:15,20 160:1 |
| | includes 33:9,16 39:22 |
| | 89:7 94:7 96:11 142:1 |
| | 142:3 |
| | including 26:4 28:10 34:17 39:4 41:12 |
| | 94:19,21 111:6,11,19 |
| | 134:10 170:14 |
| | inclusive 122:15 |
| | incorporate 39:8 59:15 151:10 |
| | incorporate/five 76:13 |
| | Incorporated 66:9 |
| | 80:10 160:13 |
| | incorporating 36:9 |
| | 66:11 incorporation 59:17 |
| | increase 129:6,8,10 |
| | incredibly 53:11 101:19 |
| | 148:16 |
| | indents 101:1 independent 116:20 |
| | macpenaent +10.20 |
| II | |

| index 20:19,19 21:7 | ins |
|---|------------|
| 26:19 53:9 85:2 87:14 | ins |
| indicated 161:9 | Ins |
| indicates 128:9 | ins |
| indirect 99:17,18 100:1 | 4 |
| individual 8:13 59:3 | ins |
| 69:11 121:4 | int |
| individually 68:1 individuals 13:4 171:7 | int |
| industries 105:9 | int |
| industry 20:22 97:20 | |
| 103:3 105:18 106:12 | - |
| 122:4 125:4 161:12 | 1 |
| 162:14 | int |
| inexperienced 80:22 | 1. 1 |
| inform 19:6 32:10 | int |
| 169:22 | int int |
| information 11:9 26:22 27:11,14 32:3,4,5,7 | int |
| 35:4,5 40:6,11,18 | int |
| 41:4,13 45:16 46:10 | |
| 46:15 47:19 57:7 65:9 | int |
| 65:11 69:2 71:19,21 | 1 |
| 72:10,11,16,17,21 | int |
| 73:3,4,13 74:4 75:8,9 | int |
| 75:17,22 76:19,20 | int |
| 77:21 78:6 81:21 82:11 105:8 116:21 | ine |
| 130:14 132:8 134:15 | int int |
| 135:22 151:3,9,19,20 | int |
| 161:17,19 164:2,16 | |
| 169:22 | int |
| informative 19:3 | int |
| infrastructure 140:3 | int |
| 142:6 145:9 166:16 | int |
| inherently 82:1 initial 22:1,11,18 | int int |
| initiate 44:18 49:8 | int |
| initiatives 140:19 | int |
| injurious 100:22 101:3 | (|
| 101:14 | int |
| inland 26:7,8 52:18,20 | _ 1 |
| 57:19 91:22 111:10 | int |
| 111:22 113:13 114:3 114:6 158:13 | : |
| inlets 53:12 54:12 | in\ in\ |
| input 7:18 11:13 17:20 | in |
| 25:5 36:3 99:1 | in |
| inside 99:2,16,22 100:2 | inν |
| 100:13 149:5 | iPl |
| insight 81:4 83:7 84:6 | isl |
| 135:8 | iss |
| insightful 115:22 | ios |
| inspection 39:7,8 74:6 97:17 | iss |
| inspections 68:14 | 133 |
| 73:19 | 1 |

spectors 68:16 **stance** 144:13 **stitute** 141:16 **structions** 5:2 45:5 49:12 structs 24:7 takes 108:5 tegrate 156:10 tegrity 1:17 27:15 63:9 80:16 97:14 122:1 123:18 125:22 129:7,9,12 135:6 160:10 162:7 168:8 tent 29:3,3 61:15 109:6 119:17 teracting 73:9 terest 48:16 82:7 terested 11:8 48:17 74:7 92:18 96:1 125:1 teresting 134:19 150:9 terface 112:19 113:20 159:4 160:7 terfaces 137:3 ternal 23:15 30:7 39:8 ternally 7:16 85:17 91:5 ternet 128:7 terpret 134:3,7 terpretation 59:2 134:21 157:5 terpreting 135:1 terrelate 157:2 tersect 47:4 89:4,7 tersected 52:11 tersecting 90:7,8,19 tersection 90:2 tersections 47:7,11 troduce 14:21 83:5 97:3 98:2 105:5 troduced 18:3 53:5 162:7 troduction 4:19 18:6 55:13 vestigating 32:2 36:1 vitation 106:7 vited 126:11 viting 117:7 volved 169:20 hone 40:1 41:21 lands 88:10 sue 6:1 27:16 29:2,13 32:21 160:16 **sued** 9:9 **sues** 8:12,14,16 20:2 23:13 28:5 35:13 122:7 142:4 167:11 168:17

it'll 59:19 J **Jacques** 2:1 3:16 125:18 126:1 161:8,9 161:13 James 64:4 161:4 Jersey 1:13 72:5,7 141:15 142:7,8 143:19 144:2 **job** 16:2 18:12 62:12 105:11 115:4 121:15 125:10 join 15:1 joined 36:12 97:12 joining 4:8 14:1 17:14 17:15 37:4 joint 105:12 jot 21:8 **JS** 43:6 jump 44:3 144:20 **Jumping** 113:5 **JUNE** 1:10 jurisdiction 41:17 81:11 jurisdictional 114:22 justifiably 148:17 justified 102:20 K Karen 1:19 81:3 **keep** 9:11,22 12:12 17:3 109:7 115:17 140:6 150:4 169:18 **Kentucky** 51:13 key 73:12 103:8 kick 4:18 80:4 82:14 killed 139:6 kinds 4:20 23:12 73:13 knowledge 133:11 known 14:14 32:15,21 knows 6:8 120:4 L 15:11 L.P 1:17 lack 54:6 75:12 lake 33:12,14 34:22 94:6,9,18,19,19,19,20

inspector 125:22

94:20 95:7,20 96:13

lakes 1:5 24:8 25:7,12

25:14,17 29:15,18

76:15 91:21 92:22

32:13,15,20,22 33:7,9

33:10,14,19,21 34:2,3

34:16,20 35:20 76:14

93:4,10,11,21 94:3,4

122:3,5 146:12

94:8,17,18 95:12 96:6 108:5,14 110:9 111:5 120:2,5,9,12,17,19 121:13,18 122:13 123:9,11,12,13 134:5 134:11 143:9,11,16 143:18,21 146:9 153:13 155:20,22 **Lakes'** 34:15 **LAN** 2:4 land 112:19 159:5 160:4,7,20 land/ocean 113:19 landmark 166:22 lands 87:21 89:22 90:6 94:2,7 112:12 113:7 113:21 114:1 landscape 81:7 Langraf 158:7 language 142:15 large 9:21 44:7 51:18 149:4 larger 10:11 47:12 52:15 93:18 122:6 launch 78:20 **launched** 105:16 **Lawrence** 33:16 94:10 95:1 96:12 lay 22:20 layer 92:12 124:19,20 layers 43:17 124:15 140:6,7 151:20 laying 25:3 lead 97:2 105:12 125:21 leaders 73:11 leading 6:11 53:19 **leagues** 112:15 learn 69:12 **learned** 47:19 learning 23:14 leave 7:1 **leaving** 171:15 led 84:3 **left** 59:2 83:1 110:5 121:9,10,11 144:17 171:5 left-hand 9:8 legal 153:3,18 legislation 116:19 legislators 141:9 legitimate 118:4 **Leigh** 3:12 Leigha 1:19 7:12 30:22 31:17 34:14 36:17 37:4 64:8 65:2 83:5 83:13 97:6 147:9 153:8 Leigha's 11:1

length 54:14 Lesniack 70:4,5 136:14 136:14 145:15,16 147:8,8 165:2 let's 75:16 115:16 124:19 130:16 131:7 131:8 132:4 154:4 169:10 level 9:4 48:7 71:1,4,5,6 71:10,13,15,16 96:5 116:20 146:12 147:14 148:10 149:21 169:21 levels 39:10 73:17 153:21 **liaison** 1:19 150:13 liaisons 11:20 life 109:5 114:8 163:9 light 121:2 **lightly** 109:18 **likelihood** 120:8,12 limit 57:17 limitation 67:18 limitations 35:16 **limited** 68:3 91:19 110:5 132:10 151:8 limiting 29:14 limits 27:10 Linda 74:22 139:9 144:21 156:14 166:9 line 91:8 95:4,9 96:18 102:5 110:16 163:11 164:14 lined 128:8 lines 25:13,16 95:3 99:6 100:7 113:12 120:17 128.8 link 41:8 45:8 56:4 77:22 88:22 171:13 links 124:12 171:20 Liquefied 38:18 liquid 19:18 38:16 44:1 44:9,9,13 45:2 47:3 49:10 52:11 55:16 92:15 105:15 108:18 114:7 116:6 126:6 167:15 168:15 **liquids** 129:5 130:11 list 49:18 52:6 87:1 104:1 listed 38:16 42:19 44:13 45:9 50:7,15 55:20 listen 17:2 20:8 listening 16:7 lists 40:18 52:1

literally 61:11 72:6

little 4:6 7:8 10:11

lithium 19:19

46:21 48:3 50:21 51:10 53:3,21 67:6 79:8 83:6,14 96:9 117:11 126:12 128:14 146:9 149:20 152:20 154:13 160:8 170:18 live 106:19 158:17 lives 17:16 120:4 **LnSec** 103:11 local 67:7 69:1 70:8,13 70:18 71:15,19 75:13 116:22 122:18,19 123:2,4,7 146:11 147:18 148:4 150:11 150:14 164:20 165:4 165:18 167:10 169:21 located 9:7 151:6 location 59:1 66:1 78:2 81:15,18 108:5 137:5 137:14 138:3 142:11 162:22 164:11 locations 38:20 39:1 52:18 63:19 74:17,20 81:22 **logical** 124:9 logistics 170:21 long 54:15 66:22 101:2 long-term 109:1 114:7 138:1 longer 43:16 67:17 look 20:3,16 21:18 23:7 25:9 42:21 56:3 57:14 68:8.11 98:20 99:3.4 99:8,9 100:3,6 112:7 118:20 119:7 125:13 132:14 141:20 142:2 144:3 155:1,13,13,17 168:11 170:5 172:4,9 looked 146:2 152:11 looking 7:10,18 11:8 17:5 24:16 27:5,5 29:14 33:8 35:8 56:18 66:4 76:3 95:7 117:1 130:22 132:8 146:14 147:11,14 153:19 157:11 172:7 looks 9:10 46:21 50:21 52:15,20 54:8 56:11 78:15 loss 100:22 101:22 lot 11:14 20:15 25:6 26:12 38:4 39:8 55:5 67:22 93:4 95:17 97:7 138:8 141:2,2,21,22 142:3,5 147:13 153:8 154:7 157:21 158:1

