## Requested Corrections to the October 28, 2020
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| Page <br> No. | Line No. | Now Reads | Requested Correction | Audio Verification Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 16 | It crosses over Nicor GAFK | It crosses over Nicor Gas |  |
| 41 | 11 | MS. BRICE: | Delete this entire line. |  |
| 41 | 12 | MS. O'LAUGHLIN: | MS. BRICE: |  |
| 41 | 18 | MS. BRICE: | MS. O'LAUGHLIN: |  |
| 41 | 20 | MS. O'LAUGHLIN: | MS. BRICE: |  |
| 65 | 16 | Frak? | Ramp? | 2:17 |
| 65 | 17 | Frak was not | Ramp was not | 2:17 |
| 82 | 22 | attributions in ExhibitS, correct? | attributions in Exhibit F, correct? | 3:56 |
| 84 | 15-17 | And you had this document, this 204-38 in your possession. At the time you wrote your Report, it didn't show up, right? | And you had this document, this 204-38 in your possession at the time you wrote your Report, Exhibit 205, right? | 3:59 |
| 96 | 22 | Do you deny saying that Sir? Yes. | Do you deny saying that sir? Nope. | 4:21 |
| 102 | 4-5 | "Answer: It can be on the GAFK site re-boundary. I don't know." | "Answer: It can be on the Site 3 boundary. I don't know." | 4:29 |
| 121 | 21-22 | Q. 57534? A. 57534. | Q. 67-534? A. 67-534. | 5:02 |
| 159 | 5 | faster way to get to the question. <br> MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I <br> don't mean to mess up your thoughts. <br> MS. BRICE: I disagree. | faster way to get to the question. I don't mean to mess up your thoughts. <br> MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I disagree. | AUDIO CUTS OUT AT 6:08 |
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ENFORCE - ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT
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The report of proceedings had in the hearing of the above-entitled cause before Hearing Officer Bradley Halloran, called by the Pollution Control Board, taken by PAMELA A. MARZULLO, a Notary Public in and for the County of Pinellas and State of Florida, via Zoom, 1230 Gulf Boulevard, Clearwater Beach, Florida, on the 28 th day of October, 2020, on October 28th, 2020, at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m.

## PRESENT:

NIJMAN \& FRANZETTI
BY: MS. KRISTIN GALE \& MS. SUSAN BRICE
10 South LaSalle Street
Suite 3600
Chicago, Illinois
(312) 262-5523
k@nijmanfranzetti.com
sb@jmanfranzetti.com
Appeared on behalf of Midwest Generation;
MR. CHRISTOPHER \& MS. ELLEN O'LAUGHLIN
69 West Washington Street
18th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 814-2087
cgrant@atg.state.il.us
eolaughlin@atg.state.il.us
Appeared on behalf of the of Illinois Department of Transportation.

## ALSO PRESENT:

MS. MARIE TIPSORD
MS. JENNIFFER VAN WIE

## REPORTED BY:

Pamela A. Marzullo

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

312-419-9292

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're Continuing
with the direct of Steven Gobelman. Also on behalf
of IDOT is Christopher Brant, $B-r-a-n-t$.
I'm going to do a brief info. My name is Bradley
Halloran, Hearing Officer with the Illinois Pollution Control Board. I'm assigned to this matter 14-3JM versus IDOT. It's October 28th, approximately 9:42.

This matter is continued from October 28th 2020, yesterday. This meeting here is also being available through Webex. And right now, we have IDOT's attorney, Ellen O'Laughlin, continuing the direct of her expert, Steven Gobelman, who is still under oath.

I think I covered the bases. We do have here -- I think we have people on Webex as well from the Board. Ms. O'Laughlin, you may start

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Thank you.

SSS

STEVEN GOBELMAN,
was adduced as the witness herein; after having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Gobelman. We're just continuing from yesterday. What I would like to ask

[^0]you is a couple questions about IDOT area of liability. If you could turn to 2205-9 of your report.
A. Okay.
Q. What did you not include -- why did you not include 5SAS into IDOT's liability.
A. Based on the Board's rules, I thought it was very clear that they were only addressing IDOT's involvement in right-of-way 0339, which was construction of the Greenwood Avenue, the embankment required.

As everybody knows, this original process was about a parking lot that had asphalt bumpers, that were alleged to have been destroyed and mismanaged by IDOT.

There were two types of construction going on there. There was the Greenwood Avenue, which is included in the embankment, which is why they needed the right-of-way 0393-38.

In order to fill that embankment, and the embankment was being built because there was a bridge that was being built in the proposed highway that was going to be built, and it had also included a bridge over a railroad; and, therefore, it became

[^1]touchdown to this area where it came all the way back to the surface.

It also then required an embankment also being built on Grand Road, which was the cross street.
Q. Pull Exhibit 202 out of your binder, and you'll be referring to the report. Just take it out.
A. In order for IDOT to build that embankment, they had to create multiple feed roads in order for workers to be able to continue to use and traverse through Greenwood Avenue to get to the party's side to work.
Q. Okay. What embankment is that?
A. The main embankment, the main detour road, had to be created.
Q. Okay. So, the detour road you're referring to, can you point that out on Exhibit 202?
A. It is the Grand Road and basically going from the northwest -- southwest corner up to the northeast by the property.

It ties back into Greenwood Avenue somewhere near the location of $5 \mathrm{~S}, 6 \mathrm{~S}, 7 \mathrm{~S}$ and 8 S .
Q. That was the numbers $5 \mathrm{~S}, 6 \mathrm{Sm} 7 \mathrm{~S}$ and 8 S .
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That's what you are referring to throughout this hearing in discussing IDOT's liability?
A. Yes, those are the borings associated with the south side of Site 6 that the Board didn't use in their description to IDOT.

So, in order to build the embankment, IDOT had to cut a large area, bring it down to grade and had to steal some areas along this area to bring it up to grade.
Q. That is the detour road?
A. The detour road. That all had to be done in advance of any construction associated with the Greenwood Avenue embankment that was going to be built.
Q. And the Greenwood Avenue embankment, point that out and describe that on Exhibit 2.
A. The construction for Greenwood Avenue are shaded in gray beginning at stages 7 plus 60, and then going west to the edge of the map where it crosses the detour road.
Q. Seven plus 60, what is that, in connection with the IDOT, or is that a different structure?
A. Seven plus 60 is the IDOT station along Greenwood Avenue and reflected in the 1971
construction plan. That is noted as the beginning of construction. However, in that, there was additional work.

Basically, they were going to resurface Greenwood Avenue so it had to have a smooth tie-in from stages 7 plus 60 to 7 plus 00 .
Q. The 7 you're referring to is shown here on Exhibit 202 as running through the middle of Greenwood Avenue; is that where that is?
A. Yes, basically it typically runs through the center line of Greenwood Avenue. There is also a center line in the zoning here of Stage 2 associated with detour road and following IDOT constructional road.

It picks up where they are at to a continuing place. The survey will state the road embankment and doing work at a certain stage, doing building plans and financing.

## Q. Okay.

A. So, in terms of the embankment for Greenwood Avenue, that begins in sort of the green area in the top 6 on map A., the green area is defined as the IDOT construction limit that they needed to build the embankment.
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Q. At what point does the embankment to Greenwood Avenue begin, in terms of $1 S, 2 S, 3 S, 4 S$ and 5S?
A. Well, the beginning of Greenwood Avenue embankment. This area does not start until the Detour Road A is in place.

So, it's already grade, and they've already diverted traffic onto the detour road so they can begin the work.
Q. Where does the embankment, the rising embankment for Greenwood Avenue, more or less, begin?
A. The embankment, in essence, starts at some point west of 7 plus 60. In 7 plus 60, they are already at the grade of the original Greenwood Avenue.

So, the embankment -- I have to look at the old plan. I believe it starts somewhere around 8 plus 00 before it starts typically up.
Q. Okay. This is somewhere in between?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If you could go down from there, it looks like it is west?
A. The Greenwood Avenue basically is 7 plus

[^2]60. It's basically between $4 S$ and 5S.
Q. Okay. So, the Board considered all of this before in the first hearing?
A. There was transite material found throughout the entire site. The detour runs over the Nicor Gas. The Board anticipated it was going to involve everywhere IDOT --
Q. You're referring to the Detour Road A?
A. Yes.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: One at a time, please.

THE WITNESS: The entire Detour Road A that runs southwest to northeast. BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Okay.
A. It crosses over Nicor GAFK. The Board said IDOT was liable for all construction work. It was included with the borings associated with the Detour Road A, and specifically the other features which apply to this is dealing which boring D345, the Board specifically stated it was on the east side of 0393.

On 0393, in the Board's ruling stated if
D3 -- I mean, D345 was stated in the Board's ruling
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that it was within the right-of-way, it is applicable to IDOT. If it's not in the right-of-way, it's not applicable to the right-of-way.

D345 sits along the corridor of the detour
road. The Board was very clear that it wasn't talking about anything that had to do with the true Road A, which included if the boring D345 was outside the right-of-way; and, therefore, would also include the borings along the south side of Greenwood Avenue 5S, 6S, 7S and 8S.
Q. Okay. So, the Board did not find IDOT liable in connection with Detour Road A at all?
A. No.
Q. This was all considered and set forth in the first hearing that you're reviewing now?
A. All this information was provided in the first hearing.
Q. Okay. If you could turn to 205-9, the last paragraph prior to 6.
A. Okay.
Q. *205-9 If you could read beginning with -reading that last paragraph beginning with "The IPCB."

[^3]A. "IPCB," The Illinois Pollution Control

Board, "ruled that the eastern edge of the reconstruction of Greenwood Avenue was near soil sample location 4 S, which is near IDOT Stages 7 plus 60, the beginning of the Greenwood Avenue roadway construction."
Q. Okay. That's what we just talked about in Exhibit 202?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could continue to read, please.
A. "The IPCB further ruled that IDOT did not open up enough ACM ways in the construction of Detour Road A that is associated with borings 5S through 8S."
Q. Okay. Again, just to reiterate, you just said -- if you could begin reading the second sentence. I'm not quite sure where we were.
A. "The IPCB further ruled that IDOT did not open ACM way in the construction of Detour Road A, which is associated with borings 5 S through 8S."
Q. Okay. Let's make it clear, for the record. You have -- if you could show on Exhibit 202 the area that you're referring to 5S through 8S?
A. 5 S through 8 S is the area to the west of station 7 plus 00 that's the center line of Greenwood Avenue, which is outside of the embankment that is not along Greenwood Avenue.
Q. Okay. So, the detour road is associated with 5S through 8S?
A. Correct.
Q. If you could continue to read, please.
A. "Based on the amount of fill materials used to create Detour Road A, 2.5 feet or less, the depth that ACM found as a latext substance agent three feet or more for general legal excavation depth of 7.5 feet. I do not see any new information that would be considered new evidence to the agency in the area defined by the Illinois Pollution Control Board."
Q. Okay. If you could go to Exhibit 21A-24.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Madam Court
Reporter, is everything okay? Are you able to record? Did you get everything?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
THE WITNESS: 21A --
BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. 24.


[^4]of the survey of the ground surface along that corridor.

As you see, there are areas that are elevated and areas that are below the line that's marked as -- on the left-hand side as 590 , which is the elevation they are trying to achieve with a grade to match up with the grade elevation of Greenwood Avenue.
Q. And that's where you come up with the 2.5 feet or less?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the JM's review excavation test, 627.5C, can you explain what that is? That's the amount that they remediated down at that area?
A. In some areas, I think it's more associated with the northeast excavation.
Q. Where did you obtain that information?
A. That would have been from their final report.
Q. You referenced the final report?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the depth of ACM found in the site investigation three feet or more, where did you obtain that information?

[^5]A. That was found as part of their
investigation reports.
Q. That was --
A. That was referenced and shown in 202 , the depth and price of materials that were found in the borings associated along the south side of Greenwood Avenue.
Q. Okay. Again, this information was not the final work plan, but the ACM found in the site investigation, that was also at three feet or more, that was all in the first hearing; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, you heard the mystery solved on Mr. Dorgan's report, and you heard Mr. Peterson's explanation of some photographs saying the depth of the site.

Did you review those photographs that were discussed yesterday or Monday?
A. I, unfortunately, looked through all the photos that they submitted.
Q. How many photos did they submit?
A. I think it was over 10,000 photographs.
Q. Of those 10,000 -- I thought you said 30, 000 .

[^6]A. I think it was 30,000 documents, pages.
Q. Okay. And only 10,000 photos?
A. Yes.
Q. So, the photos they selected they talked about yesterday, does that have any -- how does that play into your analysis on Detour Road A?

MS. BRICE: I would like to enter an objection. This would be in your opinion you testified in the deposition that he had no opinions about the photographs.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. O'Laughlin?
MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I'm just asking him to respond to Mr. Peterson's explanation, I believe it was on Monday, on the photographs.

I mean, they are saying -- there are a series of photographs that show something. I would like him to explain why they don't show everything that is listed.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. Brice?
MS. BRICE: This is all laid out in Dorgan's report about the photographs, had conversations with Mr. Peterson about the discussions, and he received all of Mr. Dorgan's report. He said -- in his deposition, he said he had no information about
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that.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm going to sustain the objection. You can offer that, bring it as an offer of proof. BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Mr. Gobelman, go to 205-9, can you read the last sentence of that paragraph before you?
A. "Based on the amount of fill material used for Detour Road A of 2.5 feet or less, the depth of ACM found at the site investigation three feet or more and JM mediation excavation depth of 67.5 feet.
"I do not see any new information that would be considered new evidence to increase the area defined by the Pollution Control Board."
Q. What do you mean by "new information"?
A. The information that Mr. Dorgan used in his report to try to explain why there needed to be an expansion of the area associated with Site 6.
Q. New information in his attempt to increase liability for Site 6?
A. Yes, he wanted to include 5S through 8S.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: And then through the offer of proof, I would like to ask him about Mr. Peterson's testimony.
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HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Again, in an offer of proof, and Ms. Brice can cross-examine under an offer of proof. We'll see what the Board decides. You may proceed. BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. You heard Mr. Peterson's description of the photographs during this hearing and looked at those photographs.

Does that have any impact on your
conclusions in your report contained -- that you just read, or is that contained in the Section 5.356 area within IDOT's responsibility, as defined by IPCB?
A. No, it doesn't change it. I would have expected, based upon the original information we provided at the first hearing, that borings 5 S through 8 S had a variety of different specimen-containing materials at depth from zero to 3 feet in those borings.

I would expect that there would be material discovered on the -- within the excavation.
Q. So, it's consistent with the information you had looked at previously?
A. Yes.
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Q. That concludes my offer of proof.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you.
MS. BRICE: Can I cross?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes. When the time comes, let me know.

BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Turning to 205-D of the report, the section that begins 5.2, "Site 3 area within IDOT's responsibility as defined by IPCB."
A. I lost you. Where are you at?
Q. 205-D, the section that begins 5.2, "Site 3 area within IDOT's responsibility as defined by IPCB."
A. Okay.
Q. I just want you to go there.
A. Okay.
Q. Well, read the first sentence.
A. "IDOT's responsibility, as defined by the Illinois Pollution Control Board within parcel 0393, includes soil boring locations D325, D315, D316, D350 and D345, to the extent that will leave D345 all on parcel 0393."
Q. Turning to Exhibit 202, can you describe those boring locations in relation to the embankment
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## of Greenwood Avenue?