21:16 23:16 28:8 34:9

34:14 37:19 42:2,18

158:14 161:16 164:15 165:22 167:7,8,10 168:1,6,13 169:21 170:16 171:21 lots 23:8 125:14 **Louisiana** 2:1 54:8,9,13 109:22 110:7,9,12 111:10,22 113:9 124:7 125:19 126:3 126:17,18,19,20 127:3 128:5,7,10,12 129:3,5 132:11,17 162:7 love 172:4 lower 31:9 lunch 8:1 9:21 79:8 171:3,11

M

mail 46:5 main 38:11 104:13 124:13 maintain 30:10 109:2 maintained 47:20 65:18 **major** 103:6 majority 111:2 118:9 making 58:21 133:2 138:8 142:21 157:1 164:18 **mammals** 127:8 management 27:15 41:13 63:10 97:16 122:1 123:19 125:22 129:12 135:7 145:6 145:11 146:1 160:11 168:9 manager 1:14,16,20 13:14 105:12 managing 147:1 mandate 18:1 21:18 24:4,5 32:9 34:1 60:14 77:13 84:13 108:13 114:5 120:1,6 mandated 118:22 119:17 mandates 7:11 18:12 19:7 109:4 manipulating 61:5 manner 103:6 **manual** 88:3 manufacturing 97:20 map 6:6 17:11 22:6 34:11 35:20 38:8,9,22 39:3,7,22 40:1,16 43:20 54:5 58:6 80:15 81:6 85:1 90:20 92:7 93:10,14 95:11 106:5 110:20 120:14 127:16

128:6 154:12 167:4 mapped 25:7 80:12 108:2,7,10 112:21 114:21 122:10 153:2 mapping 24:3 29:14 32:13,18 34:8 36:6 37:7 38:1 41:13 43:12 44:15 49:7 53:20 58:9 80:11 96:6 118:19 127:11 141:21 142:21 154:14 156:3,9 164:13 maps 7:13,15 23:2 31:18,20 40:14 42:1 46:19 49:22 50:19 53:13 57:9 66:9 84:2 84:4,18 85:16 88:17 89:2,19 91:12 93:7 96:22 117:21 118:14 118:19 124:11 **Marathon** 134:6,20 marginal 129:8 marine 22:3 24:9 26:1,5 28:3,9,10 29:4,10,15 30:16 36:7 87:16,19 87:22 88:4.6 92:3.11 108:14 111:21 112:1 112:9,14,17,20 113:7 114:17 121:19 122:13 124:2,7,9 127:7 129:2 129:14,16,21 130:1,5 131:12 158:9,13,19 159:1 marked 111:20 marshes 87:17 88:19 89:3 111:20 129:16 marshland 89:6 **Mary's** 94:21 96:18 mass 44:11 Massachusetts 86:17 86:20 89:16,22 90:14 91:8 massaging 48:4 massive 121:12 168:14 matching 90:5 material 14:22 97:18 161:6 materials 1:3,12 4:13 16:20 64:6 matter 14:6 79:15 103:5 156:6,8 172:14 maximum 103:20,21 Mayberry 1:20 13:14,16 **McGinty** 77:20 mean 26:15 33:3 76:18 90:8 104:1 133:17 134:4 142:20 157:3 meaning 96:12

means 26:14 33:1 69:5 126:22 meant 22:2,4 118:21 measurement 88:13 89:14 90:12 measuring 88:6,9 meat 121:22 media 116:22 medical 5:15,18 6:1 Medina 62:19,20 63:6 63:16 **medium** 104:8 meet 19:7 28:1 84:12 meeting 1:8 11:5,10 12:22 17:9 18:16,20 21:21 22:18 23:1,15 25:6 27:1,3 28:7,20 30:4,20 32:6 53:7 78:21 83:9 84:7,15 117:12 118:1 131:19 135:20 170:15 171:2 172:13 meetings 4:21 14:2 19:16 131:20 153:22 meets 69:18 137:22 member 116:5 158:12 158:16 members 62:6 men 16:1 mention 8:4 90:1 132:15 mentioned 19:14 22:17 33:4 43:22 64:12 65:6 73:16 118:14 127:14 139:4 142:15 143:8 145:2 147:12 156:6 156:14 mesh 158:2 messaging 61:20 **messing** 18:22 met 1:13 metadata 46:10 51:15 69:13,14 77:22 78:4 metal 100:22 101:22 method 122:16 methodology 106:5 **Mexico** 25:13 91:19 mic 56:8 Michigan 94:20 95:13 120:3,4 microphone 12:2 143:7 167:21 microphones 11:21 mics 81:4 middle 21:11 131:19 migratory 127:8

mile 85:6,19 89:4,10,14

110:21 127:21 137:11

52:13 129:11 162:9 miles 47:3,13 52:10,12 74:10 88:7 90:11 99:21 100:3 107:13 111:10,21 112:13,15 113:18 114:2 123:6 136:21,22,22 137:9 137:13,13,13 146:22 162:3 **million** 107:12 **mimic** 88:1 mind 56:21 mine 126:12 minimal 129:6,8 **minimize** 56:15 minute 42:18 43:11 78:16 79:4,21 minutes 12:13 15:6 40:17 50:11 83:17 146:21 minutia 139:14 140:4 miraculous 144:17 mired 107:20 misconception 98:10 103:1,2 151:22 missing 73:6 96:19 147:3 **mission** 16:16 **Mississippi** 111:12,13 111:14 113:10 **mistakes** 118:18 mitigate 129:20 **mixed** 65:4 mobile 10:3 **model** 99:2 models 152:3,12 modifications 27:18 **modified** 103:10 **modules** 50:12 moment 15:20 16:4 113:5 momentum 170:8 money 167:8 **monitored** 8:11 9:3 Montana 124:4 Morgan 159:12,16 morning 4:4,15 7:3,6 10:9 13:17,21 15:4 17:20 21:5 23:13 25:4 33:3 35:9 37:4 62:20 64:4 70:4 72:3 79:2 98:4 117:3,4 126:10 morning's 8:20 10:18 11:15 morons 163:21 Mountains 160:20

137:17 165:13

mileage 47:10,11 52:9

mouthful 97:7 move 5:12 7:10 16:21 32:8 35:3 36:5 124:19 125:16 133:12 135:10 139:13 146:22 154:4 170:7 171:1 moving 3:4 6:17 9:13 17:3 18:12 24:2 46:16 48:9 117:15 133:3 171:11 **multiple** 116:12 municipalities 72:8,14 73:9,11,12,17 74:3,5 74:10 75:14,14 municipalities' 72:20 Murray 1:21 6:7,10 79:2 79:6,12,18 81:2,20 82:15 97:5 104:21 115:21 119:12 125:12 130:15 133:20 135:4 139:3 141:12 143:6 145:14 147:4 149:17 152:18 154:10 156:5 156:9 157:6 158:4 159:10 160:22 164:22 166:8 167:19 168:1 169:5 172:10

N

name 4:11 12:8 40:21 62:8 72:3 named 65:19 names 144:18 Nan 66:8 80:3,9 82:13 160:12.22 narrowed 23:4 **nation** 109:18 nation's 19:9 106:15,21 108:9 115:7,11 national 27:6 32:12 34:11 37:6 38:1 42:8 48:5 71:16 87:18 88:20 93:2,13 95:5,15 96:4 110:17 116:13 116:17,19 119:2,18 127:10 148:21 155:3 160:21 166:19 167:5 nationally 27:9,13 natural 2:1 38:19 66:11 125:20 126:4 128:13 160:17 167:17 168:18 169:3 **nature** 95:19 NatureServe 42:14 50:16 52:4 65:19,19 149:1 151:13 NatureServe's 50:8

nautical 88:7 90:11

112:13 113:17 114:2 navigable 25:8,10 42:7 91:21 98:16 106:20 108:8 120:14 127:2 128:3,4,18 151:14 navigation 120:8,11,13 near 112:11 nearly 91:8 necessarily 54:9 82:5 152:9 168:3 necessary 47:20 **need** 5:10,11 8:16 9:11 9:19 13:12 14:7,7 26:14 41:20 45:22 52:21 63:17 66:9,10 70:16 78:19 82:11 92:9 104:10 114:18 115:9 117:15 120:6 122:8,9,10 123:3 132:13 133:13 135:2 141:3 146:14 155:3 156:10 162:20,21 163:10,11 needed 18:11 48:8 104:13 110:3 needing 171:3 needs 9:16 48:21 49:18 66:21 75:9 76:3 80:20 155:5 158:15 neighbors 14:18 network 42:8 93:2 95:5 never 17:2 134:14 142:7,8 148:18,19 **new** 1:13 19:18 30:10 30:11 31:3 35:14 37:21 44:20 45:5 59:7 59:11,12 61:21 64:2 67:9 72:4,7 76:14 77:4 82:8 92:7 98:21 102:22 109:3,17 110:1 114:21 115:10 115:16 129:2,7,9 133:6,7 138:13 141:15 142:7,7 143:19 144:2 162:2,6 165:12 166:15 167:16 newest 37:9 43:18 78:4 news 116:21 **NGO** 158:22 **NGUYEN 2:5 NHD** 57:4 96:9,16 99:19 110:16 111:19 Niagara 94:22 **NICA** 98:10 Nick 62:20 nine 93:3,9 94:1,16 95:11 112:15 **NJ** 167:13

NMPS 127:17 128:4 **no-build** 160:16 **NOAA** 26:19 27:18 53:19 154:20 NOAA's 53:8 non- 100:21 102:4 non-HCA 98:10 103:2 non-injurious 100:22 norm 109:12 normal 64:22 north 54:21 144:15 northern 109:20 **note** 56:2 96:9 107:3 notes 17:5 18:20 **noticed** 140:9 notification 77:2 **notified** 44:10 49:7 notify 77:3 **NPMS** 37:12,22 38:2,5 38:12 39:12 41:9 44:14 45:7 46:13 47:3 49:6,13 55:13 61:10 67:8 74:18 76:21 77:1 91:5 125:8 127:10 number 4:19 7:13 10:19 13:9.12 18:8 19:13 28:18 31:17 53:10 56:4,19 79:14 91:18 92:2,9,13,20 93:3 110:11 122:7 134:4 162:3 170:10 **numbers** 47:12 139:18 **numerous** 127:3,9

0

nutrient 88:3

objectively 109:9 observation 19:21 107:22 **obtain** 65:11 **obviously** 8:12 10:9 occur 5:14 73:15 158:15 occurred 15:21 ocean 111:4,4 112:2,4 112:19 113:15 Oceans 91:20 offer 81:4 135:15 **Office** 82:17 161:5 official 70:19 165:5 officially 66:18 officials 39:16 41:11 67:7,8 69:1 165:19 **offshore** 28:12 40:20 90:16 98:1 112:13,15 112:16 113:18,20 114:2 137:10 158:14 159:15,20 160:1,8,8

121:2 123:1 124:6 130:10 138:5 old 166:7 older 133:5 **OMB** 154:1 onboard 133:6 once 28:19 31:19 43:18 64:9,13 76:15,15,22 **one-to-one** 158:2 ones 44:2 102:22 ongoing 23:13 30:5 online 10:14 36:4 50:8 **Ontario** 94:18 95:12 onus 123:17 **OPAs** 43:5,15,21 open 11:18 17:1 18:12 25:12 26:10 55:17 112:2 113:14,19 130:19 136:11 137:10 opened 153:14 Opening 3:3 operate 40:11 44:9 45:1 134:5 operating 44:19 60:22 61:13 82:4 150:21 operator 40:10 44:13 45:13,18,22 49:16,18 49:21 50:6,15 60:21 62:22 71:10 123:17 142:9 146:7 147:20 150:22 166:3,17,20 operators 27:14 38:13 39:3.17 41:11 43:14 44:1,1,9 48:12,22 49:9 55:16 58:7 59:3 59:12,14 60:10 63:1,3 64:15 67:12 68:3,5 71:16 77:3,15 81:7,10 82:4 92:20 103:3 104:13,14 107:1 122:11 125:7,10 135:5,13 138:13,18 140:21 143:3 147:18 148:4 151:2 152:1 158:9,10,12,16 165:18 166:14 opinions 96:1 97:4 149:10 opportunities 19:15 **opportunity** 17:20 18:8

79:9 136:3 149:19

options 125:1 132:21

order 47:21 66:21 78:20

orange 86:11,13,13

organization 12:9

opposite 164:9

Ohio 51:1.12.14

oil 53:16 87:9,10 98:1

organized 116:17 orifice 99:9 original 102:19 other's 126:12 other- 43:5 ought 135:1 138:16 146:1 160:18 outreach 1:21 38:6 82:16 150:11 159:9 overall 152:22 overarching 165:3 overblown 163:17 overcomplicating 136:18 overlaid 142:22 overlap 31:7,10 51:11 51:21 54:1,6,7 55:10 55:11 99:17 119:21 overlapped 54:3 overlay 73:4 **overly** 166:1 oversimplify 131:7 overview 3:2 37:12 49:14 71:9

Ρ P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4:1 **p.m** 7:22 Pacific 54:18 91:20 111:4 page 11:4,5,10 13:7 78:20 83:9 170:15 **painting** 109:14 Paired 113:11 panel 3:11 34:6 79:19 82:20 97:3 116:8 131:10,18 136:10 139:4 150:7 156:21 panelist 125:16,16 panelists 7:19 11:7 83:17 97:9 105:2 125:15 130:16,21 131:5 169:8.10 panelists' 35:9 Panhandle 155:4 paraphrasing 131:9 park 16:6 166:19,21 167:6 Parks 119:3,18 part 13:18 18:4 38:6 48:17 59:6,21 64:17 64:19 66:19 74:1 77:6 85:3 87:18 92:15 96:3 117:22 122:2 124:16 125:14 128:2 163:21 164:15 166:18,21 170:22 172:12

| 11 |
|---|
| PARTICIPANT 56:9 |
| 57:2,15,19 60:19 |
| participants 6:16 |
| 136:13 participate 14:12,14 |
| 17:17 18:8 74:5 |
| participated 26:18 |
| 60:10 participating 83:8 |
| participation 10:5 |
| 11:13 14:10 19:10 |
| 20:6,10 particular 82:7 162:15 |
| 164:20 171:14 |
| particularly 70:7 81:5 |
| 143:8 partner 72:17 |
| partners 68:10,12 |
| 158:22 parts 42:19 92:17 96:18 |
| 142:19 |
| pass 55:22 |
| passes 99:22 password 67:8 |
| pathway 73:10,14 |
| Patty 72:4 75:11 141:14 |
| 143:6 144:22 167:13 pause 15:19 |
| paying 140:10,11 |
| Pennsylvania 75:1 |
| 166:12 people 4:15 7:20 8:17 |
| 10:8,14,16 14:15 |
| 32:22 61:11,13,16,19 |
| 69:5 70:14 73:12 74:14 75:11 79:10 |
| 106:19 109:6 127:19 |
| 127:20 133:6 143:1 |
| 153:9 157:9 163:19 163:20 164:19 166:4 |
| 168:17 |
| perceive 26:16 |
| percent 31:4,9,14 54:3 54:20 55:5 59:21 60:2 |
| 89:9 90:5,10,14,18 |
| 91:10 100:21 101:21 |
| 101:22 102:1 percentages 57:16 |
| 100:18 |
| |
| perfect 79:12 |
| perfect 79:12 performed 80:21,22 |
| perfect 79:12 performed 80:21,22 permanent 108:22 114:6 138:1 |
| perfect 79:12 performed 80:21,22 permanent 108:22 114:6 138:1 permitted 44:2 68:4 |
| perfect 79:12 performed 80:21,22 permanent 108:22 114:6 138:1 permitted 44:2 68:4 165:13 |
| perfect 79:12 performed 80:21,22 permanent 108:22 114:6 138:1 permitted 44:2 68:4 |

personal 8:12 personally 58:12 94:11 151:2 154:3 personnel 5:18 21:12 81:1 149:5 perspective 117:7 141:20 **phase** 32:8 **PHMSA** 1:14,16,18,19 1:20,22 2:5,5 3:3,6 13:8 14:3 16:17 17:22 18:11 19:2,6,21 20:11 21:12 33:18 37:5 38:14 39:1 45:19 46:1 46:2 48:10 49:17 50:2 58:6 59:6,9,10 66:21 67:18 68:12 69:19 72:18 73:13 76:19 81:11 82:17 84:9,22 85:6,10 87:16,20 88:1 88:14 91:12 92:2,9 93:10 94:1,16 95:11 96:5 104:18 117:7,11 118:15,18 119:7 121:15 125:9 135:2 135:19 139:16 140:11 140:13,20 143:20 146:5 148:1,7 149:6 151:8,17,19 152:19 153:21 154:16 166:12 169:13 PHMSA's 32:12 38:6 81:17 110:6 119:15 167:16 phmsa.pipelinesafet... 8:8 **phone** 13:19 **phrase** 157:4 pick 40:3 101:20,21 124:15,19,20,21,22 132:13 153:2 154:3 170:7 picked 132:11 picking 152:7 153:20 **picture** 119:11,13 **piece** 72:19 119:14 142:17 pieces 44:6 pilot 23:16 30:8,9 47:17 48:11,17 60:10 84:5 84:16 86:18 90:4 94:11 96:10,17 105:13 132:7,19 136:3 157:11 **PIMMA** 41:12,21 43:12 43:18 46:16 74:19 **pipe** 52:11 80:16,17