A. Those D325, D316, D315 fall within 0393 and within the IDOT's construction 11. It appears that D350 was within the construction limits of the area that comes through the 0393, as a part of the detour road, and D345 exists in Exhibit 202. It falls slightly outside 0393 within the construction limits of the detour road.
Q. And the specific borings referenced in the IDOT -- excuse me, the specific borings referenced in the Illinois Pollution Control Board Order December 2016, identifies references specific borings in relation to -- that are close to the Greenwood embankment?

MS. BRICE: Objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We have an objection.

MS. BRICE: I would like to make an objection. Mr. Gobelman is testifying about Exhibit 202, which is the exhibit used in the first hearing, which is very different from the exhibit used in his supplemental report in 207 and in 205.

He has different places that are places which Mr. Dorgan established. His pointing to
boring locations on 202 is misleading.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I think you can attack that in your vigorous cross-exam. Overruled. Thank you.

MS. BRICE: Thank you. BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Mr. Gobelman, if you could, describe how those boring locations, that are referenced in the Boring order, relates to the embankment of Greenwood Avenue?
A. They are all involving the borings that are associated within the right-of-way 0393, and 0393 was only necessary in order to build the embankment associated with Greenwood Avenue and nothing to do with the construction of the Detour Road A.
Q. Okay. Then Ms. Brice had an objection regarding the map 3 supplemental report as part of this hearing, but we're discussing what the boring found in the first hearing, and Exhibit 202 is pertinent to that analysis that you used in your report, right?

I mean, it shows -- Exhibit 202 shows the borings that were presented to the Board in the

[^7]first hearing?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I would like to turn to

Exhibit 21A-26. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. What is this document?
A. This is a cross-section of the soil borings found associated under Greenwood Avenue and Sand Street, the surface reflects what the final construction grade will be in association with those streets.
Q. Could you read what the information on the bottom right states?
A. There was a note on the bottom right-hand side for the contractor to reflect that this information -- "The information provided on this figure is for information only."
Q. Okay. Is there anything else indicated in this document to you?
A. It does lay out in the Greenwood Avenue profile that, in essence, the work -- the embankment work, and stuff like that on Greenwood Avenue, begins at 7 plus 60 .
Q. Okay.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

A. Beyond to the further east, that is all deferred.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I would like to go to the next one. I would like to use your report that begins with, "The analysis of the task bucket."

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Is there a way to
move the tripod closer to the speaker for Pamela or
no?
BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Go to Exhibit 4.
A. In 207?
Q. In 207, correct. In Figure 4, 207-16,
what is this figure?
A. This figure shows the AT\&T location.
Q. We talked about this yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's move to Exhibit 5.
A. 207-17?
Q. In Gobelman Exhibit 5, 2070-17, Gobelman

Exhibit 5, what is this a picture of?
A. This is a figure showing the location of North Shore Gas line that is part of the location on the map.
Q. Can you describe the location of the North

[^8]
## Shore Gas?

A. The North Shore Gas comes into Site 3 along the western border, roughly halfway within the site, and traverses diagonally up to the northeast and crosses into Site 6 somewhere between boring 3S and 4 S.
Q. And this is the hashed area?
A. The hashed area, yes, is the area that $I$ used in my calculations for the North Shore Gas.
Q. What is the green and the pink?
A. The pink color is the area that falls outside of 0393. The green area is the area that falls within 0393.
Q. Okay. And what are the total costs for the North Shore Gas bucket?
A. Are you asking for what is on the total page?
Q. Yes, correct. What are the total costs that Johns Mansville paid for Site 3 for the North Shore Gas cap bucket?

Is it 332,000 ? It's 207-5.
A. Oh, 332,005.4.
Q. How did you determine IDOT's share of liability?

[^9]A. I looked at the area of the corridor that was going through Site 3, and that was divided by the total area of the dashed line as it traversed all of Site 3.
Q. So, is that what these two colors demonstrate?
A. Those two colors represent the entire area.
Q. Okay. And how much in the green area falls within the IDOT area of liability?
A. Approximately 39.3 percent.
Q. Okay. And then what did you do with the 39.3 percent?
A. I used that to calculate IDOT's -- what is attributed to IDOT for the cost associated with that area.
Q. You came up with what amount?
A. 130,682 .
Q. Moving to Site 6 for the North Shore Gas line, can you explain what you did to determine IDOT's liability for Site 6 for this gas bucket?
A. The way it lays out, I used linear feet of the gas line as it traverses through Site 6.

## Q. Okay.
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A. And then basically used the reporting -- I believe reporting of Mr . Dorgan's report, that stated that the length along the south side of Site 6 was approximately 2,000 linear feet.
Q. What is the linear feet of IDOT's responsibility on Site 6?
A. The amount of IDOT's responsibility is the center between $4 S$ and 5 S was 72 feet.
Q. Okay. And then did you calculate the percentage based on linear feet?
A. Yes, it came up to 6 -- sorry, 3.6 feet.
Q. Okay. And then you applied that to the total cost that JM made?
A. Yes.
Q. You came up with how much for the IDOT attribution?
A. 8,455 .
Q. And for the cost for Site 3 and 6, it cannot be attributed to -- applied to both Sites 3 and 6?

How did you figure out-- how did you determine IDOT attribution for Sites 3 and 6?
A. I took the cost that I attributed to IDOT for Site 3 and added the specific cost to IDOT for

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

Site 6, and then divided by the total amount that Johns Mansville paid regarding the gas line portion and came up with a percentage for those Sites 3 and 6 cost of 24.5 percent.
Q. Okay. And that's based on the analysis for Site 3 or Site 6, and then you came up with the percentage for Site 3?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there anything else worth noting regarding the North Shore Gas line involvement in figure 5?
A. No.
Q. I'm going to ask you now about the utility/ACM soil excavation gas buckets.

If you could turn to your first report. What may be helpful is $205-11$. The reason why it's in your first report is because why?

I'll withdraw that. Do you discuss utility ACM excavation in your supplemental report?
A. No, because nothing changed in the calculation based on the changes associated with the work.
Q. Okay. What is the utility ACM soil excavation gas buckets? If you could describe

[^10]
## previously what was done.