pipeline's 18:1 pipelines 38:4,16 40:4 40:5,12,18,19,22 41:1 41:17 44:10 45:2 55:7 74:6,10,14 81:8,12,15 126:17 128:9,11,20 128:22 129:9,11,19 134:10 138:10,12,14 140:14,15 146:15 159:1,6,15,20 160:1,9 162:2,6 164:1 167:15 167:17,18 168:9,16 169:3 **pipes** 18:13,14 19:8 24:6 40:7 47:3 49:10 117:10 place 5:8,10 64:14 72:13 107:22 123:6 166:2 places 79:22 107:17 placing 139:1 **Plains** 1:17 97:12 plan 18:19 24:2 32:12 123:19 149:9,13,16 166:18 169:17 planning 82:8,12 167:1 170:22 171:7 plans 17:22 167:16,19 168:2 plants 38:19 151:4 **play** 58:14 106:20 **playing** 144:16 please 4:4 10:2,5 11:9 11:17,22 12:8,12,20 13:15 14:14 15:1 20:9 56:8 105:21 126:8 162:11 171:12 pleasure 121:12 plenty 36:22 62:4 **plus** 46:8 poignant 16:4 point 6:12,18 10:4 13:13 32:11 38:10,20 39:13 54:7 74:20 75:3 103:8 117:20 132:7 135:5,14,16,18 147:3 147:7 149:18 150:9 151:7 156:7 170:8 pointing 39:19 63:18 points 20:2 115:22 125:15 143:14 policy 32:11 50:9 115:1 policymaking 14:4 **polygon** 58:22 95:10 96:15 polygons 96:12 99:1 poor 71:1 populated 98:15,16

102:13 106:19 108:7 127:1,15,16,18,21 **population** 42:5 43:6 164:16 165:6,20 166:6 portion 57:12 78:21 portrayed 25:15 **poses** 34:9 possibility 124:9 **possible** 5:18 6:2 9:12 22:10 86:1 129:4 138:19 possibly 25:17 58:15 79:7 136:1 post 18:20 161:10 potential 27:16,17 30:15 34:2 91:15 107:19 168:15 potentially 22:5 30:11 30:13 61:4 94:15 **Powell** 159:13,16 **PowerPoints** 171:17,19 practical 101:10 practice 146:6 practices 145:7,11 146:1 pre- 117:22 pre-read 83:2,10,14 117:22 pre-reads 11:6 precise 52:17 53:1 predicted 146:20 prefer 21:3 preference 43:4 prepare 68:13 104:11 prepared 171:13 **PRESENT** 1:15 2:4 presentation 20:16 31:19 36:17 37:1 55:13 98:14 104:22 126:17 130:13 presentations 18:21 19:2 22:21 35:11 126:12 127:15 170:13 presenter 83:5 preservation 119:4 president 1:18 105:6 presiding 1:14 press 164:10 pressure 98:8 100:11 101:11,15,16 103:10 pretty 71:3 106:5 146:4 147:13 153:7 prevailing 95:17 prevention 158:20 **preview** 131:1 132:9 previewing 130:22 previous 117:16 127:14

81:19 152:5

128:16 previously 33:4 primarily 29:5,11 86:14 143:19 primary 16:16 30:8 43:1 44:13 49:6 53:14 86:2 88:9 93:9 **Prior** 126:2 prioritization 98:9 102:4 103:7 107:14 109:11 **prioritize** 102:7 106:12 107:2 priority 104:7 107:5 162:18 **pristine** 138:21 private 22:13 proactive 158:18 **probably** 4:14,20 6:8 9:20 10:10 26:22 34:19 38:3 53:6 71:9 71:12 163:22 164:6 **problem** 13:6 14:16 62:2 70:9,10 71:22 **problems** 5:9 15:14 procedures 45:9 153:9 proceed 80:6 process 20:12 23:14 43:10 45:12 48:18 49:1,15 64:18,19 66:19 67:12 76:22 77:2 81:13 148:14 149:4,8 153:18 154:1 154:7 processes 69:10 processing 48:5 69:18 **produce** 38:14 49:22 65:22 67:19 70:15 92:11 130:3 produced 42:12,13,16 46:11 65:18 69:9 71:6 84:2,5 155:14 producing 69:11 product 53:18 54:11 56:18 70:10 85:20,21 91:14,16 152:4 productive 12:22 15:16 products 16:20 53:10 61:17 92:15,17 130:9 130:10 program 1:14,16,20 8:21 21:6 61:22 73:10 79:7 programmer 105:12 programs 135:7 148:21 **project** 23:16 30:8,9 44:7 47:17 96:11 105:12 149:6

projects 98:1 promise 15:5 **promptly** 172:12 **proper** 5:3 6:19 proposals 142:10 proposed 74:13 90:3 102:10,14,22 104:14 125:3 165:10 166:15 166:18 proposing 153:19 **proprietary** 67:20 70:10 **protect** 69:2 114:9 115:18 146:13 147:2 159:6 protecting 29:9 109:5 115:6 145:20 protection 70:22 73:21 108:2 122:19 127:12 145:17,18,22 165:16 165:21 protections 74:8 protocol 64:22 166:13 protocols 59:14 **provide** 5:13 15:7,17 17:20 61:8 63:1.4 104:10 105:17 121:12 122:17 **provided** 118:14 providing 7:12 27:13 **public** 1:8 12:10,11 14:16 19:16 21:21 23:15 25:6 27:1,3 28:7,20 30:4,20 32:5 37:12 38:9 39:17,22 40:1 43:6,20 46:13,16 51:16 53:7 69:13 70:5 70:11,13 71:20 72:15 74:18 75:6,12 76:1 84:7,15 117:8,8,12 118:1,6,8 119:6 120:20 122:21 125:9 127:12 131:20 133:22 135:20 136:15 139:12 140:10,18 141:1 142:18 143:4 153:7 153:22 161:17 171:2 172:13 public's 68:20 publicly 125:8 163:15 163:18 164:3,12 publish 77:1 published 140:13 Puerto 46:9,12 51:1,6

65:7,10,12,14 66:3,4

Puget 54:21

pull 83:4,11 140:6

pulled 46:13 88:20

pulling 48:2 147:11

puncture 99:10 purple 113:8,12,22 114:1 purpose 68:5 86:18 88:12 93:22 124:21 purposes 29:12 30:9 82:12 89:12,13 pushed 116:18 put 13:11 14:17 41:6 71:14 102:2 125:1,2,5 128:17 145:4 167:8 168:22 171:19 puts 123:16 putting 106:12 140:15 143:7

Q **Q&A** 3:11 9:5 11:18 21:14 36:21,22 53:2 55:17 56:3 125:14,17 quality 30:14 51:3 145:22 quarter 85:6,19 89:4,10 89:14 110:21 question 12:3,7 14:16 14:18 26:6,9 33:18 34:5 35:2 58:2.5.6 59:6 60:19 61:8 62:15 64:9 65:8 66:7,8 67:1 67:15 69:15 76:9 77:10,19 80:2,5,8,9 81:5 82:13 84:17,20 84:22 93:9,9 110:11 110:21 111:6,19 112:12 113:5,16 114:3 145:16 147:9 152:19 154:7 158:6 159:9,12,13,18 160:15 161:3,7,15 162:11 163:14 167:14 168:13 question's 98:6 questioning 153:20 questions 3:9 7:17 8:18 8:20 9:2 12:16,19 21:4,8,9 26:12 30:3 31:22 33:2 36:14,18 55:18,22 56:1,7 58:1 60:17 62:3 64:7 66:17 76:8 78:10,14 83:2,7 83:10,15,20 84:1,3,8 84:10,10 86:19 87:15 89:20 91:11 96:21 97:2,6,10 105:1,4 110:6 114:15 117:18 129:14 130:19 131:1 131:11 132:9 136:6,9 136:12 147:5 154:19

161:2 169:6,6,7 171:20 queue 10:21 11:1 quick 37:11 45:11 49:14 53:21 55:4 58:8 85:16 86:22 90:20 96:8,22 quickly 37:22 42:22 46:6 153:7 154:2 quite 13:18 26:17 72:5 117:18 148:2 quiz 50:11

R rainy 103:22 raise 6:9 12:2 168:12 raising 14:15 rally 6:11,17 ran 47:1,5 53:4 54:1 90:1 range 87:13 ranked 87:8 rapidly 166:6 **Raritan** 144:13,16 rate 103:20 reach 99:11 100:8 104:3 143:21 150:15 reached 48:14,22 132:6 read 40:21 80:2 83:21 93:6 101:22 140:21 reads 118:1 ready 18:6 45:14 real 70:8 71:22 96:22 121:5,22 168:16 realistic 159:1 reality 124:16 realizing 140:18 reason 16:11 115:14 168:12 reasonable 34:18 111:1 reasons 47:15 70:1,9 reauthorization 18:4,7 34:1 Rebecca 58:3 76:9 receive 7:18 32:5,6 35:4,7 36:3,4 45:13 49:11 50:4 51:8,14 received 7:2 25:5 26:2 28:6 30:19 35:11 80:2 recognizable 119:13 recognize 39:12 recognized 80:12 recommend 66:15 85:14 recommendation 52:8 65:21 88:11 98:12 104:6,15 171:17 recommendations 26:3

26:11 36:2 recommended 23:1 56:17 90:12 95:2 166:14 reconvene 78:16 79:14 record 62:9 79:16 172:15 records 39:9 recover 124:6 recreational 29:5,11 red 54:5 55:10 62:17 86:9,12,14 110:19 redefining 161:10 162:13 reduct 101:15 reduction 98:8 100:11 101:12,15 redundant 126:13 reevaluating 141:4 reexamined 75:9 refer 7:5 145:1 reference 87:20 89:19 91:12 94:1 references 91:13 refined 130:10 reflect 30:11.13 170:17 refresh 82:1 refreshed 113:3 **refuges** 119:4,18 regard 158:15 regarded 32:18 regarding 10:4 23:10 76:10 83:2 111:7 130:19 131:11 143:15 156:12 regardless 7:10 85:11 100:18 101:13 137:5 137:5 **regards** 18:16 regional 160:16 registered 10:8,14 registration 11:5,10 83:9 170:15 regs 148:17 regularly 116:20 regulation 102:1 163:3 **regulations** 23:8 24:15 24:20 33:6 36:10 38:16 42:20 59:15 64:13,16 108:21 123:18 129:7,10,12 141:10 165:17 regulators 68:7 regulatory 81:14,17 122:8 124:22 reintroduced 18:3 reinvent 22:10 33:5 reiterate 70:6

relate 159:2 related 8:13 35:13 36:8 92:6 **relates** 167:20 relatively 19:20 release 31:16 50:17 104:2 105:15 108:19 114:7 released 45:3 50:14 relevant 53:17 reliability 149:22 rely 71:16 148:5,9 remain 109:10 114:18 remainder 21:5 remaining 33:1 80:2 remarks 3:3,18 12:12 remember 15:20 16:16 47:10 108:12 remind 12:17 reminder 11:1 62:5 **reminds** 16:15 remotely 17:15 **removed** 51:21 repair 100:20 101:5 102:6.9.12 103:3.5.7 104:10 107:7 162:22 163:12 repaired 102:17 repairing 107:9 repairs 104:11 repeat 162:10 repeating 118:18 reporter's 18:20 represent 85:7 110:22 117.8 representative 78:8 92:22 111:3 113:19 132:14 representatives 70:13 represented 25:17 representing 70:5 136:15 represents 85:18 112:18 repurposing 140:14 request 41:22 43:11 44:2,18 45:5,16,18 48:18 49:15,16 51:7 60:20 61:2 requester's 50:3 requesting 51:12 requests 49:9 require 59:14 66:21 145:7,7 165:17 required 59:12 76:20 145:10 146:6

132:11 170:19 researching 34:10 **reserved** 121:10 reside 87:12 resist 109:14 resolve 122:8 resonated 16:14 156:13 resource 19:7 107:2 resources 2:2 24:10 35:21 36:8 37:13 39:19 41:10 63:19 66:12 70:21 92:4 105:20 106:15 108:15 109:4 125:20 128:13 130:2 151:8 respond 5:6 103:21 161:14 responders 146:21 responding 107:3 response 5:3,5 107:4 161:8 responsible 58:7 61:17 73:19 rest 82:19 172:13 restore 129:20 restricted 41:10 43:9 43:13 145:3 restrooms 9:7 result 52:17 84:5 89:2 resulted 15:22 resume 172:11 **resumed** 79:16 **Rethink** 72:4 141:15 167:13 retire 133:6,12 retreating 109:22 return 46:1 114:4 171:11 Returning 113:16 review 11:7 45:11 50:21 53:21 55:4 87:15 96:21 110:3 118:2 **reviewed** 171:19 revise 121:17 **Reynolds** 64:4,5 65:2 161:4,5 162:12 **Rico** 46:9,12 51:1,6 65:7,10,12,14 66:3,4 right-of-way 158:17 rises 109:13 risk 97:15 105:19 river 94:21,22,22,22 95:1 96:13,19 111:12 124:5 146:12 riverine 119:1

requirements 38:17

81:17 82:3 168:11

research 104:17 110:3

rivers 33:11 119:5 road 19:12 ROBERTSON 2:5 robust 105:3 125:13 roles 97:19 room 6:15,20 8:11 12:4 55:21 153:17 172:2 Rotolo 2:1 3:16 125:18 126:9.10 161:21 round 84:10 130:17 169:11 route 64:18 65:1 routed 81:9 routes 120:15 routing 66:22 80:15 **RSTRENG** 103:11 rugged 109:20 rule 76:17 102:11 122:1 122:2 124:16 125:3,6 134:12 160:11 rulemaking 20:4 64:18 64:22 153:18 154:1 rulemakings 168:7 rules 68:9 120:22 159:16.21 160:2 run 5:21 57:3 132:19 152:3 168:20 running 33:14 74:11 rupture 99:5,6 103:19 108:22

safe 16:19 **safely** 6:16 safety 1:3,13,21 2:2 3:2 4:13,19 13:15 14:22 16:17 17:4 19:8 20:22 58:4 64:6 67:5 75:1 76:10 82:17 106:13 109:15 116:2,6,10,13 116:15,18,19,21 139:10 158:19 161:6 166:10 Saint 33:15 salinity 112:11 **Sam** 1:20 5:15 6:14 78:11 80:1,7 136:8 158:4 169:6 sample 31:17,20 84:18 sausage-making 14:4 saved 167:7,8 saw 62:16 saying 61:3 103:14 104:2 139:12 154:5 161:16 165:4 says 58:22 66:9 76:12 77:9,12,20 80:10,14

S

requirement 27:8 44:20

102:1 146:7 153:8

| II | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 158:11 160:15 | Senate 116:12 | she'll 7:14 31:18 | situations 131:15 |
| scale 93:18 147:15 | send 8:10,19 9:1 10:5 | shed 142:2 | six 87:4,6 92:9 114:15 |
| 149:11 155:3 | 44:12 45:18 55:18 | Sheila 77:20 | 141:6 |
| | | | sixth 123:11 |
| scenario 103:18 | sending 46:6 | shelter 5:7,10 | |
| scenic 119:5 | sends 49:16 | shipping 93:1 | size 58:17 85:8 99:9 |
| schedule 100:20 | Senior 1:14,16,20 | shore 85:3 111:3,7 | 101:13 102:2 |
| scheduling 98:7 100:11 | sense 112:17 125:9 | shoreline 28:15 30:21 | skip 1:18 15:1 17:6 |
| 103:7 107:7 162:18 | 131:13 141:22 164:7 | 31:3,5,10,15 53:11,22 | 20:14 22:17 |
| schemes 124:22 | sensing 121:14 | 54:10,15,22 56:11,12 | slide 93:5 |
| science 107:16 109:10 | sensitive 1:6 17:12 | 56:15 57:1,4 60:11 | slides 11:1 84:17 93:7 |
| 115:6 133:8 137:2 | 23:21,22 28:21 29:17 | 85:2,7,11,19,21 86:4 | slightly 31:14 |
| 141:18 145:22 146:3 | 30:1 39:5 42:16 67:22 | 86:7,10,11,13,13 87:3 | slip 14:17 |
| 148:18,18 156:13 | 98:17,18 101:19 | 88:7,10,10,11 89:5,15 | slope 58:14 75:21 |
| 157:2 | 105:14,20 106:15 | 91:14,16 92:13 | 152:5 |
| scientific 102:21 | 107:17,19 108:16,17 | 109:19 110:14 111:7 | sloping 100:2 |
| 107:21 109:3 142:1 | 115:7 120:2,5,10 | 111:9,12 113:11 | slow 147:16 |
| 154:18 155:9 156:15 | 126:14 133:10,16 | 130:6,7,8,8 132:15,18 | smaller 52:18 146:12 |
| 157:1,4 | 137:4,22 138:20 | 136:22 137:5,6,18,21 | 149:11 |
| scientifically 122:15 | 139:15,21 140:16 | shorelines 85:18 92:17 | SMEs 22:13 |
| 139:20 | 142:9 145:10 151:1 | 110:4 114:6,8 136:20 | smile 20:15 |
| scientists 154:16,19 | 152:21 156:19 164:4 | 137:2 | smiled 15:9 |
| scratching 135:21 | 168:5 | short 19:20 | snap 128:16 |
| screen 11:4 | sensitivity 26:19 46:20 | shortly 30:22 45:10 | snapshot 39:11 |
| se 1:13 162:2 | 53:9,16 85:2 92:14 | 55:16 | social 140:2 |
| sea 26:10 137:10 | 130:6,7 158:13 | show 6:7 7:14 46:19 | softer 114:1 |
| seam 101:2 | 161:18 | | |
| | | 50:19 53:13 96:22 | soil 58:15 66:8,12,22 |
| search 40:7,10 | sentiment 131:14 | 122:16 124:12 155:18 | 80:9 |
| seats 4:4 79:19 | 156:12 169:20 | showed 40:16 167:3 | soils 66:10 |
| seawater 112:11 | sentiments 156:11 | showing 23:2 31:18 | Soilworks 160:13 |
| Seaway 33:16 94:10 | 170:6 | 57:9 89:11 90:20 | solid 132:21,21 |
| second 6:7 8:6 38:5,10 | separate 93:7 114:19 | 95:10 128:7,17 | solidly 133:8 |
| 43:19 59:6 77:19 | serious 161:11 | shows 78:2 93:15 128:4 | somebody 9:18 55:21 |
| 78:19 84:10 163:13 | serve 141:15 | 128:13 | somewhat 137:14 |
| 170:22 172:12 | served 116:4 | shrinking 21:1 | soon 5:18 6:2 35:21 |
| secondly 133:2 | servers 51:20 | shrubs 112:5 | 37:18 |
| Secretary 2:4 15:11 | serves 116:20 | shut 162:20 163:11 | sorry 4:5,17 20:15 |
| 24:7 | service 66:12 153:7 | side 9:7,9 19:19 21:11 | 55:19 59:8 61:14 63:9 |
| section 4:16 24:6 53:2 | session 8:1 10:18,19 | 35:15 83:1 87:11 | 73:22 74:2 139:7,8 |
| 86:7 121:17 | 10:20 11:3,15 21:15 | 112:17 164:9 | 167:20,21 |
| sections 85:20 87:2 | 37:1 56:4 78:15,19 | sighting 81:11 | sort 35:5 148:9 |
| sector 22:13 | 79:14 147:13 171:12 | sign 45:22 | sound 54:21 153:14 |
| secure 46:3 50:18 | 171:13 | signed 117:11 | sounded 153:11 |
| security 5:17 13:4 | sessions 8:22 9:5 | silence 10:2 | sounds 55:8 110:22 |
| 171:8 | 10:17 11:15 | similar 4:20 49:15 | 153:1 |
| seeing 31:20 141:1 | set 6:19 48:5 51:9,18 | 68:14 77:2 103:6 | source 30:14 42:13 |
| 142:5 169:9 | 53:5 58:22 60:6 83:2 | simple 153:1,11,14 | 53:15 65:17 70:22 |
| seek 92:2,7 | sets 27:6 35:15,16 | 154:9 159:1 169:18 | 77:21 78:8 80:12 |
| seen 71:15 72:7 98:13 | 38:11 | simpler 128:15 159:7 | 94:12 108:1 116:21 |
| 107:18 142:7,8,12,13 | settle 35:21 | simplicity 156:22 | 127:12,13 142:3 |
| 144:11 145:9 | seven 92:13 | simply 51:2 109:15 | 144:6 149:12 151:9 |
| sees 75:12 | shape 6:5 101:14 | 160:15 | sources 22:22 23:5 |
| segment 107:10 123:17 | share 19:5 63:2 71:19 | Sinclair 33:12 | 34:11 39:2 42:4,17 |
| 146:7 | 83:13 134:16 | single 49:18 50:6 58:22 | 72:11 95:2 106:18 |
| segments 85:7 86:4 | shared 7:17 49:2 70:12 | 89:6 92:11 94:12 | 136:4 148:5,20 |
| 97:9 152:2 | 161:17 | 130:3 | 154:12 156:20 164:6 |
| select 12:1 41:15 78:19 | sharing 68:14 73:13 | sit 20:8 | sourcing 75:4 |
| selected 93:16 110:13 | 75:8,22 115:22 | sites 102:15 164:5,13 | south 6:22 109:21 |
| 110:18 | 169:12 | sitting 17:13 50:13 | 132:16 |
| | | | |
| II | | | |