A. It's regarding the service of construction work done based on the test soils for Site 6, which is calculated, in essence, the same way Mr. Dorgan calculated his using this calculation that my attributions were different.
Q. Okay. So, what was your attribution?
A. I utilized the calculations that I used for the ACM line for site 6. It's the total length for Site 6, which is approximately 5,470 linear feet, and the length attributed to IDOT's responsibility, which is defined as 197 linear feet along the western edge of site 6 to the halfway point between 4 S and 5 S , and then that percentage became 3.6 percent.
Q. And that 3.6 percent did what?
A. The 3.6 percent was then applied to the total cost that was spent in that gas buckets of 155,318, and I came up with an IDOT responsibility of 5,591.
Q. Okay. And, then, the utility ACM total excavation occurred on both sides of site 6?
A. Yes.
Q. That only pertains -- that gas bucket only
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```
pertains to Site 6?
```

A. Yes.
Q. Moving to Gobelman Figure 6, which is 207-18?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What is Gobelman Figure 8?
A. It is a figure showing the location of the northeast excavation.
Q. Describe where the northeast excavation is?
A. It is along the northern border of Site 3 that runs from a point some place east of total boring 3 S to a point slightly east of 6 S .
Q. It is the hashed area?
A. The hashed area.
Q. The hashed area on Gobelman Figure 6?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the northeast excavation site gas buckets?
A. It was an area that they were required to do more extensive excavation associated with excavation in that area.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You're trailing off again. Sorry.
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THE WITNESS: It's an area they did a more extensive excavation in that area. BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Okay. In Gobelman Figure 4, there is two sets of lines. Can you describe those two sets of lines?
A. Yes, it describes the area within the right-of-way 0339 and the area outside of 0393.
Q. And what does the 1889 mean?
A. That is the area that was calculated underneath that of what is the area -- the square feet of the area within 0393 and the area outside of the 0393 that was calculated at 6,611 square feet.
Q. You mean 5,000?
A. 5,611 square feet.
Q. What did you do with those numbers?
A. I took those and --
Q. Did you calculate percentage?
A. Yes. Just a second.
Q. Okay.
A. I took the percent, the square feet inside 0393, 1889, and divided it by the total of the whole area, which would have been the total of 1889 plus 5611 square feet, which is a total of 7,500 square

[^11]feet, and that gave me a percentage of 25.2 percent.
Q. And with that 25.2 percent, you did what?
A. I applied it to the cost -- the total cost for site -- associated with Site 3, with the northeast excavation of 29,934 and came up with IDOT's cost of 12,583 .
Q. Okay. And what about D45, boring D45, did you include that within IDOT's area or no? How did you treat that?
A. Well, in laying out the boring locations, even in the revised site map, 0345 falls outside of IDOT's right-of-way 0393.

According to the Board's rule, or Board's ruling, as it fall outside, that is not IDOT's liability; however, $I$ decided in the first report that I submitted that since it fell outside of 0393 of about five feet, that $I$ would include it within right-of-way 0393; but I didn't want to spend two days testifying about a five-foot differential within right-of-way 0393.

So, the purpose of all these figures, I am letting D345 be inside 0393.
Q. And IDOT's area 6 liability?
A. IDOT's area of liability.
Q. Are there any northeast excavation costs associated with Site 6.
A. I do not have any costs associated with Site 6.
Q. Okay. Let's move to the dewatering gas buckets.
A. Okay.
Q. What is the dewatering?
A. Dewatering was required in the construction project because the ground water elevation in this area was pretty high, and so any excavation would tolerate the ground water; and in order for them to create the corridor, they needed to have a dry condition.

Soils can be managed both sides with three liquids in them, so they had to install a ground water pumping system so the water would fall down to ground water along the north side of Site 3 and then the south side of Site 6 so that could work.
Q. Okay. And what utility lines for other gas buckets were associated or needed by dewatering? You could turn to 207-7 of your report to help you.
A. For site 3, the utilities that were affected were the Nicor line, the North Shore Gas
line, the City of Waukegan waterline and the northeast excavation.
Q. Okay. And for Site 3, how did you determine IDOT's responsibility or liability?
A. I calculated it the same way Mr. Dorgan did in his, except I applied allocations for IDOT were less than his.
Q. And why is that?
A. Because of the percentages that I had assessed on the area or the link that were impacted within those different gas buckets.

Also, I didn't include any costs to the City of Waukegan waterline, because it was outside of the Board's ruling on the boring location.
Q. Okay. So, what did you -- are these part of your Table 1? Is this calculation part of your Table 1?
A. Those are found in Table 1. They are the same calculation tables that Mr. Dorgan used in his report.
Q. If you could turn to 207-22. Now, you said you used the same methodology as Mr. Dorgan?
A. Correct.
Q. But your percentage of IDOT liability is

[^12]less than the amount of overall percentages and different numbers?
A. Correct.
Q. But the methodology is the same. Okay. So, let's go to the dewatering analysis, which is on 207-23.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you walk us through how you -- it's the same methodology. We've gone through it with Mr. Dorgan.

Your overall amounts are different so you have a different percentage?
A. Yes. And the summation of costs associated with dewatering in those utilities that needed the dewatering; and, in essence, there is a division of 50 percent, based upon what those utilities were cost attributed to IDOT.

And then take the total amount that IDOT was attributed divided by the total amount, and you come up with a percentage.
Q. What percentage did you come up with?
A. For Site 3, my percentage was 21.7.
Q. What did you do with the 21.7 percent?
A. I placed that 21.7 at every line that was
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listed in Mr. Dorgan's for the cost for dewatering.
Q. Okay. And what was the total amount you attributed to IDOT liability for dewatering on Site 3, based on this methodology?
A. For Site 3, the cost was 56,221.
Q. Okay. Site 6 dewatering?
A. I used the same process of utilities that were associated with dewatering associated with Site 6, divided by the total amount, I came up with a percentage of 23.5 percent, and the total cost for that at Site 6 was 106,587. IDOT's cost -- the cost attributed to IDOT was $37,738$.
Q. Okay. And you limiting it to IDOT's area of liability?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know offhand what Mr. Dorgan did?
A. He did a number of things.
Q. And you reference to Site 6 dewatering analysis?
A. I believe he assessed the AT\&T lines as one in and one out, I believe. Without looking, it was 50 percent of the dewatering process associated with Site 6.
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Q. Okay. How about the cost for dewatering for Sites 3 and 6, in particular?
A. That calculation is shown in a sub-box at the bottom of that table, which is the total dewatering cost for Sites 3 and 6 .

The total of IDOT's cost attributed to IDOT, which was 93,000. If you divide those together, and you come up with a percentage of 22.4.

And that is put into the Site 3 through 6 boxes that have costs; and of the 39,000 of 175 that was spent for dewatering, regarding the combined Site 3 and 6 area, IDOT's cost -- I attributed IDOT's cost to be 8,775.
Q. Is there anything else that is pertinent to your analysis of dewatering costs that we haven't already discussed?
A. No.
Q. Moving along to Gobelman Figure 7, which is 207-19 -- are you there?
A. Okay.
Q. What is this a figure of?
A. This is a figure of the location of what is called the ramp area.
Q. Describe this on your figure 7?

[^13]A. This runs along the northwest portion of Site 3 within the area defined as the right-of-way of 0393, but outside of the area that the Board -outside the borings that the Board attributed to IDOT.
Q. And how did you treat the cost associated with the ramp gas bucket?
A. I applied no cost to IDOT, outside of the Board's ruling of the borings that IDOT is liable for.
Q. And do you know what the costs were for the ramp?
A. The cost associated with the ramp was 20,880.
Q. What are you looking at?
A. I am looking at page -- Exhibit 205-515, because of the redrawing of the site map.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Hold on a second, Mr. Gobelman.
(Pause)
BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. I am not exactly sure where we left off.
A. I was stating that the ramp cost was -the total ramp cost to JM was $\$ 20,880$.
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Q. And did you include that in IDOT's
liability?
A. No.
Q. And why?
A. Because it's outside of the borings that were assessed by the Board. I think it also stated on page -- Exhibit 205-15, at 207, nothing changed associated with the cost associated with the ramp when I created my total cost.
Q. Okay. Moving along, is there anything else worth noting about ramp costs for this figure?
A. No.
Q. Moving along to Gobelman Figure 8, 207-20.
A. Yes.
Q. What is Gobelman Figure 8?
A. It is a figure showing the area regarding IDOT's allocation regarding the filling and capping location.
Q. What are filling and capping costs?
A. It is the costs associated with the capping project that had to be done at the conclusion of all the remedial work.
Q. What was the area involved that needed to be filled and/or capped?

[^14]A. All of site 3 needed to be capped.
Q. Including the ramp area?
A. The ramp area exists because they couldn't cap in that area, and then they got a waiver for capping on the northeast corner of Site 3, because they couldn't -- they weren't able to place a cap along the embankment. I believe it was too steep, or something like, that they couldn't do.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Do you have an objection?

MS. BRICE: Yes, I have an objection. Mr. Gobelman has identified the map in the extra report for that filling area on the figure, not as the larger area which the other witnesses testified, which involves a much larger ramp area.

He is, therefore, now reciting to what he heard in the testimony today -- over the last couple of days and changing his opinion.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. O'Laughlin?
MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I don't understand the point she's making.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I don't understand the point.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I don't understand the
objection she's making. I don't understand the point that she's making.

MS. BRICE: This is a new opinion.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Well, you know, again, like the last -- the offer of proof, it sounds like he's just responding to the last couple of days of testimony, which I don't think is a bad thing.

His opinion is based on now the past direct testimony he heard the last two days.

MS. BRICE:
MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Mr. Hearing Officer, his opinion is supposed to be based on his expert report.

This is directly contradicting what is set forth in the report; therefore, we never had an opportunity to discuss anything about this.

MS. BRICE: I don't believe it's contradicting or supplementing anything from his expert report.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Why don't I withdraw that objection, and we will focus on your expert report regarding filling and capping. BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. If you could turn to 205-15.

[^15]A. Yes.
Q. Now, did you -- before we moved to discuss the specifics of 205-15, does your supplemental report include any discussion or analysis of building the capping costs?
A. No.
Q. And why?
A. Because it didn't change in relation to the cost allocated to IDOT.
Q. Could you read back the last question and answer?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Pamela, could you please read back the last question and the answer, please?
(Said record was read.)

BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
So, your analysis of the building and capping cost, and the ramp cost, did not get altered by your correction of your base map that was provided in your supplemental report; is that correct?
A. Correct, the cost percentage.
Q. Okay. If you could turn to 205-15, and turn to 6.8.
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A. Okay.
Q. If you could read that paragraph?
A. "Due to site conditions, it was not practical to install the required section cap in an area on the northwest corner of Site 3. Instead of a section cap, a 3-inch stone aggregate layer was placed over the impacted clay in lieu of top soil adjacent to a low, off-site wet area.
"Since this work occurred within's parcel 0393, and is located to the west of the soil sample, location D 325 is located outside of IDOT's responsibility, as defined by the Illinois Pollution Control Board liability area."
Q. Where is D329 located on any of these figures?
A. In essence, it is the second boring to the east of the boring listed there. The first boring is D326, which is the farthest west boring within 0339 and D325 is the next boring.
Q. Okay. And then the ramp area you just read from your expert report is depicted?
A. As the far western portion of Site 3.
Q. Okay. And did you include costs associated with the ramp task bucket in your IDOT
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attribution?
A. No, the associated cost of 20,880 is not attributed to IDOT's responsibility as defined by the Pollution Control Board.
Q. Moving to filling 7. What are -- I already asked you what filling included. I'm not going to ask you again.

What are the filling and capping costs
task bucket for site 3 ?
A. The total cost is 426,254 , and this includes the construction needed for filling and capping construction $T \& M$ for filling and capping construction, management for filling and capping.
Q. Which totals that amount?
A. That totals 426,500 -- sorry, 426,254 .
Q. And those cap costs came from Mr. Dorgan's report?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you determine what filling and capping costs should be allocated to IDOT?
A. I calculated entire area associated with Sites 3 and the area of IDOT's responsibility regarding the borings listed and extended the Board's boring of D325 and extended it to the next
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cleaning of the boring, which was D3-26.
Q. Why is it being a clean boring relevant or pertinent to your analysis?
A. Normal practice of things, if you are going between borings -- two borings that are contaminated, you assume distances.

In order to do clean-up and stuff like that, typically if the next boring is clean, you only know you are clean until you get to that clean boring.

So, I didn't assume a halfway distance. I went to the next clean-up boring, because that would be showing that the entire area was clean.
Q. Okay. And that area that you just described, can you explain how it is demonstrated in your Figure 8?
A. In Figure 8, there is a hatched-in site on Site 3 within the right-of-way of 0393 that hatches, in essence, from boring D -- D326 and extends to the east, so the eastern edge of right-of-way 0393, and it is then calculated that area is 0.2 acres.
Q. Okay. And how did you determine what should be allocated to IDOT, based on your hatching process, in determining that as .2 acres?

[^16]A. I had to calculate that area associated with the area that we're hatching that included the borings of IDOT's responsibility and going to the west to the next cleanest boring.
Q. Okay. And what percentage of this . 2 acres of Site 3?
A. It is approximately 6.5 percent of Site 3.
Q. Okay. And then what did you do with the 6.5 percent calculation?
A. I used that percentage to calculate for site 3 IDOT -- what IDOT attributed to.
Q. Okay. Which is how much?
A. 27,707 .
Q. Okay. So, this is all of Site 3, that area required filling and capping; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then of all those . 2 acres is what the Board found IDOT liable for and wanted further evidence?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And moving to Site 6.
A. In site 6, I included the hatching from the western edge of Site 6 to a point halfway between boring 4S and 5S, halfway between because 5S

[^17]also contained asbestos-containing material, so I went halfway to the halfway point.
Q. And why halfway?
A. That's standard practice for doing that. It is assumed that the contamination exists through that whole area, and you sort of look at it is what it is attributed to.

Is it attributed to contamination
associated with borings or contamination associated with 5S? It's halfway between standard practice.
Q. Okay. This map also shows IDOT's area of liability as referenced by the Board's boring efforts?
A. Yes, it references 1S, 2S, 3 S and 4 S .
Q. And you can see the size of Site 3 in relation to the IDOT area of liability for -- excuse me, the IDOT area of liability doesn't support the December 2016 order, which references boring locations. It doesn't demonstrate it.

And except for Site 6, it shows it running out to Site 6?
A. Correct.
Q. This goes to the geography that IDOT is liable for?
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A. Yes.
Q. And what was the percentage that you found for Site 6 filling and capping costs?
A. The percentage for Site 6, which was a calculation of the linear feet, within the borings that I discussed that were associated with IDOT, has a total length of the north and south corridor for Site 6 came up with a percentage of 3.6 percent, which after calculating that to the total, came up with the cost attributed to IDOT of $11,173$.
Q. Okay. And what about cost for Site 3?
A. I utilized Mr. Dorgan's process of calculating the portion of cost for the cost that could not be separated.

So, in this case, the amount that $I$ had currently calculated for Site 3 and Site 6 was a total of 38,879 .

And the total cost for Site 3 and Site 6 was 736,607 , which provided a percentage of 5.3 , which related to IDOT's responsibility in the cost for sites a throw and 6 of 18,657 .
Q. Okay.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Would it be okay if we took a short break? I know we're trying to get through

[^18]this.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: That's great. Let's be back in 15 minutes. Pamela, you are relieved for 15 minutes.
(A recess was taken.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: All right. So, it's approximately 11:29. We're back on the record. Ms. O'Laughlin?

BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. Mr. Gobelman, I want you to review a group of task buckets that applies to the higher -- that are not segregated in Site 3. They are not segregated in Site 6. That applies to the whole Site 3 and 6.

And the methodology that you used for the general site/site preparation costs, the health and safety costs, the EPA oversight costs, and the cost for legal support services, did you use the same methodology as Mr. Dorgan?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's start with the general site/site preparation costs. What are those?
A. Limited to the general project management support interface with regulatory, the professional
service oversight of project activity escalation and maintenance of storm water control, practice control, clearing, rubbing of the site and the preparation for construction.
Q. Okay. Those were not segregated for the entire Site 3 and 6?
A. They were segregated by the work
associated for Site 3, and there was some stuff that was associated with Site 6, and there were costs associated with Sites 3 and 6.
Q. Okay. Turning to your report 207-8 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- 3.5, "General Site/site Preparation." What are the total general site/site preparation costs?
A. The total cost that JM gave for Site 3 were 932,730 . For Site 6, it was 807,328 .
Q. In terms of costs for the project, the costs that JM purportedly paid, those are pretty significant amounts, the time for the ramp of $\$ 20,000$.

But for the general site,
site/preparations, which are applied to the whole site, the 932,730 is at the high end of costs?

[^19]A. Yes, I agree.
Q. Okay. So, turning to your Table 1, which begins at 207-22 and runs through 207-25.

In essence, Mr. Dorgan's table shows your calculation of how you came up with percentages, which you then applied to the general site preparation; is that a fair summary?
A. Yes.
Q. So, turning specifically to 207-24, and the task bucket general site/site preparation --
A. Okay.
Q. -- how did you determine IDOT's attribution?
A. The calculation that is created outside of the bottom of the table on the right-hand side called the general site prep.

It has for Site 3 the total, which relates to the way Dorgan did it, the total construction costs associated with Site 3, divided by --
Q. And what are the total construction costs associated with Site 3?
A. $1,476,454$.
Q. Where did that number come from?
A. That comes from the addition of all the
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costs from -- that Mr. Dorgan said were attributed to those costs.
Q. What does the total construction cost represent, $1,476,454$ ?
A. That's the total amount of the cost that applied to the construction of Site 3.
Q. At the bottom right of Exhibit 207-24, in the bottom right, there is "General site/site preparation," and you have total construction costs in Site 3 that same amount 1,476,454.

Do you see that?
A. Say that again?
Q. At the bottom right of 207-24.
A. Yes.
Q. General site/site preparation?
A. Yes.
Q. You have total construction cost, total IDOT attribution and percent of IDOT's attribution?
A. Yes.
Q. So, we already talked about what the total construction cost is.

What does the total IDOT attribution represent?
A. The cost for the construction services
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that were attributed to IDOT's responsibility that was defined by the Board, 247,616 .
Q. Thank you. And where did you get the
numbers from?
A. It was from all the attributions associated with the different task buckets that applied to this general site, the prep work.
Q. Okay. And let's walk through what task buckets are included. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. So, to find out the total IDOT attribution for Site 3 cost, is the AT\&T -- your allocation for the AT\&T telephone line would be included?
A. That table doesn't specifically state exactly where it's coming from, because I am just copying from Mr. Dorgan's table and how he calculated this system.
Q. Okay.
A. So, in his calculation, he is adding -the computer is doing this. It added itself together based upon the same cells that he added together.