| | i | 1 | 1 |
|--|--|--|--|
| southern 55:3 129:5 | 158:9 | submerged 87:21 | taken 13:17 70:1 74:21 |
| span 99:8 | stars 87:4 | 89:22 90:6 94:2,7 | 109:18 135:5,14,18 |
| spatial 39:10 41:5 | start 11:3 24:3 31:20 | 112:12 113:6,13,21 | 169:16 |
| 156:1 | 37:11,22 106:9 125:4 | 114:1 | takes 157:11,11 158:1,1 |
| spatialized 40:9 | 137:10 149:10 171:13 | submission 67:3 | talk 14:5 16:8 17:21 |
| spatially 155:18,18 | started 48:11 79:21 | submit 18:18 21:4 | 21:15 23:16 31:21 |
| speak 62:6 63:8,10 67:6 | 84:20 156:1 | 36:14 66:17 148:6 | 43:19 53:3 83:14 97:8 |
| 106:8 114:15 145:16 | starting 156:3 | 151:9,17 | 98:7,9 131:18,20 |
| 153:10 | state 12:8 24:8 27:12 | submitted 38:21 41:1 | 141:2 152:19 154:12 |
| speakers 19:3 | 40:12 41:18 42:17 | 150:1 151:3 | talked 18:17 28:8 |
| speaking 19:13,15 | 44:22 45:2 48:2,3 | submitting 38:18 60:20 | 130:20 135:16 141:5 |
| 48:15 74:3 | 49:11 66:20 68:7,10 | subset 29:21 | 144:22 171:22 |
| speaks 144:21 | 68:11 69:12,14 71:1,3 | subsidence 159:6 | talking 7:8 13:18 21:17 |
| specialist 2:1 125:19 | 71:4 72:11 78:1,7 | subsistence 121:11 | 23:12 25:21,22 26:4 |
| 126:6 | 80:13 82:5,7,9 87:21 | substantial 120:8,12 | 30:22 34:20 118:13 141:3,7 145:19 150:4 |
| specialty 97:15 species 24:17,17 52:4,7 | 89:21 90:6 91:4 94:2 94:7 108:3 111:13 | successful 126:4 151:12 | 157:10 167:14 |
| 92:6 106:16 107:18 | 112:12 113:6,13,20 | suffer 114:6,8 | Tank 38:20 |
| 107:20 112:20 127:6 | 113:22 116:19 122:20 | suggest 85:8 122:14 | tanker 120:15 |
| 127:7 129:18 139:1 | 126:3 143:18 147:19 | suggestions 26:3 | tanker 120:13 |
| 144:10,11,12,14,17 | 150:11 164:10 | summarize 153:6 | taps 164:12 |
| 151:13 | stated 33:22 139:11 | summer 31:1 44:10 | tar 138:6 |
| species-focused 24:16 | states 46:8,11 48:2,7 | 45:11 49:4 113:4 | targets 164:1 |
| specific 27:12 31:22 | 50:4 51:11 65:6 68:1 | Superior 33:15 34:22 | team 82:16 |
| 48:20 89:3,20 115:2 | 69:9 132:14 134:11 | 94:20 95:13 | technical 35:14 88:3 |
| 149:2,7 151:3 172:5,8 | 155:6 | supervisor 1:17 97:13 | 97:14 116:6 153:4 |
| specifically 30:2 37:6 | statistic 57:3 | 159:17 | 166:11 |
| 65:17 73:20 74:6 | statistics 57:11 | supply 106:18 | tee 131:2,17 147:6 |
| 96:17 133:14 148:15 | stay 170:22 171:7 | support 17:21 26:19 | 152:19 |
| speech 16:11 | steep 75:21 160:20 | 30:15 82:11 84:18 | teeing 97:6 136:6 |
| spell 163:3 | step 4:6 17:10 50:16 | 93:7 97:1 105:18 | teeth 140:21 |
| spent 124:13 145:17 | 121:20 | 140:5 143:14 | tell 46:21 135:2 |
| spill 87:9,10 107:4,4 | steps 3:18 21:17 35:19 | supports 154:14 | telling 45:14 tells 137:2 |
| 121:2 122:4 123:14 123:21 124:4 137:16 | Steve 1:14 4:11 13:16 14:11 15:8 18:17 53:5 | surface 145:18 147:2 surprised 119:22 | |
| 138:5 146:18,19 | 63:13 64:8,9 106:1 | surrounding 51:11 | temporary 9:9 ten 166:6 |
| 152:3,11 | STEVEN 1:16 | 143:16 | tends 72:11 |
| Spills 137:8 | stole 119:11 | survey 32:17 66:12 | terms 60:14 65:4 69:17 |
| split 136:20 137:12 | stop 66:3 141:3 | surveying 148:1 | 71:8 135:9 156:18 |
| spoke 65:3,4 | storm 122:18 | surveys 66:22 | 169:15 |
| spot 141:3 143:8 | story 16:13 | susceptibility 87:13 | terrain 100:2,5,7 |
| 145:20 | straight 111:16 | susceptible 87:9,10,11 | territory 167:6 |
| square 127:20 | straightforward 148:19 | suspect 13:5 71:7,8 | terrorist 163:19 |
| St 94:6,9,10,19,21,21 | Strategy 3:4 | 77:4 134:17 | test 132:19 |
| 94:22 96:12,13,18 | streams 108:6 142:4 | swamps 87:17 111:20 | tested 111:1 |
| stab 159:22 | 144:7 | 129:15 | testify 116:11 |
| stabilized 100:21 | Street 6:21 | sweep 6:15 | testing 136:3 |
| staff 2:5,5 16:12 19:3 | stress 44:17 | synthesizing 35:6 | tests 132:7 157:11 |
| 20:11 152:19 158:18 | stretch 111:17 | system 19:9 32:13 37:7 | Texas 71:3 86:18,20 |
| 169:13 stage 79:20 | stronger 116:18 strongly 11:12 159:3 | 37:14 38:2 39:9 61:12 112:10 127:11 162:8 | 89:16 90:1,9,18 91:10 |
| stage 79.20 stakeholders 17:2 20:3 | struggling 25:2 | systems 43:3 49:22 | 112:14 138:2,4 165:10 |
| 159:3 | stuck 139:13 | 105:8 119:2 127:12 | text 84:17 91:15 93:4 |
| standard 154:6 | studies 80:21 | | thank 13:19,21 14:1,9 |
| standards 116:7 145:13 | stuff 68:20,21 118:8 | T | 20:13,14 36:11 37:2 |
| standing 16:6 171:4 | 124:12 163:14,18,22 | table 21:10 56:1 | 52:7 56:6 59:5 62:9 |
| | 127.12 100.17,10,22 | | |
| standpoint 121:5 | subdivision 98:22 | tables 21:7 | 62:19 63:13 65:2 67:2 |
| standpoint 121:5 stands 43:5 108:16 | | tables 21:7 tabular 41:5 | 62:19 63:13 65:2 67:2 67:3 72:1 73:15 74:21 |
| | subdivision 98:22 | | |

| | I | l | Ī |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 76:5,6 78:9,21 80:10 | 167:11 170:10,13,21 | 53:18 68:13 93:22 | 113:15 |
| 81:2 82:12 83:18 97:5 | 171:20 | 114:9 124:15 138:16 | unscrupulous 161:20 |
| 98:3 104:21 105:22 | today's 17:9 22:17 | 140:6 146:13 147:17 | Unsuitable 66:10 |
| 115:19,21 117:7 | told 16:3 | 155:13 156:2 160:6 | untrained 80:22 |
| 125:11,12 130:14,16 | tolerance 101:18 | tune 122:22 | unusual 98:17,18 142:8 |
| 136:10 139:3 141:12 | 103:15 | turn 4:5 21:13 63:9 | unusually 1:5 17:12 |
| 145:14 147:4 150:6 | Tom 56:8 | 83:12 | 23:21 29:16 30:1 39:4 |
| 152:18 158:4 159:10 | tomorrow 21:6 | turned 119:8 120:13,14 | 42:15 105:14 108:16 |
| 159:11 160:22 161:4 | tool 80:11 101:18 | Twenty 137:9 | 108:17 120:2,5,10 |
| 161:20 164:22 166:8 | 103:14 106:11 109:11 | two 15:5,6,20 16:3,4 | 121:16 126:13 133:10 |
| 169:5,10,12 170:20 | 109:16 | 64:7 75:5 76:7 79:14 | 133:15 137:21 139:15 |
| 172:10 | top 75:7 86:10 100:6 | 86:1,6 89:15 99:4,11 | 139:21 140:16 145:10 |
| thanked 167:7 | 103:15 | 111:19 150:6 | 151:1 152:21 |
| thanks 13:16 15:2 | topic 53:6 83:3 106:8 | type 6:1 44:22 85:4,11 | update 3:7 32:12 37:9 |
| 20:10 37:4 78:11,12 | topics 130:20 156:16 | 92:7 98:5,5 99:13,14 | 43:18 44:4,4 46:7 |
| 97:4 106:1,1 135:4 | topography 140:16 | 100:8,13 123:15 | 47:21 48:10 50:22 |
| theme 14:5 | tortured 119:16 121:8 | 130:8,9 137:6 149:12 | 51:8,14 55:14 60:7,8 |
| themes 131:4 | total 10:7 | 164:16 | updated 45:10 61:11 |
| thicker 86:10 | totally 117:6 138:15 | types 28:18 39:14 | 65:11 115:9 151:3,19 |
| things 15:5 19:14 25:20 | Touching 114:3 | 40:14 56:12,15 58:14 | updates 37:16 66:2 |
| 26:14 37:8 74:8 99:4 | towns 127:22 | 68:16 109:19 111:3,7 | 78:6 114:14 115:10 |
| 118:17 119:6,8 | traces 152:6 | 111:7 132:15,18 | 151:20 |
| 121:16 122:12 125:11 | trade 154:17 | 164:1 | updating 47:18 105:18 |
| 131:21 133:22 140:9 140:12 154:7 157:13 | traditionally 145:3 tragedy 15:21 | typically 111:17 112:1,9 | upper 163:3 upriver 91:17 |
| 164:1,4 168:6 169:17 | training 48:20 50:8,10 | U | upset 101:16,17 |
| 170:10,16 | 61:22 | U.S 1:1,13 4:12 32:16 | upstream 123:7 |
| thinks 121:1 | transcribe 18:19 | 42:6,9 91:1,3,7 93:1 | USA 3:7,11 4:16 7:7 |
| thinner 86:11 | transcript 170:14 | 105:13 107:13 116:5 | 13:9 19:7 24:9 25:15 |
| third 6:21 69:21 | transcription 170:6 | 116:12 | 25:19 26:7,7 27:21 |
| third-party 71:7 | transmission 38:15 | U.S.A 108:10 | 28:4 29:19 30:21 31:4 |
| thought 83:16 94:13 | 126:7 | U.S.C 33:8 | 31:6,12 32:14 33:21 |
| 112:2 120:1 130:22 | transparency 143:5 | ultimately 23:18 33:14 | 35:20 36:7 42:10,11 |
| thoughts 14:14 19:5 | transport 129:4 | un-injurious 163:5 | 42:12 43:17 44:5 45:6 |
| 131:22 132:1 143:12 | transportation 1:1 2:4 | un-simple 154:2 | 46:19 47:14,22 48:9 |
| threatened 24:16 | 4:12 15:12 16:19 | underlining 106:9 | 50:20 54:2,4,17 55:15 |
| 144:10 | 116:13 | underneath 5:12 | 57:13 60:7,8 64:3 |
| threatening 127:7 | Transportation's 116:5 | 110:20 | 65:16 67:16 69:18 |
| three 12:12 15:6 16:1 | travel 100:4 108:4 | underscore 17:18 20:5 | 70:7 74:21 76:16 |
| 19:12 30:8 39:14 43:1 | traverse 129:18 | understand 19:22 20:1 | 80:18 82:19 90:2,7,9 |
| 86:7 112:13,14 | treat 142:11 | 22:2,4,12 23:19 | 90:19 91:10 92:4,8,12 |
| 117:10 124:14 | treaty 121:10 | 100:12 134:1 135:22 | 108:15,16 118:8,12 |
| three-part 58:5 | trees 112:5 | 158:12 161:16 164:19 | 127:5 130:1,4 137:1 |
| ticking 125:4 tidal 112:4 | tribal 121:10 tributaries 168:20 | 168:14 169:19 170:19 | 156:19,19 158:17 |
| tie 62:17 | trip 16:5 | understanding 32:1 53:20 102:21 135:10 | 164:16 USA/HCA 37:14 |
| tied 76:2 157:13 | troublesome 142:16 | 157:4 169:2 | USAs 24:12,13,14,19 |
| tiers 104:8 | true 56:13,14 57:21 | understands 119:7 | 25:1 29:20 30:11 |
| times 27:10 49:2 | 71:2 103:4 165:15 | understood 118:22 | 31:16 35:14 37:10 |
| 116:12 142:3 168:13 | truly 69:15 | 122:15 133:8 | 43:9 56:10 102:10 |
| tired 157:9 | Trust 2:3 58:4 67:5 | underway 65:11 168:6 | 106:16,18 107:17 |
| today 5:8 13:10 14:1 | 76:10 116:2 | 168:8 | 108:1 112:22 113:2 |
| 15:19 17:21 18:21 | truth 71:21 | undisturbed 160:18,19 | 114:11,13,18,21 |
| 19:2 20:6,10 34:7 | truthing 80:19,20,20 | unfortunately 46:18 | 115:15 118:19 119:1 |
| 35:4 36:3 37:8 53:13 | try 9:4 12:18 22:2 41:4 | 67:15 101:7 142:13 | 119:8,19 120:16 |
| 96:2 106:8,14 121:21 | 66:3 99:7 150:11 | United 155:6 | 121:22 122:10,16 |
| 133:10 136:7 138:4 | 154:17 | unnecessary 101:11 | 125:7 126:14,15,22 |
| 138:22 140:8 141:5 | trying 9:22 23:18 34:10 | unprotected 112:2 | 126:22 127:4 128:19 |
| | I | I | I |

128:22 138:18 141:18 155:9 161:10 162:13 168:4 **USC** 94:17 **USDOT** 4:21 use 22:6 27:14 30:16 33:7 36:14 37:13 43:3 49:19,21 59:7,11,12 60:15 62:22 68:2 69:1 71:11 76:11 88:12 91:4 103:16 107:1 123:8,9 124:9 157:16 165:7 **useable** 51:22 useful 109:10 **useless** 166:7 user 41:14 50:15 users 39:14 50:7 51:22 61:9 uses 87:2 141:18 149:1 **USGS** 34:11,16 87:17 88:21 93:12 95:15 96:16 110:17 154:20 **usually** 102:8 112:10 **Utah** 151:13 **utilize** 104:9

V

validate 45:1 validated 170:2 validation 69:22 149:21 Valley 166:19,21 valuable 73:7 106:11 109:16 valves 164:12 **varied** 110:4 variety 14:19 29:9 35:11 97:19 various 22:13 52:6 53:13 85:13 92:16,17 131:5 153:21 vary 137:14 vast 54:14 109:18 vegetation 112:6 vendor 71:7 **vendors** 67:19 verification 45:20 69:4 69:8 verified 49:10 verifies 50:16 verify 45:20 164:21 verifying 50:2 version 96:16 113:2 versions 113:3 versus 98:10 157:4 **vetted** 41:16 video 11:4 12:5 78:20 video-based 50:10

view 10:14 61:19 74:18 128:15 viewer 39:22 40:1 43:20 46:16 82:13 171:10 viewers 4:9 8:5,19 62:9 66:7,16 76:8 78:10 136:9 158:6 viewing 7:21 8:9 11:3 61:4 views 20:2 villages 127:22 violets 21:1 visible 7:5 visual 143:10 vitally 106:21 voices 153:17 volatile 130:10 **volume** 4:6 99:5 103:19 voluntary 38:21 41:2 volunteer 5:20