The total cost attributed to the cost being looked at, which he just said IDOT contributed
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to it, and recalculating it by hand.
I want to go to Dorgan's report, it says how he calculated that.
Q. How did you come up with the 15.8 percent?
A. The 15.8 percent is just a simple calculation of what was being told by Mr. Dorgan's report of the total construction cost for Site 3, and using the same IDOT allocations that he used in his calculation, given that my allocations for those specific cells are different, based upon the percentages that I applied.
Q. So, they involved your percentages?
A. Yes. And then they made the decision in coming up with a percentage of 15.8.
Q. So, the total IDOT attribution reflects your numbers in the task bucket that we talked about earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What did you do with the

## 16.8 percent?

A. I applied that 16.8 percent to the general site and site prep associated with Site 3 that had cost in it and applied 16.8 percent to each one of those costs, and came up with a total IDOT -- that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

would be costs attributed to IDOT of 124,676 .
Q. Okay. And that number is shown at the bottom row of Table 1, 207-22, task bucket Site 3, general, site preparation?
A. Yes.
Q. Moving to Site 6, general Site 6/site preparation, the rows on the bottom of this page you have the percent item attribution for Site 6 as being 5.5 percent. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you arrive at 5.5 percent?
A. Again, $I$ took the total construction cost that was provided that Mr . Dorgan used in his report of $1,232,059$, and then added the cells that he used in his calculation but using my cost associated with allocated to IDOT.
Q. Okay. Do you know cells those were? Would it include the Waukegan waterline? Was the Waukegan waterline one of those cells?
A. I don't have it written specifically which cells they were being applied from.
Q. Okay.
A. I can go back into Mr. Dorgan's report,

[^20]and then it would be the same calculation.
Q. Okay. So, let's go through these and we'll compare it to the percentages that Mr. Dorgan came up with in his calculation so we get an idea how these two match up.

But for now, how did you arrive at the 5.5 percent attribution?
A. Taking the total construction costs for Site 6 and divided it into my IDOT allocations for those total construction costs as attributed to IDOT and came up with 5.5.
Q. And then what did you do with the 5.5?
A. I applied it to the individual cells with the insight for the general site prep.
Q. Okay. So, you're assessing 5.5 percent for Site 6 general site/site preparation costs to IDOT?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you come up with what amount?
A. Total amount attributed to IDOT is 6,538.
Q. No.
A. I'm sorry 44,403.
Q. Correct. We'll got there. And, so, Sites 3 and 6, you came up with a percent IDOT attribution
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of 8.8 percent?
A. Correct.
Q. Was that determined through the same method you had described?
A. Yes, and that Mr. Dorgan used.
Q. And then you applied that percentage?
A. To the cell that had the cost in it and came up with IDOT attribute of 6,538.
Q. Okay. Let's, if we can, pull out Mr. Dorgan's appendix $F$, I believe. I have a hard time reading this one. We may not stay here.

It is Exhibit 204. Can you find where Mr. Dorgan did a similar analysis for general site/site preparation on his -- in his figures?
A. Yes.
Q. Where is that?
A. 204-110.
Q. 204-110?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, 204-110, Mr. Dorgan's Exhibit F, and your Table 1, 207-24, is a similar methodology in using the same construction costs and using the same overall general site/site preparation; is that correct?
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A. Yes, it utilizes the total construction cost, utilizing individually what we assessed IDOT's responsibility costs, coming up with a percentage for those areas and applying those percentages to the cost for the general site/site prep.
Q. Okay. So, for Site 3, you come up with a percentage of 16.8 percent; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And what is the percentage that Mr . Dorgan arrived at?
A. 74.2 percent.
Q. Okay. And, so, you each applied that percentage to the cost with your respective IDOT allocations?
A. Yes, for the general site/site prep.
Q. Okay. And obviously the figures are different because the percentage allocation is different?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And the 74.2 percent for Mr. Dorgan, and the 16.8 percent for you, is based on your analysis of earlier allocation of task?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So, that general methodology was
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applied to the general site/site preparation, and it was also applied to the health and safety expenses?
A. The same methodology of how it's calculated for his and mine.
Q. Okay. So, turning to 207.24, your Table 1, so for Site 3 -- excuse me, for health and safety, the costs are allocated to Sites 3 and 6; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you applied that same percentage, 8.8 percent, to the Site 3 and 6, health and safety costs?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So that same percentage applies to the Site 6 overall calculation?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. What are those?
A. It would be the costs associated with the health and safety plan and the potential of monitoring the work in regards to safety. Costs associated with that would be applied to safety with how they charged in their system.
Q. Okay. And applying 8.8 percent to the overall total cost of 77,000 , you come up with what

[^21]amount?
A. 6,776 .
Q. And turning to Mr. Dorgan's Exhibit F, 204-110, his percentage for IDOT attribution for Site 3 and 6 is 63.1 percent.

Am I reading that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So, he came up with a 63.1 IDOT attribution, based on whatever he did, and he applied that, that same percentage?
A. Correct.
Q. Same methodology, different percentage?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, similarly, task bucket EPA oversight, what are EPA oversight costs?
A. It's the cost the USEPA was charging for their review.
Q. Okay. And those could not be assigned to a particular job. It applied to the whole area.

So, did you follow the same methodology for the EPA oversight of costs?
A. Yes, it was the same calculation that we used in the general site/site prep for Site 3; and the calculation that was used for Site 6,

[^22]16.8 percent for Site 3, and 5.5 percent for Site 6 .
Q. And you're looking at 207-25?
A. I'm looking at 207-24, which is at the bottom beginning with "The general site/site prep."
Q. Right.
A. Those percentages are applied into the EPA oversight cost, in regards to their cost associated for Site 3 and for Site 6.
Q. Okay. And, similarly, port services cost, how did you figure out IDOT's attribution?
A. Again, there's a calculation we had at the bottom of the table that is identical to what Mr. Dorgan did, and was explained by Mr. Dorgan in his testimony, in regards to the total cost for the utility work, which is divided into; and then the total cost of Site 6 utility work, and any amount that I applied for IDOT's allocations.

And then there's a cost for Sites 3 and 6 utility work, and a cost for what I attributed to IDOT regarding that, and the total for those different areas. Utility work was 1,638,836 for the total cost of the utility work that JM did.

The amount regarding those same areas that we pulled those off from, IDOT -- the cost
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attributed to IDOT was 190,281.
Q. Okay. Do you know offhand what utilities were involved in determining the total cost for utility work?
A. It included -- it was with regards to the legal work associated with easements and other agreements for Sites 3 and utility work.

I didn't define the specific utilities that applied to it. I adjusted it as the general site and site prep.

I utilized the same areas or buckets that Mr. Dorgan used in calculating -- coming up with those totals and used the same allocations that were percentages regarding those and creating those totals attributed to IDOT.

It wasn't specifically written, the exact cells from each location within the table.
Q. Okay.
A. It was presented in the demonstrative that was provided by Mr. Dorgan. It was done exactly the same way.
Q. Okay. So, the total IDOT attribute for utility work is how much?
A. The percentage that $I$ came up with at 11.6

[^23]percent, and it came up to the IDOT's -- the cost attributed to IDOT as 8,333.
Q. Correct. Okay. And turning to Mr. Dorgan's Exhibit F, 204-111, what percent IDOT attribution did he come up with?
A. 47.5 percent.
Q. Okay. And you came up with 11.6 percent; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then that 11.6 percent, just like the others, you applied that to the legal services?
A. Correct.
Q. And came up with?
A. 8,333.
Q. Okay. I would like to turn to 207-10.

Are you there?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. So, what is this chart or table on 207-10?
A. It's the summary table of all the costs attributed to IDOT regarding individual task buckets that were processed and developed in the table that we just talked about.
Q. Okay. So, this summary includes all the things that we've gone through yesterday and today,
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regarding the breakdown of each of the task buckets, what IDOT attributed to the task bucket?
Q. So, let's walk through this to come up with a total that you arrived at for IDOT attribution.

So, starting -- and this is a summary of everything we've been walking through since yesterday and today?
A. Yes, it reflects the cost attributed to IDOT for each bucket list for each column for cost of Site 3, cost for Site 6 and the cost for the area defined as Sites 3 and 6.
Q. So, for Nicor Gas, which is the first line, that was a task bucket?
A. Correct.
Q. How much did you attribute to IDOT for Nicor Gas?
A. It attributed the cost of Nicor gas is in the defined area.
Q. And the City of Waukegan waterline, how much cost that you attribute to IDOT?
A. I didn't attribute any cost to the Waukegan waterline because it crossed 0393 outside of the defined boring location.

[^24]Q. And for AT\&T, which is the third line in your summary chart?
A. I attributed a total cost of 31,303 .
Q. Okay. And for utilities/ACM excavation?
A. I attributed a total cost of 5,591.
Q. And for North Shore Gas, what was your attribution?
A. I attributed 153,385.
Q. And the northeast excavation, what was your total attribution to IDOT?
A. Northeast excavation that was attributed 12,583.
Q. And what was dewatering?
A. Dewatering was attributed to IDOT of 102,734.
Q. Frack?
A. Frack was not attributed to IDOT.
Q. Filling and capping?
A. Filling and capping costs was 57,537.
Q. General site/site preparation?
A. The cost attributed to IDOT was 175,617 .
Q. Health and safety cost?
A. Health and safety was 6,776.
Q. USEPA oversight cost?
\[
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A. The cost to IDOT was 46,191 .
Q. Legal support?
A. Legal support costs contributed to IDOT 3,133.
Q. And all of those were how much?
A. Total cost attributed to IDOT was 600,050 .
Q. What is your opinion -- I'll withdrew the question. Let me rephrase that.

Did you reach this opinion to a reasonable degree of professional certainty, or whatever the magic expert language is?
A. Yes, based upon the information I had at the time of creating this information.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: If I can just take a quick break to review my notes. I think I'm done. Let me confer with counsel.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Nobody leave the room.
(Recess taken.)
MS. O'LAUGHLIN: We have no further questions of Mr. Gobelman in our direct examination.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I think we've agreed we're going to take an hour lunch, and we're going to be back here at 1:05, and we'll see you then.
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Thank you.
(Recess taken.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're back on the record now. It's approximately 1:15. Mr. Gobelman is still on the stand under oath. Susan Brice, the attorney, is continuing cross.

MS. BRICE: Just before I start, I'm just renewing my continuing objection with respect to Mr. Gobelman and his map and figures.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: And the record so notes. Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Okay. Mr. Gobelman, you were the expert during the initial hearing on liability in this case; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you offered a number of opinions in your expert report at the hearing, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you testified you were 100-percent correct about those opinions, didn't you?
A. Not 100 percent, within a reasonable degree of certainty.
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Q. Okay. If you would open the exhibit in front of you. I think it needs to be attributed to -- I'm handing you what is the deposition transcript from the first hearing June 23rd of 2016.

> Do you remember testifying on that day?
A. No.
Q. Do you remember testifying in the first hearing?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If you could turn, please, to page 26 of this document. Let me know when you are there.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm on page line 21 , page 26. It says, "Question: Okay. Well, I think when we discussed earlier at the very beginning of your cross-examination, you had testified that your opinions, all of your opinions, were reached to a higher percent degree of certainty.
"Do you recall that?
"Answer: Yeah, I consider that would be a reasonable degree of high expert certainty.
"Question: A 100 percent certainty?
"Answer: Same thing.
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'Question: A reasonable degree of
scientific certainty and 100-percent certainty are the same thing?
"Answer: Uh-huh, in my mind, they work." Do you recall that testimony?
A. I don't remember it. It is what it is.
Q. But it is here in this transcript, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you. The Board disagreed with some of your opinions in your expert report and your opinions in the hearing, right?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Well, the Board -- you said that there was no liability associated with IDOT. Is that your opinion?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And the Board found that IDOT wasn't liable, did it not? Is that yes or no?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, what you say it's possible for IDOT to have buried ACM at site 3 and 6 . The Board found that IDOT did, in fact, buried ACM in those locations, didn't it?

[^25]A. I would say the Board found that IDOT was liable for certain borings associated within certain sites within the right-of-way.
Q. Again, you are being offered as an expert in the damages phase of this case, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are -- you reached a number of opinions; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I would like for you to turn to Exhibit 205. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And this is your initial expert report dated August 22nd, 2018; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you wrote this report, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you changed your opinions as of that date, August 22nd, 2018, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you maintain that those opinions were 100 percent correct, didn't you?
A. I think I said within a reasonable degree of certainty.
\[
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Q. Okay. You said, did you not, that you were 100 percent -- you weren't sure that they were a 100 percent certainty?
A. I don't believe I testified to that.
Q. Okay. Let's open your deposition. We're going to Gobelman Exhibit 1, the deposition that was taken. I believe everyone should have the deposition in front of you them. And we're turning to page 48.

Gobelman 1 is dated --
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Exhibit 29?
MS. BRICE: Sorry. Exhibit 229A. And we're going to the page number 48.

And, Mr. Horan, let me know if my page numbers are off. I think they are right.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes, they are right. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. If you could go to 48, line 9. Do you recall having your deposition taken in this matter?
A. Yes.
Q. Your deposition was taken ON two occasions in this matter, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And in the first deposition on page
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48, line 8, it says, "Question: Are you 100-percent certain that you were last time?
"Answer: 100-percent certain, within a reasonable degree of scientific certainty.
"Question: Okay. What does that mean?
"Answer: I am pretty confident that my approach is accurate.
"Okay. So, give me a percentage of certainty.
"Answer: You want to go to percent, I'll go 100 percent with you.
"Question: Okay. So, there's room for doubt that your opinions are incorrect or inaccurate in any way?
"Answer: The approach is correct."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that was from your first deposition in this case; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In the deposition, you talked about earlier in your cost attribution opinion, from this report that you said was 100 -percent accurate in your deposition, turned out not to be accurate;

[^26]isn't that true?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. In fact, Mr. Dorgan provided your August report, pointing out problems in your report; did he not?
A. He rebutted the report, yes.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Maybe if
Mr. Gobelman will speak up.
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. I'm going to rephrase it again.

Mr. Dorgan rebutted your report, pointing out various problems with your report; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And in response, you changed some of your opinions, didn't you?
A. I don't believe I changed my opinions. I changed the location of right-of-way 0393.
Q. But in changing the location of the right-of-way of 0393, your numbers, your opinion numbers, increased $\$ 100,000$ from 400 and something thousand dollars; isn't that the case?
A.: Yes, I allocated more costs.
Q. If you could turn to 207 in your report. In the binder, sorry. This is your report dated

[^27]November 7th, 2018.
This is a supplemental report, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. This is a supplemental report that you wrote after receiving information from Mr. Dorgan; is that right?
A. After $I$ was aware that the right-of-way was marked in the wrong location, yes.
Q. It changes your matrix, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that changes some of your cost attributions also?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Once again, you maintain that these figures and opinions in 207 are 100 percent correct; is that right?
A. I'm not sure what language you are using with regard to that.
Q. Okay. Let's take out your second deposition, which is 229D. We're going to page 3, I believe. I'm sorry, we're going to page 30 of this second deposition on February 7th, 2019, page 30.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: They are off again, Ms. Brice.
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MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Can you give us the number?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I believe it's 229D. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. $229 \mathrm{D}-31$.
A. Okay.
Q. And I'm going to the top of the page of 30, and we're talking about your second report, and I say -- and you do remember being deposed a second time, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You argue "You are 100-percent certain that Figure 1.8 -- Figures 1 through 8 that came in the supplemental report are correct?
"Answer: Yes."
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You haven't issued any new reports, have you, after this supplemental report Exhibit 207; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. You used to work for IDOT; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. How long did you work for IDOT?
A. 22 years.
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Q. And now you work for Andrews Engineering, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is IDOT currently your client at Andrews Engineering?
A. They are a client.
Q. Are they are your client? Did you get the money off of the work you did for IDOT?
A. I get nothing for the work I do for IDOT, other than what I get here.
Q. Okay. Now, your bonus at Andrews is based upon how many hours you bill, correct?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to your first deposition, page 60. The statement in your deposition is accurate; is that correct?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. And I have here -- give me a second. Sorry about that. My bad. We're going to line 10.

It says, "Okay. And what's involved in your bonus" is the question.
"Answer: I believe it's based on the availability. Availability. How high a percentage you are available at being profitable and your
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management of your project."
Do you see that?
A. I don't know what page you are on.
Q. Page 50, line 10.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you dispute you said that in your deposition?
A. No.
Q. Isn't it true that more than half your work at Andrews comes from IDOT?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Turn to page 49 of the same report, line 19, and it says, "Okay. What percentage of your work do you do for IDOT?
"Answer: I would suspect it's probably somewhere 50 percent, 60 percent, I guess."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. As I understand it, the expertise you are relying on, in offering your opinions today, is your experience dealing with evaluating costs on Highway Authority and agreements with the USEPA; is

[^28]that right?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Turn to page 15 of this same report -- of the deposition, please. If you go to line 17 -- well, let me go to line 18.

It says, "What experience are you relying on in offering these opinions?
"Answer: Well, my experience in dealing with evaluating costs of Highway Authority agreements, and I am done dealing with my work with the Highway Authority."

Do you see that?
MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Where are you?
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. I'm on 229, line 18. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You have no experience doing a cost allocation between these litigants under CERCLA or state law, correct?
A. I probably can't remember if I have done work under state law.
Q. Okay. I can show you your deposition where you say that. Yes or no?

```
A. I don't recall.
```

[^29]Q. Okay. Turn to page 16, please. I would like you to go to lines 1 through 4, "Do you have any experience doing cost allocation under CERCLA or state law?
"Not specifically regarding state
allocation, right. I'd say 'no.'"
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know what the Gore Facters are?
A. Yes.
Q. Tell me what they are.
A. I believe they have to do with, you know, the cost factors.
Q. What are the factors?
A. I don't remember all the factors.
Q. You don't know?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. There is a number of maps and figures in your expert report that are based on surveys, correct?
A. I wouldn't necessary say they were surveys. There were some surveys that were included.
Q. Some of the maps you report are surveys,

[^30]in part; is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that an appropriate way of saying it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you don't have experience creating surveys, do you?
A. No.
Q. You don't dispute Mr. Dorgan's
qualifications for offering the opinions contained in his report, do you?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You have to stand up and shout.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I'm sorry. Objection, he did not offer an opinion on Mr. Dorgan's qualifications.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'll overrule her. Mr. Gobelman can answer, if he's able.

THE WITNESS: I have no opinion on the qualifications. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Do you have any reason to dispute his qualifications?
A. No.
Q. Turn to 204 in your binder, please. What
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is this?
A. It is Mr. Dorgan's expert report on damage attributed to IDOT.
Q. I'm going to ask you a series of questions together, just to make this go fast, and I don't think you'll have a problem with it, because we already talked about it.

You agree with Mr. Dorgan on the amount of the cost incurred by JM and that these costs were reasonable and paid; is that correct?
A. I agree that the amount of costs that they were paid, because they were paid by JM.
Q. And that they are reasonable?
A. I assume Johns Mansville would have made the determination of reasonability.
Q. But you're not disputing that they are reasonable, correct?
A. I'm accepting that if they were paid, they are accurate.
Q. Do you agree with how Mr . Dorgan placed the costs in the various task buckets?
A. What?
Q. Do you agree with Mr . Dorgan how he placed the costs in the various task buckets, correct?

[^31]A. Yes, I agree.
Q. And you used the same 13 task buckets to do your own calculation, right?
A. Yes, I used the same allocation.
Q. And you agreed with the amount of money that went into each task bucket.

So, therefore, you guys used a similar methodology in reaching your attribution?
A. Correct, we utilized the same protocol for JM.
Q. And just to be perfectly clear, he's got -- in the back of his report, he's got Exhibit B, which came from Dr. Ebihara; Exhibit C, which came from Peterson; and Exhibit D that -- let me back up.

C is a cross tabulation. C is from
Peterson. It is a cross tabulation. D is the management invoice table. $E$ is the job manual.

You don't have a dispute with any of those documents in his report, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. What you guys are disputing are the attributions in Exhibit S, correct?
A. How I attributed costs.
Q. As I understand it, your only problem with
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Dorgan's Figure 1 -- if you want to take a look at it is 204-38.

I'm talking about Dorgan's Figure 1,
Exhibit 204-38, and my question is: My
understanding is that your only dispute with
Dorgan's Figure 1 is that you didn't know the sorce of the material for the figures"; is that correct?
A. I don't think I used that term. My problem was that it didn't lay out when I was aligning it with the actual survey and the figure in the final report. What they did on the location of Site 3 and layed it on top of it.
Q. Turn to your first deposition, if you would, please, the earlier deposition that we had and turn to page 14. I'm going to line 22.

And it says, "Question: But your problem with Figure 1 is he doesn't identify the source material within which he used to create the figures; is that what you said?
"Answer: And the source materials, how did they come up with it?
"Question: Would that be the same issue with respect to Figure 3 and Figure 4?
"Answer: Yes.
"Question: And no other specific problems in Figure 3 or Figure 4?
"No, I don't notice anything."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Turn back to 204-38, please, and I would like to direct your attention to the very bottom of 204-38. 204-38 is your Figure 1 that we were just talking about; is it not?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you see at the bottom it says, "Note: Site layout drawings by AECOM."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had this document, this 204.38 in your possession. At the time you wrote your Report, it didn't show up, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Your August and November report both contained opinions, right?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Your August and November report both contained opinions, correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. Is there one that contains your current opinion, or do I need to look at both of them to extract the opinions?
A. To extract the -- the second report only changed the allocations for change because of the change in the location of the right-of-way.

So, you would have to look at -- if you wanted to see the full IDOT allocation description, you would have to look at both reports.
Q. You described your methodology for coming up with the opinions in your report as percent of impact versus the area; isn't that right?
A. I don't know if $I$ said that.
Q. If you want to take a look at your first deposition again on page 45, and I'm going to line 12, and it says, in response to, "okay. What did you tell -- I'm looking at this as dealing with the cost allocation using percentage of impact versus the area."

Do you remember that?
A. I don't remember it, but it's written.
Q. Do you dispute that you said that?
A. If it's written, I don't.
Q. You say, "This method accounts only for

[^32]the area that the Board specifically identified." Is that right?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to 45 and at line 15 it says, "And why is that? Why did you decide to use percentage impact?
"Answer: To me, it was a change to be an appropriate way of looking at things, as far as if there are specific areas that the Board should rule that IDOT is liable for.
"IDOT should only be accounting for that area impacted within their area." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you please provide me with a treatise, or any form of peer reviewed literature, that discusses this impact methodology?
A. Not off the top of my head.
Q. In fact, you didn't look at how courts allocate response costs in environmental cases before writing your report, did you?
A. I did not look at any court papers.
Q. Well, that wasn't my question. My question is: You didn't look at how courts allocate response costs in environmental cases, did you?
\[
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A. I didn't review any.
Q. And you didn't think to look at other ways to approach cost attribution in the case; isn't that right?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Turn to page 46 in your first deposition. We're going to line 3, and it says, "And how does -- did you consider any other approaches, other than looking at what you described as a percentage in task?"
"Answer: No. I don't think I came up with any other approaches."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's take a more granular look at your methodology. You seem to limit your IDOT Areas of Liability to areas immediately surrounding soil borings specifically identified by the Board as being attributed to IDOT; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So, let's just take one short example. Turn to 207-5 in your supplemental record. I want to direct your attention to the North Shore Gas line, the section on Site 6.

[^33]You come up with 72 linear feet is the IDOT responsibility, because the North Shore gas line on Site 6 only touches boring 4S; is that correct?
A. No.
Q. No? Okay. You want to tell me how that is not the case?
A. I state that it's around soil location 4S.
Q. And on the next page, it says, "It is just east of soil sample $4 \mathrm{~S}^{\prime \prime}$; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And your opinion doesn't consider causation, does it?
A. No.
Q. And it doesn't consider what would actually be describing USEPA's choice of remedy, does it?
A. No.
Q. You've read the enforcement action, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it focused on corridors for underground utilities to ensure the utility workers were not later exposed to asbestos, correct?

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

A. Correct.
Q. So, it was not just concerned with asbestos around a single bore, was it?
A. As far as what JM had to do is resolve the bore and and what is the significance of IDOT.

I'm trying to figure out --
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We've gone all
afternoon. This is the same setup.
MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Can we go off the record?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)

BY MS. O'LAUGHLIN:
Q. I'm talking about the enforcement action memorandum itself, okay?

It was focused on creating clean corridors around underground utilities, to ensure the utility workers were not later exposed to asbestos. And you said, "Yes.

And then I said, "So 'it'" meaning the enforcement action memorandum, "was not just concerned with asbestos around a single boring, was it?"
A. Correct, but it involved all impacts of
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asbestos that were attributed to Johns Mansville, and I'm only looking at the asbestos that are attributed to -- that IDOT is responsible to.

MS. BRICE: I move to strike as nonresponsive. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. I think I heard you say earlier in this case that you are not an expert in AutoCAD; is that correct?
A. Right.
Q. And you've only, as I understand it, played around with it in dealing with simple stuff; is that right?
A. In essence, yes.
Q. But your expert reports for the base of this case relied heavily on base maps and figures created in AutoCAD, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you relied on Mr. Nguyen, and I'll spell that for you, Court Reporter. It's $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{y}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{n}$. To use autoCAD cast to mark the map configures in your report; is that right?
A. He did the AutoCAD for me, yes.
Q. If you could turn to 229S, right after -actually, after 204, and a few back behind that,

[^34]229s-377.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. Have you seen this document before?
A. Not before the hearing.
Q. Not before this hearing? So, you weren't given a copy of this document at any point in time?
A. This document as it exists on paper here, no.
Q. Okay. Were you given, at a certain point, an AutoCAD -- like a thumb drive that had AutoCAD drawings on it in an AutoCAD file, an DWG file, that had been given to JM -- to IDOT's counsel?

Were you given that?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. I believe earlier in the hearing there was some testimony that that wasn't provided before you wrote your expert report.

Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is that your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I would like to mark Exhibit 66-99, which also happens to be Exhibit 205-46. I have it here on the Board, and I'll hand this to you,

[^35]Mr. Gobelman.
(Said document was marked as Exhibit No. 6699 for
identification.)
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. This is a document that you used in your expert report, correct, 205-46?
A. Yes.
Q. And you used it to -- tell us what you used it for?
A. I used it to deal out the lateral locations of $1 S$ through 9 in Site 6.
Q. Okay. I would like you to turn that document on its side and tell me if this is an AutoCAD document, does it have a DWG reference on it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, you had this AutoCAD document in your possession, prior to writing your first report, Exhibit 205; is that right?
A. I did not have the AutoCAD document in my possession when I wrote the first report.
Q. You had that document --
A. I had a pdf of the document in the report.

[^36]Q. Right. But you knew that that was an AutoCAD-generated document, because it said it was it an DWG file, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you ask right away, "Hey, can I get these auto cad files"?
A. No.
Q. If you could turn to 225 in your binder, please, and I will represent for the record that these are also actually -- hold on, let me back up. I might be confusing things.

It's in the binder that we gave to you, Mr. Gobelman's binder. Actually, let's just stay with 66. I think they are in this document as well, which has already been admitted. Okay?

So, there are --
A. Where am I supposed to be?
Q. I want you to look at Exhibit 66-73, 66-99, 66-74 and 75. Okay? So, these are Exhibits 66.

I'll represent, for the record, these are from that same document for the remedial actual work Plan Revision 2, which you used one of them in your reports.

[^37]And then if you turn to 225, this is also from that report, $I$ will represent for the record, and it does not have a Bates number on it, but it is from that same report, and you can see the Bates number for Exhibit 225-1110. Okay?

Do you see these documents? Are these AutoCAD documents?
A. All the pdfs in all the reports are AutoCAD documents.
Q. So, these were in your possession at the time you wrote Exhibit 205?
A. I had in my possession the pdfs that were in the report, yes.
Q. That were generated in AutoCAD, correct?
A. They were generated by somebody else in AutoCAD, yes.
Q. Let's talk about your two pages back. First, let's turn to 205-22, which is your initial base map.

MS. BRICE: Mr. Halloran, all of these are in that binder that we gave you. Everything that I'm talking about should be in that binder. Okay? BY MS. BRICE:
Q. So, Exhibit 205-22 is your initial base

[^38]map; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then turn the page to 207-13, which is the supplemental base map; is that correct?

I believe you testified about this extensively earlier.
A. Yes.
Q. So, these two base maps, as I understand it, serve as a foundation for the figures that follow them in each of the respective reports; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So, all of your attribution opinions are tied to these base maps and figures, correct, understanding that 207 trumps 205 in certain situations?
A. Yes.
Q. So, it follows, then, does it not, if your base map and figures are inaccurate, then calculations you made, based been inaccuracies, are also inaccurate; isn't that the case?
A. It would be different, yes.
Q. Okay. Stick with 205-22 for a moment. You testified earlier at the first hearing you

[^39]determined various maps and the records did not line up; is that right, in the first report?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, you concluded that the maps the Board relied on, in determining where IDOT was liable at the first hearing, were inaccurate; isn't that right?
A. I didn't make any proof of inaccuracy. I was just saying they weren't consistent in the way they lined up.
Q. Okay. Well, let's go to your deposition, the first deposition on page 63, and then line 10, please.

The question is: "Based upon your opinion in this report, your current report, you're saying that the maps the Board was using to render its opinion were not accrrate?
"Answer: If you are utilizing my base map, then yes, those maps would -- I would have deemed them as being inaccurate." Do you deny saying that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And those maps relied upon by the Board were based on materials submitted by AECOM to USEPA,
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correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And approved by USEPA, United States Environmental Protection Agency?
A. Yes, they were approved.
Q. And, nonetheless, you and your colleague, Mr. Nguyen, decided to create your own new maps from scratch; isn't that right?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Turn to page 55 of your deposition, please, the first deposition, and I am on line 5, page 55, line 5.

I'm sorry, it's actually line 3. "What is your point you're trying to make here in Section 5.1?
"In essence, the point is without having a base map that $I$ can depend on, I created one, in essence, from scratch, based upon the information from various reports, because the rest of my dealings was going to be based upon that base map and I needed to have it as accurate as I thought it could be."

Do you deny saying that in your
deposition?

[^40]A. No.
Q. And you've never created a base map before, have you?
A. I'm not sure what context you are using as "creation."
Q. Well, it's something you've never done before creating your own map -- let me ask it this way: Have you ever created a map just on features and boundaries on a property that USEPA has already approved a map where those features and boundaries have been placed?
A. Not that I remember.
Q. Let's look at 205 -- to base map 205-22. Sorry, I apologize.

Let's go to 202, which we talked about a lot, and this is further back in the middle section of the binder.
A. What was that again?
Q. 202. Are you there, Mr. Gobelman?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What is this document, sir?
A. The document that $I$ created that would show the areas where asbestos-containing material was found throughout the site.

[^41]Q. And this is from the first hearing, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. This was presented to the Board as evidence in the first hearing?
A. Correct.
Q. After the Board issued its decision, you determined this very same map was inaccurate, correct?
A. I determined that Site 3 depicted in this map didn't line up with other information that $I$ had regarding the boundaries in Site 3.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to 205-22, which is the base map.

Would it be helpful for me to put it up on
the easel?
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Sure.
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. 205-22 is the original base map from the first report?
A. Yes.
Q. On this map that you created, I believe you testified that you used the northern boundary on Site 3 from where it was located on the map used in

L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C.

the first hearing, including 202, about 10 feet to the north; is that correct?
A. I moved the boundary to the north because the three maps that $I$ compared to didn't have good relationships to each other; and, therefore, I moved -- I decided in order to allocate the cost, I would just use the end line of Site 3 as the boundary of Site 3.
Q. Okay. The question is more simple than that. You moved -- turn to 202. On 205-22 you moved the northern boundary about 10 feet to the north, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. As I understand it, and you just said you moved it to where you thought it would co-exist with a fence that you claim you saw on a Google image; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But you weren't sure that that was exactly accurate, were you, about it being co-extensive -the northern boundary being co-extensive with the fence line?

You weren't 100-percent sure that that was accurate, were you?

[^42]A. No, I thought I was accurate, but that is where I put the northern boundary was on the fence line.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to your deposition, page 58, please. This is the first deposition again, and I'm on page 58 line 4.
"The fence line" -- tell me if you are there.
A. I am.
Q. Okay. "The fence line is demarking" -this is your answer, "The fence line is demarkating that somewhere inside that fence line of Site 3. Whether it's accurate that the boundary of Site 3 is actually on the fence line, there is no information on that.
"Question: Okay.
"Answer: I'm just making that as an assumption, and I'm making it to Site 3 is the fence line."

```
            Did you say that?
```

A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then just for -- let's just go to page 60, also, and then lines 4 through 9. So, "Answer: The assumption that I'm making is that the

[^43]fence encompasses Site 3.
"Question: Encompasses is different from being on Site 3 boundary, though.
"Answer: It can be on the GAFK site re-boundary. I don't know."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Even though you didn't know, you put it there anyway, didn't you?
A. Yes, at the time it was a bad representation.
Q. And you then tied the location of many Site 3 boundaries, such as boring locations, to this new northern boundary of Site 3 on 205-22; isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. 205-22 wasn't your first draft of your base map, for the second base map?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Let's look at 221 in your binder. Do you see this?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What is this document?
A. I believe it was a pdf that we had laid

[^44]into the site.
Q. Okay. So, this is a document -- I'll note to the bottom it says, "SG003644."

So, this was produced by you, correct?
A. I guess. I don't know.
Q. But it says "Andrews Engineering" on it, does it not?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What's the date on there? I believe it says April 2018. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that's before your first damages report in this case, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And this document has state plane coordinates on it, does it not?
A. Yes.
Q. But you didn't use this map, did you --
A. That was --
Q. Can I finish my question? This is not the same as 205-22, is it?
A. No.
Q. Do you know who Don L. Jenkins is?
A. No.

[^45]Q. So, it turns out, as we've discussed, you made some mistakes when you created 205-22, and Mr. Dorgan pointed these out.

In fact, the northern boundary of Site 3 is not co-extensive with the fence, is it?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So, everything tied to the northern boundary in Site 3 was also misplaced on 205-22; isn't that right?
A. The borings within the right-of-way were tied to the northern boundary of what $I$ would have called Site 3. So, they were moved. When I moved it up, it moved up.
Q. Okay. So, just to be clear, so everything you had tied to the northern boundary of Site 3 was also misplaced on 205-22? It locked it into the northern boundary?
A. The borings within 0393, yes.
Q. Let's look at your second base map again, 207-13. This is your corrected base map, right?
A. Yes.
Q. By correcting the base map, your IDOT attributions went up, as we previously discussed, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. They went from about 489,000 to about $\$ 600,050$, right, roughly?
A. Roughly.
Q. And that's because when you moved Site 3 boundary north on 205-22, it impacted how much of the work was tied to the IDOT -- your IDOT area of liability, correct?
A. Yes, it affected some of the areas.
Q. Take a look at, just by way of example, 205-26, which is your North Shore Gas Line IDOT area of liability?
A. Yes.
Q. And then pull up the same one for 207, which I believe is 207-17. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, on 205-26, what was the square footage of your Site 3 IDOT area of liability for North Shore Gas?
A. On 205?
Q. 205-26.
A. The area on the outside of 0339 --
Q. Inside. Inside the green. 3278, do you see that?

[^46]A. Yes.
Q. And is that site 3 IDOT area of liability square footage for the North Shore Gas Line based on this map?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. So, then, as we said, going back to 207-17, I would like you to answer the same question with respect to 207-17.

What is the square footage?
A. The square footage that I'm attributing to IDOT is -- it looks like 4271. That is also I'm assessing a larger area beyond the D326, were in the original photo, the allocation for IDOT ended prior to D326.
Q. Right.
A. The area becomes larger, because of the way that is allocated.
Q. But it becomes larger because of what changes you had to make in the map because in the first map, it was a smaller area of liability; but after you made the change, it was a larger area of liability, correct?
A. Yes, it changed.
Q. Now, I have a question here: Once you

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

realized you needed to correct your initial base map 205-22, you didn't go back to Exhibit 202 from the first hearing, did you?
A. No.
Q. You didn't begin anew with other maps form the first hearing, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Instead you used 205-22 as your starting point, and that had Mr . Nguyen make some changes to it; is that accurate?
A. I changed the location of the right-of-way.
Q. Okay. And anything tied to the northern boundary of Site 3; isn't that correct?
A. It applied -- it moved the northern boundary of Site 3 south ending.
Q. Right. But you started with 205-22. You didn't start with a new map and go back and create something new.

You just started with 205-22 and moved things at 205-22 to come up with 207-13?
A. Correct.
Q. As $I$ understand it, you don't have an opinion at this point on the accuracy of the AECOM

[^47]maps contained in the final report; is that right?
A. I don't have an opinion regarding the map on the final report.
Q. So, for creating these base maps, and I think you described it in 205, is that correct, the sources you relied upon?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm just going to -- if you want to turn to 205-7, it might make it easier for sake of reference. Okay?

So, I have it here. You say that you used a legal description to plot parcel 0339; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you used the IDOT as-built to plot the stationing; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you used ELM-15, which is 205-45, to plot the site 3 borings, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you used AECOM map 66-99, which we had up on the board here. You used that one to plot the site 6 borings; is that correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. Okay. You also used that document to plot and scale the northeast excavation, right? I think that is on 205-8 up at the top.
A. Yes.
Q. And you used Mr. Dorgan's Figure 1, which is 204-38, that we talked about a lot in this case, to plot the AT\&T line, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And, finally, you used AECOM's final site survey to plot the North Shore gas line, the Waukegan waterline and the Nicor waterline; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you used the same sources for both maps, Exhibit 205-22 and 207-13; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. But you admit that some of these sources are inconsistent with one another, do you not?
A. The layout of Site 3 was inconsistent among the maps, yes.
Q. Let's turn to 205-43. Actually, I think it's 205-42. I apologize.

What is this document showing?
A. The layout I had created showing the site

[^48]3 layout based upon the final report, based on the northern easement that we had for the corners, the layout of the Atwell survey, and the layout of Mr. Dorgan's Site 3 limits.
Q. So, the point of this was to show certain of these maps were inconsistent with one another, right?
A. Yes, I made the assumption originally that the Atwell survey had to be more accurate than the others.
Q. Okay. But you used Dorgan 1 for the AT\&T lines, right?
A. It is the only map that $I$ had to show where the AT\&T lines were.
Q. I believe that the document that you have right there shows some of the 205-46. So, this shows some of the AT\&T line?
A. It shows some communication line.
Q. Okay, thank you. So, you used the Dorgan one for the AT\&T line, and you used the AECOM final site report for the location of the Nicor line, the North Shore gas line and the City of Waukegan line that's is green on this 205-42, correct?
A. Yes, but I also would represents this map
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of 205-46 only shows the partial area of Site 3, and not the entire area of Site 3, where all communication lines come in.
Q. Right. I understood. But I think when I showed you the rest of 66 previously, and the record will reflect what it reflects, but I believe the AT\&T lines are shown throughout 66, which you testified to previously that you had in your possession prior to drafting your expert report.

So, my point is that you used, to create your base map, the red line for some of your -- to locate certain things, and the green lines to locate some certain things, which you say are inconsistent with one another; is that right?
A. The location layout of Site 3 doesn't line up with each other.
Q. Go back to 205-22, please. If you read in the legend, $I$ can bring it up here to you, it says -- what does it say under No. 2? If you could read the legend No. 2 to me.
A. It says, "IDOT right-of-way 0393, land acquisition legal description and Atwell plat of the property surveyed July 22nd, 2018."
Q. Okay. And the Atwell -- hand me that
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back. You are referencing Exhibit 205-22, correct?
A. Exhibit 205-22, yes.
Q. And on looking at the three lines, the three Site 3 boundaries, the Atwell map is included, correct? That was 205-42?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you please provide your answer again, Mr. Gobelman?

Does the Atwell on 205-43 have the Atwell plat? 205-42.
A. Yes.
Q. Turn the page to 205-43, please, I believe you testified earlier, I'm not sure, that your map is this black dotted, the dashed line; is that correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. And that doesn't line up with the northern or eastern boundary on any of these other maps identified on 205-43, does it?
A. No.
Q. When creating a map from different sources, you need a common point of reference, right?
A. You need to be able to tie it into to
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something to make it work right.
Q. So, do you need a common point of reference?
A. Ideally, it would be nice that all the figures had the same plat that you could tie into.
Q. Okay. Let's turn to your deposition at page 85, please, line 8. Again, this is your first deposition.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: What page again?
MS. BRICE: 85.
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. The question is: "What's the reference that you -- well, would you agree you need to have a similar reference point in order to prepare different maps?"
"Answer: Uh-huh."
"Question: Right?
"Okay."
Then the court reporter said, "Is that a
'yes'?" And the witness says, "Yes. Sorry."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you deny saying that in your

```
deposition?
```

A. No.
Q. But you agree that Dorgan Figure 1 lacks a common point of reference with your base map? Do you remember talking about that?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Would you agree that Dorgan Figure 1 lacks a common point of reference with your base map?
A. Yes.
Q. Yet you used this to plot the AT\&T line, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I understand that you believe the most reliable way to plot the property is to GPS them in; is that right?
A. Yes, it's creating maps at the northeastern coordinates. It would be an accurate way of producing where they are at.
Q. What I asked is: The most reliable way to determine property boundaries is to GPS them in?

Is that something you believe?
A. I believe it's an accurate way of
depicting --
Q. Is it the most reliable way?
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A. I never compared reliability.
Q. Turn to page 79 in your deposition, and starting at line 17, and the question is: "Is there a more reliable way to determine property boundaries than this sort of manual overlay in CAD?
"Objection, vague and ambiguous.
"THE WITNESS: Well, if I have to -- I mean, in dealing with properties, you have legal descriptions that define the property boundaries, you can GPS them in to obtain corners and running a line down, determining what they are.
"Okay. Did you do that here?
"No."
Do you see that there, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. So, you didn't do that here, right, using the GPS?
A. No.
Q. When you prepared your initial base map, you used the CQM, which is Christopher Quail Mary final site survey; is that right?

You can turn to 205-45 right there.
Sorry, 47.
A. Okay.

[^49]Q. Okay. And you used this to place your key site figures, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. This is attached to your report, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So, there are northings,
$n-0-r-t-h-i-n-g-s$, and eastings, $e-a-s-t-i-n-g-s$, on this survey; isn't that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And where are those northings and eastings on this document? Can you please describe it for me?
A. The northern easements are shown at the corners of Site 3.
Q. Okay. And these were likely GPS'd in, then, I take it?
A. I would assume so.
Q. But you didn't rely on these GPS coordinates to geo locate the northern boundary of site 3, did you?
A. I utilized those coordinates in comparing it to the Atwell survey.
Q. That's not my question. You didn't use

[^50]these coordinates to create your northern boundary for Site 3 on 205-22, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. The Board's description -- the Board's decision, excuse me, describes IDOT's areas of liability? Scratch that. Sorry.

So, in some instances, the Board
identified certain boring locations in its decision, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So, the placement of the borings on your map is important, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's just turn back a couple pages to 205-45. What is this document?
A. It's a Figure 15 soil boring locations for

Site 3. It is Figure 15, soil boring location map
Site 3 from an ELM Consulting report.
Q. And this is a draft document, is it not?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is a document you used to locate your Site 3 borings, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this document says it's approximate
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boring locations. Does it not say that?
Down there under legend, "Approximate location." Do you want to blow it up?
"Approximate locations of surface and subsurface characterization boundary lines." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. He was pointing out that it says -- it doesn't say "Approximate locations of boring locations." It says, "Approximate locations of surface and subsurface characterization boundary lines."

So, it's an approximate location of the Site 3 boundary; is that right?
A. I'm not sure what it's representing.
Q. But you used this document?
A. Correct.
Q. And it doesn't have GPS locations on it, does it?
A. No.
Q. And it doesn't have grid -- any kind of grid or state plane coordinates on it, does it?
A. It doesn't have state plane coordinates.
Q. How about a grid, do you see a grid?
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Do you see a grid on this piece of paper?
A. The borings are gridded at that 50-foot spacing.
Q. Okay. That did not answer the question. Do you see a grid on this piece of paper?
A. Define "grid"?
Q. Define a grid? A grid with lines that go -- or the box that lines can go, you know, up and down and across horizontal and vertical.
A. I do not see horizontal and vertical lines.
Q. And you used this map, I understand, because you thought this is the best map that identified Site 3 borings in the record; is that right?
A. I used this map because it gave me measurable distances between the borings.
Q. Okay. Was this the best map that you could find that has the location of the borings on it?
A. It's the map I used.
Q. Okay. Let's go to page 98 of your deposition, please, and go to line 24. And, again, we're still on the first deposition.

[^51]I would like to -- I'm on page 98, down at the bottom line 24 , and I'm going to go up to page 99. It says, "Why did you use ELM-15, given everything we just talked about, to plot your borings?
"Answer: It was the best map that I could find that had the locations of those borings." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. 25-45 and ELM-15, correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. Take a look back at Exhibit 202, which we've talked about, which was your map presented at the first hearing.
A. Yes.
Q. This map has borings on it, doesn't it?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. But you didn't use this map to create your base map and figures, did you?
A. No, because this was just a pdf of a figure that I had received from Mr. Dorgan's report submitted. So, there was no geo spatial
representation on the figures. It was just a pdf scan.
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Q. Okay. But this is a map that you presented as evidence to the Board at the first hearing, to be relied upon by the Board as evidence, correct?
A. I provided this map of a markup of Mr. Dorgan's map.
Q. And you testified about it at the first hearing, correct?
A. The borings and circles contain the specimen-containing material.
Q. And you didn't use this map to generate your base map and figures. We've already discussed it, and you said, "Yes." I'm just going to move on.

If you can turn to 67, please. If you turn to 67, you'll see the first page is the Removal Action Work Plan Revision 4, and I would like you to go to 67-534, which is six or seven pages in. It's just an excerpt of the final removal action work plan.
A. Sorry?
Q. 57-534?
A. $57-534$ ?
Q. Yes. This is the final report, final removal action work plan, prepared by AECOM,

[^52]correct? Exhibit 67.
A. I believe so.
Q. It doesn't say "draft" on it, does it?
A. No.
Q. And this 67534 has boring locations -- B3 boring locations on it, does it not?
A. Yes.
Q. But you didn't use it, did you?
A. No.
Q. You just assumed that -- well, strike that.

Let's go back to 205-45, this document here, Figure 15, ELM-15 that we've been talking a lot about.

I want to talk about how you used this to plot your Site 3 borings. What is hand scaling?
A. Well, given that the boring locations are 50 feet apart from each other, so using that grid and the measurement from boundaries coming up where the locations the borings are located.
Q. My question is: What is hand scaling?
A. It's scaling off of a map and finding out the distance.
Q. So, it's actually measuring distances on a

[^53]map.
So, did you measure your distances to get your Site 3 boring off of a pdf of 205-45?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you do that with an engineer scale?
A. Most likely.
Q. And, so, did you use the scale here at the bottom as the scale to determine how far these borings were from certain points, such as the northern boundary or the western boundary? I believe that's what you testified about.
A. I believe I would have printed this map in a larger print page paper-wise, and put it wouldn't reduce -- it wouldn't mess the scaling, as it's represented on this figure so that it would be more accurate in its measurements.
Q. Okay. But that's not really my question. I'm asking what you did do, not what you might have done or could have done.
A. I did it.
Q. You know for sure you did that? You printed it larger?

[^54]A. I would have printed, you know, this pdf on a larger piece of paper, not having it scaled, having no scaling, so that it would be more accurate, and then measuring from the location where the borings are located.
Q. Okay. Did you talk about doing it like that in your report? Is there anything in your report that says that you blew this document up to correct for the scale?
A. I didn't discuss in detail how exactly I did it.
Q. I just want to make sure $I$ understand. So, if you took this map with these boundaries, and you measured with whatever scale you used, let's say -- let's just take a boring location.

Let's just take the third one in on the top row, third one in from the right. Okay? Because it's hard to read.
A. Okay.
Q. So, how did you plot that using your scaling? Can you walk me through that?
A. Well, I would have had to not necessarily rescale every single location. All I would have to do is confirm that the boring location, as the scale

[^55]says within the document, that the location stages between each boring is 50 feet.

So, once you confirm that that spacing in that top row are 50 feet apart, and that they are in a -- laterally on the same plane, then you can -the only thing you need do is scale off and mark and find the location of one boring, and then everything else would just lay in.
Q. Okay. But didn't you testify, just a little while ago, that you measured -- from the northern boundary of Site 3, you would measure down on the scale, and then you would measure from the western boundary on the scale to geo -- not geo locate. To locate the boring on this map; isn't that what you said?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay, thank you. In your supplemental report, you moved some Site 3 and 6 features, which we discussed, correct?
A. I'm not sure what you are referring to.
Q. Okay. Let's turn to 208, please, in your binder. And this is the expert rebuttal
supplemental report of Douglas G. Dorgan, Jr., on damages attributable to IDOT. Okay?

[^56]A. Yes.
Q. And I would like you to turn to 208-11.

Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. And this exhibit purports to depict certain features on sites 3 and 6, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't dispute the accuracy of this figure, do you?
A. I didn't have any opinion regarding those figures.
Q. Okay. Let's -- the figure compares where you place features in your initial August report with where you place them in your November supplemental report, and where $\mathbf{A E}$ Com and Mr . Dorgan placed them, correct?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection. This goes beyond direct examination of Mr . Gobelman. He didn't reference this document. You can make any point you want to through her witness.

Mr. Dorgan says he doesn't have an opinion on it, and it's beyond the scope of direct.

MS. BRICE: I would like to respond, if you don't mind. This is actually a critical document,
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and it has to with the boring locations on Site 6 and site 3, and how they've been changed, how they don't align with Mr. Dorgan and AE Com's location, and they talked the whole time about where he put his boring locations.

I don't understand how I can't cross-examine him on that. Mr. Halloran is going to speak.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. O'Laughlin, do you want to respond?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: It's the cross-examination of Mr. Gobelman of our direct. At any point she wants to make of Mr . Dorgan in his report, she can do so.

Mr. Gobelman already said he hasn't looked at the document. It's going beyond the direct, and she can make whatever argument she wants, but it's not proper.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Ms. Brice?
MS. BRICE: I will move on and make my point with Mr. Dorgan. Before he said he had no opinion about the document. He did not say he had never seen the document.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We can move on, Ms. Brice. Thank you.

MS. BRICE: Give me one second.
(Pause.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Let's go to 207-20, please. Tell me if you're there.
A. 207-20?
Q. Correct. Okay. Is this generally what you believe to be the IDOT area of liability?
A. In regards to the filling and capping allocation.
Q. Well, the maximum amount of the IDOT liability, is it depicting that; yes or no?

I'm not trying to trick you. That's my understanding.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, on Site 3, your IDOT area of liability involves the eastern portion of 0393, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you went to B326, because it was the next cleanest boring, right?
A. Right.

[^57]Q. Okay. And on Site 6, you're going from just west of 1 S to about 4.5S?
A. Correct.
Q. Was 5S a clean boring?
A. No.
Q. Was 6S a clean boring?
A. No.
Q. Was 7S a clean boring?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. And was 8 S a clean boring?
A. I don't think so.
Q. The soil boring doesn't tell you exactly how much ACM was located in the spot was taken, does it? It's more representative?
A. It doesn't say anything about anything, other than visual cues.
Q. But you don't know do you how much ACM was associated with any given soil boring located on your map, correct?
A. Other than what they define as analytical or basically representative.
Q. You need to excavate it to really see what was there beneath the soil boring, correct?
A. A soil boring is a spot location that

[^58]gives you representation of what is in the area.
Q. Can you turn to 207-18, please? Are you there?
A. Sorry, yes.
Q. 207-18. So, B350 is located on Site 3, correct? That was an area that the Board pointed out that IDOT was liable for?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But in your opinion, in reaching your attribution, you didn't consider how much asbestos was below B350, did you?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And on Site 6, just take 4S, you didn't take into account the amount of ACM's analytically work effort were connected to it, did you?
A. I didn't take into account what they discovered analytically, no.
Q. Mr. Dorgan stated in his report that Mr. Peterson told him that upon excavation, he had a continuing theme of ACM running from 1S to $\mathbf{8 S}$ ?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection. It's past reflection. This was the subject of the offer of proof.

[^59]MS. BRICE: I'm getting there.
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. I'm going to ask you about the photos, but I'm not waiving my objection, nor am I agreeing that any of the testimony that you gave about the photos should be admitted. Okay?

Mr. Peterson and Mr. Dorgan discussed photographs they claimed showed a seam of asbestos from 1S to 8S, right?
A. They discussed there was asbestos continuing along that line underneath Greenwood Avenue.
Q. And you decided not to opine on this new evidence in your supplemental report, correct?
A. No, my opinion is that the Board ruled that the Detour Road A was not a part of the IDOT allocation, which reflected in the original hearings that we knew there was contamination in $5 S$ through 8S, and the Board did not include those borings in IDOT's liability.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection. This goes beyond the direct examination. If evidence about Mr. Peterson is going to be offered in an offer of proof, it seems inappropriate and unfair.

[^60]to have it both ways.
If it's an offer of proof, the examination, the cross, should be an offer of proof. The Hearing Officer ruled it should not be included and, thus, it's an offer of proof. Now she's cross-examining him on it.

You can't have it both ways. it's either part of it or it's not.

The substance of my objection is JM objected when we had questions about his reaction to Mr. Peterson, and the Hearing Officer ruled against them, and they did it through an offer of proof.

And now counsel for $J M$ is questioning Mr. Gobelman about that same exact subject that we were limited from doing. They want it both ways. They want to cross-examine him on an area that's been specifically excluded. So, outside the direct examination

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You can do an offer of proof in the examination. That is why $I$ said originally the offer of proof is the way to cross exam.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: This cross-examination is done solely for the offer of proof?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Yes.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Thank you. It was unclear to
me. It's solely for the offer of proof.
MS. BRICE: Thank you. I just have a couple of questions with respect to the offer of proof, and then I'm going to go outside the offer of proof to something that we did not object, to which he testified about. Okay?

All $I$ was trying to do is clarify about the photographs. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. You are not offer any opinions about the photographs in this hearing?

You said in your deposition that you were not going to offer any opinions based upon the review of the photographs. That's all I'm trying to establish. I can go to the line and page, if you want me to.
A. Okay.
Q. Go to page 26 , line 11 through 18.
A. 26 is the first dep?
Q. 26 is the first dep, line 11 through 18, "Question: What conclusions did you draw from looking at the photographs?
"Answer: I don't know if I actually drew a conclusion. I was mainly looking to see what

[^61]types of work was going on in the area in question.
"Question: Okay. Are you planning to offer any opinions based upon review of the photographs?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection, vague to the deposition testimony and foundation, and it's not clear what photos are being referenced in the deposition.

MS. BRICE: If you want to move up, we're talking about the 10,000 photos. If you look on page 26 , he talks about 10,000 photos, and I said, "Did you look at every single photograph?"

And he said, "Unfortunately." And I believe earlier he testified about 10,000 photos with respect to Mr . Peterson.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I do recall that.
MS. BRICE: Thank you for the additional foundation in reference to the photographs. Please clarify.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Please proceed, Ms. Brice. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. I think we discussed this earlier, and I read it out of your deposition, but I'm going to
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just confirm it again.
You don't dispute the accuracy of the figures in Mr. Dorgan's report used -- I'm sorry. You don't dispute the accuracy of Figures 3 and 4 from Mr. Dorgan's report, other than they didn't identify the source material; is that correct?
A. Can you point me to where his figure is, so I can look at it?
Q. Sure. It would be in 204-40 and 41.
A. I believe those were produced in the original hearing.
Q. You're not disputing the accuracy of either of these documents?
A. I have no opinion whether it's being accurate or not.
Q. You are not disputing it, though?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Sorry, that was outside the offer of proof in that series of questions. You did testify about the boring locations.

Okay. I just want to ask you a couple of questions here -- actually, you know what I'm going to do, I'm going to go to your 202, your document 202.

[^62]And you explained earlier that detour road A was this gray line that went from the southwest to the northeast, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And on your figure here, Detour Road A extends into Greenwood Avenue; does it not? It intersects with Greenwood Avenue?
A. It butts up against Greenwood Avenue, yes.
Q. Okay. But they come together, correct, greenwood Avenue and Detour Road A?
A. They butt up against each other, yes.
Q. On Figure 3 here, I think you can maybe see this, the Detour Road A goes all the way to station 15 of Detour Road A.

Do you see that?
A. As it shows in that figure, the Detour Road A butts up against the pavement of Greenwood Avenue.
Q. Okay. But it goes to 15 -- station 1550 about on this figure, correct?
A. The stationing that would be associated with the farthest east portion of Detour Road A that butts up against Greenwood Avenue would be approximately 15 plus 50 in the stationing that they

[^63]assigned to the Detour Road A.
Q. Correct.
A. It's an offset to the right of some distance.
Q. Right. And boring 7S is noted right here before you get to station 15; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is Figure 4 right here, Figure 4 right here. This is down here at the bottom of the cross-section of Greenwood; is that correct?
A. It's a portion of the cross-section of Greenwood.
Q. Right. It's the most eastern portion of that, correct?
A. It is an inferred eastern portion of Greenwood.
Q. Okay. What is depicted on here -- you said you didn't dispute anything on this.

What is depicted on here is the eastern portion of Greenwood Avenue, right?
A. It's depicting the area of Greenwood Avenue that is within Site 6 shown on the figure.
Q. Okay. So, I just want to draw your attention to -- let's take boring location 7S.
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Okay?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then let's go down to 7S. If you follow this down here at the bottom, what is this showing?

Is this showing that they had to, based upon the plan, excavate the peat out from under here, and build back up to this elevation here about 587 something or other?
A. No, it doesn't show that.
Q. What are you saying it shows?
A. It is showing -- you're showing a portion of a cross-section that's in the original plans that is being used by the contractor for information only of what is necessary consisting of Greenwood Avenue.

It is not depicting what is necessary to be done in the building of the Detour Road A.
Q. Okay. That wasn't my question.
A. It is.
Q. No, my question is about Greenwood Avenue.
A. All right.
Q. It's all about Greenwood Avenue. I'm not talking about detour road A. I don't care about Detour Road A whatsoever.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { L.A. Court Reporters, L.L.C. } \\
312-419-9292
\end{gathered}
$$

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're going to stop for a 15-minute break. We'll be back no later than 3:20.
(Recess taken.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're back on the record for cross-examination of Mr . Gobelman.

MS. BRICE: Thank you, Mr. Halloran.
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. I just have a couple questions going back to this Exhibit 204-41A, and I'm talking about the cross-section for Greenwood Avenue, right?

And I'm going to hand you 21A-26A, which I believe you've seen before. Okay? Over here on the right, it has with the sort of $V$ shape, it indicates unsuitable material to be removed.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And on this document, it has with that same thing, it has the word "peat" and it has location of unsuitable materials to be removed, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. This document 21A-26, without the clarifications on it, is from the as-built drawings;
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is it not?
A. It is a portion of the page of the as-built diagram. It does not reflect the true intent of how it's represented in the as-built drawings.
Q. Let's go to the as-built drawings. That drawing was actually admitted into evidence. Here is the as-built drawing 21A.

Does it say or indicate that unsuitable materials be removed?
A. It provides a legend what the hashed lines in those areas mean. It reflects the material that is to be removed with this page. It's provided to the contractor for his information only, not to represent what has to be.
Q. Can you give that back to me or second? This is an as-built drawing, is it not?
A. It is a drawing within the plans that they have firmed up and now called as built.
Q. And then the first page of $21 A$, it says these are the as-built drawings, does it not?
A. It reflects any markups on there is showing these are as-built, yes.
Q. Okay. I have one question. All I want to
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say is you take 7S right here on this 204-41A, and you go down, do you see peat soft material below it?
A. The figures that you show there is peat soft material.
Q. Thank you. EPA had requirements about clean corridors, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. They wanted a clean corridor for an entire length of the utility line, right?
A. If it was going to be utilized, yes.
Q. But you didn't include the work required for creating an entire clean corridor when you did your attributions, right?
A. It reflects the locations of 039 and the borings that the Board told us were to be allocated to IDOT.
Q. In reaching your opinion, you often relied on linear footage and square footage, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the linear footage or square footage was based upon your base maps, correct?
A. The base maps, yes.
Q. But you concede that the features and boundaries on your base map are merely

[^64]approximations and not exact locations; isn't that true?
A. I don't have the exact locations. I don't have any coordinates telling me what those boring locations are, so it's based upon measurements of known documents.
Q. Okay. They are not exact locations, they are approximations, correct?
A. Sure.
Q. If you can turn to -- I'm going to talk about your attributions now.

If you could turn to 207-15, and this is the Waukegan waterline figure, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. You claim the Board specifically stated that the liability was only associated with the borings that they laid out in the ruling; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. But they never specifically say those words as to 0393 in the opinion, do they?
A. I don't recall exactly what the wording is

[^65]in there.
Q. Okay. So, this is your interpretation of the Board's ruling, correct?
A. It is what I believe the Board stated.
Q. Okay. Take a look at deposition page 113, lines 2 through 16. The first deposition.

And we're talking about 0393 here, and it says, "That's your interpretation of it, correct?" And you say, "Yes."

Do you see that?
A. No, I don't know what page you are on.

You said page --
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I don't want anybody to rush.

THE WITNESS: You said page 2 and I didn't know.

BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Page 113, lines 2 through 6.
A. Yes.
Q. Hold on. I'm sorry. Okay, go to line 9. We're talking about the right-of-way, correct, "Because Mr. Dorgan" -- your answer: "Because Mr. Dorgan interpreted that the Board ruling was for the entire 3939 right-of-way, where the Board
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specifically stated that it's only associated with the boring that they laid out in the ruling.
"Question: That's your interpretation of it, correct?"

And you said, "yes." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And, I take it, that you didn't include the Waukegan waterline because you didn't believe there were any borings that fell near the Waukegan waterline; is that right?
A. It's outside the borings that the Board represented in their ruling.
Q. That is the way that you interpret the ruling?
A. That's what I said.
Q. Turn to -- if you could turn to 205-24, please? This is from your first report, correct?
A. 205-24, yes.
Q. Okay. And right here, 0393 appears to be straddling -- I mean, the Waukegan waterline appears to be straddling 0393 on the south side, right?
A. Okay.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes, it appears to be above and below it
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in different places.
Q. Okay. Now, in your supplemental report, you move parcel 393 we've established, right?
A. Yes.
Q. But you didn't move the Waukegan waterline, right?
A. Yes, it did move. It's straddling 0393.
Q. Okay. Well, let's take a look at your deposition. This is your second deposition on G2, I would say. So, I'm going to take 41 and 42 , and let's just go to 41 , line 24, and it says, "Did the utility line shift, too?
"Answer: No.
"Question: No? The Waukegan waterline didn't shift?
"Answer: No.
""Question: And why didn't those shift?
"Answer: Because they were tied to something else. They were just laid in as not tied to the boundary. They were just laid into the site."

Do you see that?
A. I'm sorry, I'm looking at 41. I don't see where you are at.

[^66]Q. Last line on 41 and then going down on to 42.
A. Sorry, I was looking at page 41. Yes, I see where you are at, yes.
Q. So, here you said that the Waukegan waterline did not move to the south. You said that in your deposition, correct?
A. It appears so.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection. The testimony is not inconsistent. He's just reading the deposition.

MS. BRICE: Okay. I'm sorry, he just testified the Waukegan waterline moved to the south, and I'm impeaching him where he's telling me where it did not move to the south. I don't understand.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I agree. Objection overruled.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I will clarify that.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You can do it on redirect. Thank you. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Sorry, I got taken a little bit off course. Okay. Turn to 207-15, please, and this is your Waukegan waterline in your supplemental report. As you noted, it's still in the same

[^67]place, right? It's still straddling 0393; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You didn't do any drafts of your base map and figures between your August and November report, did you?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I would like to mark Exhibit 217. (Said document was marked as Exhibit No. 217 for Identification.)

BY MS. BRICE:
Q. 217-1 is an email from Mr. Steven Gobelman to Evan McGinley Ellen O'Laughlin, and Matt Doherty, and the first line says, "Attached are the revised figures. R1 were the first changes. It only adjusted the location of parcel 0393, and R2 were the pictures used in the supplemental."

Okay. I would like to stick with this document. If you could turn to 217-5, this email is written after both of your reports were submitted, correct, November 13th, 2018?
A. It was submitted to them on November 13th.
Q. This is after your reports were written,
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correct? The record will reflect what it reflects.
Okay. Go to 217-5, please. Do you see that the Waukegan waterline is not straddling 0393. It's actually above the 0393 line; is it not?
A. It appears to be, yes.
Q. Okay. Now, turn to 217-14. At 217-14, low and behold, it's straddling the line again. Do you see that? Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It's back again straddling the line?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. In this one it has been moved south along with the northern boundary, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, thank you. Let's assume for a moment that 217-05, the one where it was all within 0393, the Waukegan waterline, is correct.

If the Board finds IDOT is liable for all costs associated with work done in 0392 , IDOT would be liable for the costs associated with Waukegan waterline, would it not?
A. I'm sorry, can you repeat that?
Q. Assuming 217-51 is correct, which is the document that you drafted in the Andrews document,

[^68]assuming that's correct, and that's consistent with Mr. Dorgan's document, for the record, and the Board finds IDOT is liable for all costs associated with work done within parcel 0393, IDOT would be liable for all costs associated with the Waukegan waterline; isn't that correct?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection, vague. If you understand the question, I'm trying to catch up with the numbers.

MS. BRICE: Mr. Halloran, can I ask the question?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I'm not sure what kind of objection that is. I'm sorry.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: The objection is vague.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: What about you are trying to catch up with the numbers?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Because I believe the numbers were so rushed through and Mr. Gobelman may not understand the question.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. So, Mr. Gobelman, do you need more time?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe so.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay, thank you.
THE WITNESS: If the Board's ruling stated that

IDOT was liable for all 0393, then in this figure, IDOT would be liable for the cost associated with the waterline as it relates to Site 3. BY MS. BRICE:

## Q. I'm going to go to your AT\&T attributions

 at this point.MS. BRICE: Mr. Halloran, I might have misunderstood you, as far as wrapping it up. Do I have to be done within the next 45 minutes?

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're trying to get out of here by 4:30, quarter to 5:00. Again, I don't want to rush you.

I would like to get out of here, you know, and we can continue the cross-exam tomorrow morning. We have to come back anyway. Try to throttle down. Let's wrap up around 4:30 or so.

MS. BRICE: I'm trying to get to the point.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I know, but don't go fast.

MS. BRICE: Right, that's the problem I'm running into. I want to make sure everyone can hear everything clearly, and I want to get through the points. I'm not trying to belabor it. I skipped over a bunch of stuff.
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HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Do you have a problem starting tomorrow at 9:00-ish to continue your cross?

MS. BRICE: No.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Okay. Again, don't rush. Do your normal pace, and we'll finish around 4:30.

MS. BRICE: Okay, thank you.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Thank you. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Okay. Mr. Gobelman, let's talk about the Site 3A AT\&T attribution.

You used linear feet within Site 3 to calculate your IDOT attributions for the AT\&T line, right?
A. I would like to refer to my map.
Q. Okay, sure. Go ahead. It's 205 or 207, sorry. 207-16, 6. 217 -- sorry, I'm losing it. It's 207-16, I believe. Yes, you're there. Are you there?
A. Yes. I'm sorry.
Q. You use linear feet right to calculate your Site 3 IDOT attributions?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's because you wanted to provide the ratio between the footage of the entire site versus the areas for which IDOT was liable?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. You agree that using linear measurements was not the best way to make attributions in some instances; isn't that true?
A. Yes, in some instances.
Q. According to the supplemental report, you say, "The AT\&T lines on Site 3 were a total of 1060 linear feet; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you calculated the portions of the line you believe fell within the IDOT area of liability. You found it to be 199 feet, and then you divided that to get your 18.8 percent; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So, is your numerator -- hold on. Okay. Same sort of questions I had a minute ago.

If the Board were to find that IDOT was liable for all of 0393, your calculations would have to include the remainder of those two lines that run through 0393, right?

[^69]A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's go to Site 6. On Site 6, you first calculated the entire length of the north and the south corridors; and to do this, you said you relied on JMOO40329, which I believe is in 205-49. If you can look at 205-49 and confirm for me that that's the document you used, I would appreciate it. This is attached to your report.
A. I was looking for 040329. I was looking at that Bates number. That number was on this figure.
Q. I don't see it on this figure. This came from your report.

Does your report reference drawing No. 4, or something like that?

I think you testified earlier that you looked at the utilities, I'm pretty sure.
A. In the report, it references that I used the figure that was JM0040329.
Q. Okay. If you go to 213E1261. Can you pull that up? That's 213E1261. We pulled up on the screen the same document, I believe, with the Bates number JMOO40329 with Exhibit No. 213-1261.

So, Mr. Gobelman, is this the document

[^70]that is here in your expert report under 205-49?
A. It appears so.
Q. What I would like for you to do is take this green highlighter for me, and on your exhibit that you have there, 205-49, I would like you to tell me where you measured -- the area you measured to reach your lineal -- northern Site 6 linear footage of 2820, and where you measured on the south side to reach 2650.

I'm trying to figure out what was included in your numbers, what areas.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection. Counsel is asking Mr. Dorgan -- Mr. Gobelman -- counsel is asking Mr. Gobelman to do something he's not prepared to, and this does not apply.

There is no foundation. It is inappropriate to ask him to do that. BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Mr. Gobelman, you say in your expert report that you used this document, did you not, to calculate the numbers to come up with your denominator for the IDOT area liability on Site 6, which is 5470 linear feet, correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. Okay. So, all I'm trying to do is for you to identify for me what went into that calculation of 5470 , as it's very important because you use it as your denominator in a couple of different instances, and I need to know what you were including in that to see if the denominator is accurate or not.
A. I don't remember what I marked off of this figure.
Q. So, you can't do that for me? You can't tell me how you measured that?
A. I can't accurately depict on this figure how I measured it.
Q. Okay. You said, I believe, that you believed it to be the entire length of the north corridor and the south corridor; is that correct?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection.
BY MS. BRICE:
Q. You testified to it.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I recall that testimony.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: You may proceed.
THE WITNESS: Yes.

[^71]BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Okay. So, if it's the entire length of the north side and south side, where would it be on that document? Can you just mark what would be the entire length of the north side and south side on that document, please?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection. Mr. Gobelman
cannot be compelled to create an exhibit.
MS. BRICE: I'm sorry, he testified this is what he did. I'm just trying to get him to recreate what is based in his report. I don't know how this could possible be objectionable.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I sort of agree with Ms. O'Laughlin, to try to do an accurate drawing -MS. BRICE: It doesn't have to be accurate. I just want to know where he thinks the entire line of the north side of site and south side of Site 6, where they go to. He said that he did this, and he based his calculations on it. If he can't point it out, that's a big problem, in and of itself.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Same objection.
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: See what you could do, Mr. Gobelman. She can examine you on redirect. Objection overruled.

THE WITNESS: At this point, I can't accurately depict on this map to see the measurements that $I$ made.

BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Okay. You came to an attribution of 1.6 percent, right? Look in your report.
A. Yes.
Q. Your 1.6 percent, as I understand it, you took 90 feet, which was the distance between 3.5 S to 4.5S; is that right, and divided it by 5470?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, in other words, for your denominator here, 5470, to be correct, you would need there to be work done on the AT\&T line along the entire length of the north side and south side of Site 6; is that correct?
A. That's what I used.
Q. Okay. If you are going to be right, if your denominator is right, those AT\&T lines needed to go along the entire north side and south side of site 60, because you're using a denominator of 5470 to calculate the AT\&T lines on Site 6?
A. 5470 is the denominator that I used, yes.
Q. Okay. That's not my question. My
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question was: In order for your denominator to be correct, in order to reach the calculation for the site 6 AT\&T line, those lines would need to traverse the whole north side and south side of Site 6; is that not correct?
A. They would have to be in the entire length.
Q. So, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. I believe you heard Dr. Ebihara, did you not, testify that that was not the case?

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: Objection to the same reason that Ms. Brice objected to our questioning about Mr. Peterson. It's not part of his opinion.

She can't question him about it. He's not offering opinions based on Mr. Ebihara's testimony.

MS. BRICE: I'm cross-examining him on his opinion.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: I agree with Ms. Brice. You can ask questions on your redirect. If there is more information, Mr. Gobelman can answer. It may be information important to him. You can redirect him, if you need to.

MS. BRICE: I mean, I can take five minutes and
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find all of the exhibits that show that. This is a faster way to get to the question.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I don't mean to mess up your thoughts.

MS. BRICE: I disagree. It's an inconsistent argument that you made with Mr. Peterson. Thank you for your speaking objection.

BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Do you recall what Dr. Ebihara and Mr. Peterson said about the AT\&T lines and whether or not they ran the entire length of the north side of Site 6 and the south side of Site 6?
A. I don't recall exactly where they said they came out of the ground.
Q. Okay. We've established that it's -- if they do not run the entire length of the north side of Site 6 and south side of Site 6, then your denominator is inaccurate?
A. If it turned out that they were short earlier, my denominator would be different distance and the percentage would go up accordingly.
Q. Your percentage would go up? I think your percentage would go down. The record will reflect what it reflects.

Actually, Mr. Dorgan pointed that out in his initial rebuttal report on 206-13. If you want turn to that, $I$ can make you turn to it, but I'll just read it into the record, if no one objects, or if they want me to have you to turn to me 2613, I can.

But he says, "Based on the record, the AT\&T lines do not run the entire length of the north and south corridor of site 6. As a result, Mr. Gobelman's calculations are incorrect."

If that was his expert report in response to your first response, your August report, but you didn't make any changes to address that point in your supplemental report in Exhibit 207, did you?
A. My only changes that $I$ did on the base map, I wasn't going to recalculate or rebut Mr. Dorgan's rebuttal of my report and create a whole new report based upon all the things he pointed out.

## All I was doing is making sure the

 accuracy of my base map was correct, based upon the location of 0393.Q. Let's consider your numerator here, which is 90 feet. Just to be clear, in order for your
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numerator to be correct, your Site 6 borings, and your measurement between your Site 6 boring needs to be correct; is that right?

The numerator was 90 feet. You measured from 3.5S to $4.25 S$ is what you said in your report. I'm just trying to establish that if that's your numerator, your measurement would have to be correct?
A. I measured from the point that the phone line comes into Site 6 to a halfway point between 4 S and 5 S .
Q. Okay. You say that's 90 feet?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's for your numerator to be correct -- I mean, that measurement has to be correct, in order for your numerator to be correct, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Your math, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm not going to belabor this. You calculated your site 3 and 6 attributions, the combined ones, the same way that Mr . Dorgan did, and your Site 3 and 6 numbers are premised on your Site

[^72]3 and 6 attribution numbers, right?
Do the calculations you do on the top part is the attributions, and then you got -- maybe that's the bottom part. Then you got the total cost, and then you divided by the attribution cost, to come up with your attribution for Site 3 and 6, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, all I'm trying to point out here is, you know, if your numbers for Site 3 and Site 6 alone are incorrect, then your combined Site 3 and 6 attribution is also incorrect, right?
A. Yes, the percentage would go up.
Q. Turn to 205-11, please. This is ACM's soils. Tell me when you are there?
A. 205-11?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay.
Q. I think this is the one -- you don't have a figure for ACM soils in Exhibit 207, do you?
A. No.
Q. So, we need to go back. That's why I'm going back to 205 on this one.

That's where your discussion of ACM soils

[^73]is located, correct, in 205 instead of 207?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You say you did your calculations similar to the AT\&T calculations, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, you used this 5470 linear feet as your denominator, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's because you believe that the USEPA required a clean corridor, no matter what, for the whole entire Site 6; is that right?
A. My understanding that the AT\&T lines went through the entire corridor.
Q. That is not my question. My question was: You believe that USEPA required a clean corridor, no matter what, for the entire Site 6, that is why you used the 5470 number?
A. It required a clean corridor for the utilities in the corridor.
Q. Okay. Turn to your deposition, page 126, line 4 through 11 in the first deposition.

MS. O'LAUGHLIN: 126?
MS. BRICE: Correct.
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BY MS. BRICE:
Q. Line 4, my understanding that a clean corridor -- okay, sorry. Let's go back up a little bit.

125-24, "Question: What type of
excavation work was involved in Site 6, do you know?
"Answer: hum.
"Question: All of Site 6?
"Answer: My understanding that created a clean corridor, no matter what, for the entire site.
"Question: For the whole northern boundary of Site 6 and the whole southern boundary of Site 6?
"Answer: Yes, I believe they did excavation associated with that, yes.
"So, clean corridors their whole way?
"Answer: I believe so, yes."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Once again, for your denominator to be correct, they would have had to do excavation work along the entire north side and south side of Site 6, correct?
A. I included the entire length of the north

[^74]and south side, yes.
Q. Okay. And your numerator -- let's talk about your numerator here. Staying with 205-11, you say your numerator is 197 feet, but you said from the western edge of Site 6 to halfway between 4 S and 5S; is that right?
A. Yes.

HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Let's call it a day.
MS. BRICE: I'm not too far. I mean, I'm pretty close. It depends on how many times I have to go back to the deposition.
(Discussion off the record.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: Pamela, we can go back on the record now. I think we're going to go back on the record and close it, and continue it on the record for tomorrow, October 29th. We're having problems with Webex. For tomorrow, October 29th, 9:00 a.m.
(Discussion off the record.)
HEARING OFFICER HALLORAN: We're back on the record. I'm the Hearing Officer. We're going to close this hearing today and continue it on record until tomorrow October 29th at 9:00 a.m. Thank you. You all have a good night.
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(The following proceedings were adjourned until October 29th, 2020, at 9:00 o'clock a.m.)
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## Requested Corrections to the October 28, 2020

Corrected Transcript Received on February 2, 2021

| Page <br> No. | Line No. | Now Reads | Requested Correction | Audio Verification Time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 16 | It crosses over Nicor GAFK | It crosses over Nicor Gas |  |
| 41 | 11 | MS. BRICE: | Delete this entire line. |  |
| 41 | 12 | MS. O'LAUGHLIN: | MS. BRICE: |  |
| 41 | 18 | MS. BRICE: | MS. O'LAUGHLIN: |  |
| 41 | 20 | MS. O'LAUGHLIN: | MS. BRICE: |  |
| 65 | 16 | Frak? | Ramp? | 2:17 |
| 65 | 17 | Frak was not | Ramp was not | 2:17 |
| 82 | 22 | attributions in ExhibitS, correct? | attributions in Exhibit F, correct? | 3:56 |
| 84 | 15-17 | And you had this document, this 204-38 in your possession. At the time you wrote your Report, it didn't show up, right? | And you had this document, this 204-38 in your possession at the time you wrote your Report, Exhibit 205, right? | 3:59 |
| 96 | 22 | Do you deny saying that Sir? Yes. | Do you deny saying that sir? Nope. | 4:21 |
| 102 | 4-5 | "Answer: It can be on the GAFK site re-boundary. I don't know." | "Answer: It can be on the Site 3 boundary. I don't know." | 4:29 |
| 121 | 21-22 | Q. 57534? A. 57534. | Q. 67-534? A. 67-534. | 5:02 |
| 159 | 5 | faster way to get to the question. <br> MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I don't mean to mess up your thoughts. <br> MS. BRICE: I disagree. | faster way to get to the question. I don't mean to mess up your thoughts. <br> MS. O'LAUGHLIN: I disagree. | AUDIO CUTS OUT <br> AT 6:08 |
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