W

wanted 8:4 15:10 30:20

31:2 96:8,21 151:21

152:14 157:16 166:14

wait 5:4 11:22 46:4

wake 139:8

walk 138:4

walking 11:20

wanting 135:21

wants 143:4 warning 140:13 Washington 1:13 15:22 116:9 164:10 watch 78:20 watching 4:10 8:5 10:16,19 12:6 56:4 78:17 water 3:6 24:13 33:14 33:17 34:21 37:10,17 42:11,15 43:9,17 44:5 45:6 46:7,19 47:2,14 47:22 49:4,16 55:15 58:15 64:3 65:5 67:16 67:21 68:21 70:7,15 70:21 77:21 80:11,12 80:14,19,20 81:6,6,20 82:2,6 88:16,20 91:6 91:8,22 93:11,18 95:19,19 96:9 98:17 106:17,18 108:1,2,6 112:18 113:19 114:4 121:6 122:18 124:8 124:10 126:22 127:8 127:12,12 129:2,4,15 145:18,21,22 146:13 147:2 159:4,14,19 164:6 165:16,21

168:5.17 water-based 154:18 water/land 137:3 waters 22:3 24:9 25:12 26:1,5,10 28:4,9,11 29:16 33:11,20 34:4,9 34:18,19 36:7 87:16 87:19,22 88:2,4,6,15 88:15 90:21,22 91:21 92:3,11 94:14 108:15 111:21 112:1,17 113:7,13,14,17 114:17 120:7,14 121:9,19 122:14 123:2,5,7 124:2,7 127:9,11 129:17,22 130:1,5,5 152:8 169:4 watershed 93:12,14,19 99:19 100:1 122:15 122:19 123:1,9,10,14 124:2 141:16,20,21 143:10,13,15 145:5 145:16,17 146:2 147:2,22 151:22 152:8.10.11 watersheds 124:3 143:21 144:3.4 146:14,16 152:1 waterway 42:8 93:2 95:5 waterways 25:8,10 27:20 42:7 57:20 64:11 96:14 98:17 106:21 108:8 127:2 128:3,4,19 131:12 151:14 168:19 wave 112:4 way 6:19,21 12:4 33:15 34:22 47:20,20 56:22 65:22 70:16 73:8 79:6 79:20 86:5 93:21 101:6 112:8 113:9 134:21,22 141:8,9 145:8 149:15 151:7

webinar 10:4 11:3 12:6 website 38:9 39:12,15 39:21 41:9 45:7,15 46:14 49:13 55:19 61:10 78:1 WEDNESDAY 1:10 week 16:10 18:5 44:6 47:6 132:9 weeks 19:13 Weimer 2:2 3:15 16:3 67:4,5 68:6,19 116:1 117:3 133:21 150:8 163:13 weird 119:14 welcome 3:2 4:8 15:11 105:21 126:8 welcoming 15:1 well-defined 122:14 well-known 15:14 well-rounded 35:17 went 48:22 67:22 79:16 96:9 142:21 172:15 weren't 56:20 115:13 117:21 west 1:13 15:13 54:19 112:14 117:4 wetland 89:6.8.9.11 wetlands 26:4 28:10 88:19 89:3 **whales** 144:14,15 wheel 22:10 33:5 white 116:15 128:8 **whoops** 139:5 wide 35:10,13 wider 8:16 29:9 113:18 widths 111:1 wild 119:5 wilderness 119:3 wildlife 119:4,4,18 129:18 Williams 77:20 willing 5:19 17:1 wish 13:11 110:8 witness 116:13 Wolverine 134:6,22 wonder 67:9 161:18 wondered 161:12 wonderful 141:21 wondering 67:5 167:16 word 75:18 words 14:6 155:21 156:6 work 5:16 19:6 20:13 37:6 76:22 81:8,13 82:9 106:12,20 115:17 135:21 142:20 149:21 150:5 154:20 158:3,14,18 168:17

151:18,18

weather 5:8

weaving 54:16

83:8 158:6

172:2

ways 14:19 23:5 41:5,6

web 10:16 66:7,16 76:8

78:10,17 80:2,3 82:13

webcast 4:10 7:21 8:5,9

55:19 56:5 58:3 62:9

136:9 169:7 171:10

14:1 17:14 36:13

webcasters 161:3

42:22 43:1 68:14

| | 1 | 1 | I |
|---|--|------------------------------|-------------------|
| worked 23:9 105:7 | 10:10 79:17 | 51:13 52:11 54:2,4 | 9 |
| working 13:20 18:14 | 10:15 78:16,18,22 79:3 | 56:10 60:7,8 67:15 | 9:50 79:16 |
| 20:22 68:12 97:22,22 | 100 111:21 166:3 | 78:5,5 84:16 90:2,7,9 | 9000 52:12 |
| 106:2 143:20 150:3 | 100% 137:21 | 90:19 | |
| works 66:8 80:9 168:2 | 105 3:14 | 2019 1:10 45:6 46:7 | 911 5:16 |
| workshop 117:16 118:5 | 10F 87:11 | 47:6 67:16 135:17 | 98 3:13 |
| world 109:14 | 11,600 47:8 | 140:15 | 99.9 90:5 |
| worms 153:15 | I | 20590 1:14 | |
| | 11:58 172:15 | | |
| worry 123:3 | 117 3:15 | 22 57:13 | |
| worrying 134:12 | 12 1:10 116:17 | 24,000 40:5 | |
| worse 130:12 | 12:30 7:22 | 25- 78:15 | |
| worst-case 99:5 103:18 | 1200 1:13 | 28 70:19 | |
| wouldn't 82:5 101:20 | 126 3:16 | 2A 112:12 | |
| 161:22 | 1268 33:8 94:17 | 2B 113:16 | |
| wow 120:9 | 13 126:2 | 2C 113:6 | |
| wrap 79:7 | 130 3:18 | | |
| wrap-up 169:15 | 14,000 52:10 | 3 | |
| written 18:19 21:4 77:7 | 140 10:13 | 3 171:12,13 | |
| | 15 3:3 111:10 137:12 | 30 55:5 105:9 137:13 | |
| X | 15- 79:3 | 145:17 | |
| | 17 84:15 | 32 99:21 100:3 | |
| Υ | 17 04.13 | 33 33:8 94:17 | |
| year 16:6 59:17 76:12 | 18,800 47:2 | 37 3:7 | |
| | 180 100:15 162:19 | 3A 87:13 | |
| 76:17 166:7 | | 3A 07.13 | |
| year/five 76:17 | 19 16:14 24:6 | 4 | |
| years 15:20 16:3,4,8,13 | 195 77:7 92:15 | | |
| 16:14 20:21 47:18 | 195.450 98:15 | 4 3:2 50:12 | |
| 59:18 64:1 70:19 | 195.6 24:15 77:8 | 42 90:17 | |
| 76:13 77:13,15 | 1999 105:11 | 43 87:7 | |
| 105:10 106:3 115:8 | 1A 87:12 110:21 | 48 31:9 | |
| 115:14 117:10 122:21 | 1B 111:6 | | |
| 124:14 126:2 132:5 | | 5 | |
| 133:18,18 141:6 | 2 | 5 136:21 | |
| 145:17 152:17 160:6 | 2 10:20 11:3 56:4 | 5,000 165:12 | |
| 163:10 165:8 166:3 | 2.4 107:12 | 50 4:14 46:8 100:21 | |
| yellow 85:17 87:4 93:15 | 20 3:4 15:20 16:8,13 | 111:10 166:2 | |
| Yellowstone 124:5 | 20:21 64:1 88:6 90:11 | 50,000 127:19 | |
| young 16:1 | 106:3 113:17 114:2 | 500 163:9 | |
| , | 115:7,13 133:17,18 | 54 31:14 | |
| Z | 136:22 137:11,13,16 | 59 31:9 54:2 | |
| zip 40:12 | 150.22 137.11,13,10 | JJ 01.3 J4.2 | |
| | | 6 | |
| zone 99:12,18 127:4 | 2001 47:2,16 51:4,5,9 | | |
| 128:5,7,17,18,20 | 52:10,16 113:2 | 60 4:15 100:14 162:19 | |
| 137:11,17 160:16 | 157:19 | 65 54:20 | |
| 165:21 | 2007 105:17 | 67 91:10 | |
| zoned 117:5 | 2011 18:13 65:14 | 67.2 90:10 | |
| zoom 40:4 111:15 | 2014 140:12 | 6B 87:13 | |
| zoomed 94:5 | 2015 97:12 116:14 | | |
| | 2016 17:22 18:13 19:8 | 7 | |
| 0 | 24:7 33:22 77:12 | 71.9 90:13 | |
| 0.5 101:21 | 121:14 | 75 50:11 | |
| | 2017 21:21 23:1,14 25:6 | | |
| 1 | 30:4,19 32:4 53:7,15 | 8 | |
| 1,000 127:20 | 84:7 95:17 117:16 | 8:30 1:14 4:2 | |
| 1:30 171:12 172:12 | 135:17,20 140:7 | 80 3:9 | |
| | 2018 30:7,21 31:3,3,6,8 | 83 3:12 | |
| 10 101:22 126:22 166:0 | | ∪J J. I∠ | 1 |
| 10 101:22 136:22 165:8 | 31·11 16 37·21 /\(\overline{A} | 97 1∩·7 | |
| 10 101:22 136:22 165:8 10:00 36:21 10:05 79:11,12,13 | 31:11,16 37:21 48:10 48:12 50:20 51:8,10 | 87 10:7 | |

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Great Lakes and Coastal Ecological

Unusually Sensitive Areas

Before: US DOT/PHMSA

Date: 06-12-19

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &