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MS. ORTH: Good morning.
My name is Felicia Orth. I'm the Hearing Officer for the New Mexico Environment Department.

We're here today, and potentially tomorrow, in the Matter of the Application of Valley Meat Company for a Groundwater Discharge Permit. This would be a renewal of Discharge Permit -- or DP -- 236 , docketed by the Hearing Clerk as GWB -- GWB stands for Groundwater Bureau -- 13-05.

The hearing will be conducted pursuant to two sets of regulations in the New Mexico Administrative Code, 20.6.2 and 20.1.4.

The rules call for an evidentiary hearing, and the broad outline of that hearing are these: The applicant, which has the burden of proof, goes first with their technical witnesses and other witnesses. The Department, which reviewed the permit application, goes next, again with their technical witnesses and other witnesses. Then the Attorney General's Office, the Front Range Equine Rescue group, six other individual parties, and Mr. Holland will go in any order they have decided to go.

Direct examination is offered first. All
testimony is subject to questioning. Rebuttal may be offered along the way by the parties or after the end of
the entire direct case may be offered by the parties.
After the technical case is concluded, I will invite public comment. The public comment will be invited in the order in which you signed in.

If you haven't yet signed in, please do so. The sign-in sheets are used as evidence of public participation and for the correct spelling of your name.

If, by some chance, we finish the technical case before 5:00 tonight, I will invite public comment, if there is any to be given before then. Regardless of whether we finish the technical case by 5:00, I will invite public comment at that time.

After inviting public comment, $I$ will talk with the technical parties in the case about whether they desire to continue the technical case after public comment or to pick it up again in the morning. If we could finish tonight, we may do that.

All testimony will be taken either from that podium or this witness table. Again, all of it is subject to questioning.

The transcript of this proceeding is being made by Kathy Townsend of Kathy Townsend Court Reporters. If you would like to obtain a copy of the transcript, please make contact with Ms. Townsend directly and make payment arrangements.

The transcript also eventually becomes a public record viewable in the office of the Hearing Clerk.

Sally Worthington is the Hearing Clerk. Sally, please wave your hand. We've mentioned Sally quite a bit. Sally is the one with the sign-in sheets. Sally will also be able to answer your questions while we're in hearing, and after we leave today, if you have a question about where we are in the posthearing process, please call Sally. She's brought a lot of business cards.

We'll take breaks every 90 minutes to two hours. We will take a break for lunch. We may or may not take a break for dinner.

Again, no decision is made today. This is the time when we're taking the evidentiary hearing. We have a lengthy posthearing process. That posthearing process lasts approximately four months. I expect Secretary Flynn to be making his decision sometime in February.

The administrative record maintained by the Groundwater Bureau is here in two volumes, and certainly when we're on a break, you are free to look at it.

I also have the Hearing Clerk's pleading file, and on a break, you're certainly welcome to look at this as well, and the Bureau has maintained the record on a
web page. It's also viewable there.
I understand that this case and the general
topic has generated strong feelings in a number of people on all sides of the issue and that those feelings have taken a number of forms of expression, but today what we're doing is making an evidentiary record, and it's my job to assure that that record is made in an orderly fashion.

So outbursts, demonstrations and displays in this courtroom are not appropriate and will not be indulged. You will be removed, and we will have to continue without you.

Comments that are not made from that podium or this witness table will not be reflected on the transcript. So if you have comments for the record, please participate as the rules require, come up when $I$ call your name or otherwise invite you up expressly. If you would prefer, you may submit your comments in writing. You can give those comments in writing to Sally at any time today, tonight, and potentially tomorrow, until the record is closed. Once the record is closed, those comments can't be made part of the record. But until that time, you can submit comments to Sally.

I believe the technical parties have agreed to
give a brief warning before graphic images are shown, and we do expect some graphic images as part of this hearing. Those with more delicate sensibilities will have an opportunity to close your eyes. I've also requested that those images not be made redundant through this hearing.

So we have a lot to do today.
I will ask for appearances.
Department, please start first, please.
MR. KENDALL: Jeffrey Kendall on behalf of the New Mexico Environment Department.

MR. POWERS: Good morning, Madam Hearing
Officer.

We do have limited microphones, so Valley Meat and the Department may have to share microphones. That, I guess, is the courtesy for the audience.

If the reporter does not hear our testimony, I just would ask that she notify us immediately.

With that said, my name is Kevin Powers,
Assistant General Counsel, Environment Department.
MS. ORTH: Thank you.
Mr. Dunn.

MR. DUNN: Good morning, Madam Hearing Officer.

Blair Dunn on behalf of the applicant.

MS. ORTH: Okay.

Mr. Wagman.

MR. WAGMAN: Good morning, Madam Hearing Officer.

Bruce Wagman on behalf of Front Range Equine Rescue and the six Roswell individuals.

With me also is Katherine Cisneros from my office.

MS. ORTH: Hello.

MS. CISNEROS: Hello.
MS. ORTH: Are you Mr. Biernoff?
MR. BIERNOFF: Good morning, Madam Hearing
Officer.

Ari Biernoff for the New Mexico Attorney
General's Office.
MS. ORTH: All right.

And Mr. Holland.
MR. HOLLAND: Good morning, Madam Hearing

Officer.

John Holland with the Equine Welfare Alliance.
MS. ORTH: Thank you very much.
These are our technical parties. I will tell
you there is excellent legal representation on all
sides. Public comment should not include technical
testimony. All technical testimony has to come through
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one of these parties.
On Friday, the counsel and Mr. Holland and I participated in a long teleconference concerning a couple of motions.

Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Powers or Mr. Kendall, $I$ believe that the motion to determine party status and representation was adequately addressed in that teleconference.

Next was a motion to strike the entry of appearance of the New Mexico Attorney General's Office. I have given, as $I$ said, more thought to it since Friday afternoon, and also considered the memorandum that was issued to that motion sent by Mr. Biernoff over the weekend, and it has not changed my conclusion that the motion should be denied.

Finally, as to the motion to strike or limit the testimony of Mr. Olson, I considered again everything we spoke about on Friday afternoon and also paid special attention to the statute at 10-16-8(B), as the Department had asked me to do, and didn't change my mind there, either.

I think there is some real challenges to the Department's interpretation in that language of the statute, particularly as to what it means to represent someone and what the words "this matter" means.

Mr. Dunn?

MR. DUNN: Yes, Madam Chair.
If it's appropriate, I'd like to renew our objections from the hearing the other day to --

MS. ORTH: All right.
MR. DUNN: I'd like to put those on the record, if that's acceptable.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Please.

MR. DUNN: With the matter of striking the presence of the Attorney General to provide technical testimony, I'd like to renew that the Attorney General is the top legal officer for this state, he is not the top environmental officer for this state, that is not his area of expertise, and providing technical testimony in contravention of the actual technical experts of this state presents a conflict of interest that is $I$ believe is unwaivable at this point.

Regarding Mr. Olson, a similar objection, he is representing the state, he's a former officer of the State of New Mexico, a former employee of the state of New Mexico, that actually ruled on these matters previously in his official capacity. To now show up and to speak against his own previous actions, we find also to be a conflict that pretty much destroys his
credibility.
So we'd like those on the record.
MS. ORTH: All right.

Does the Department join in this renewed
motion?

MR. POWERS: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer, we do. We renew our objections.

And if it pleases the Court, we can make an offer of proof of certain witnesses, and we can do that at a different time or later time during this proceeding, but we do renew our objections against Mr. Olson's testimony under 10-16--10-16-8(B) because of substantial public interest or the substantial involvement that Mr. Olson had during the proceedings below or in prior proceedings.

Those were enforcement actions against the same permittee here today, so we do believe that there is a conflict that is apparent, and for the sake of justice, we believe that Mr. Olson's testimony should be stricken.

As to the Attorney General's appearance, we do renew our objection and believe that there is a conflict between who represents the State of New Mexico, in what capacity, and in what capacity any witnesses that are going to be presented represent the views and opinions
of the state.
MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you, Mr. Powers.
Any change in the opposition to the motions?
MR. BIERNOFF: No change, Madam Hearing
Officer. I won't rehash our positions. I just want to indicate our continuing opposition to both of these motions.

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Wagman, you join in that position, I assume?

MR. WAGMAN: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.
As I said on Friday, I think there is no question about the identity of the person who makes the decision in this matter, that's Secretary flynn, absolutely, that's -- primary jurisdiction is in Secretary Flynn's hands.

Having said that, we have among the broadest permitting procedures in the country when it comes to public participation and the variety of ways in which they can participate in permitting proceedings, and $I$ don't see an exclusion there for the Attorney General or -- and again, as $I$ said, $I$ think the language of 10-16-8(B) does not form a basis to exclude Mr. Olson.

So are there any other issues that we need
to address before we begin with the applicant's presentation?

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer, again, just for the record, you did discuss that there were varying branches of governments in your ruling last Friday.

Could you maybe expand on that and put that on the record for us as well, if that's still -- if that's still your present reasoning as to allowing the different branches of the government -- of the state government to participate in the same capacity?

MS. ORTH: Okay. So if I understand your question, and I'm not remembering at this point exactly what you said in the teleconference, it's certainly true that other branches of New Mexico State Government -and my memory is there are about 22 branches of state government set out in our Constitution -- that sometimes branches -- other branches participate in our permitting hearings and our rule-making hearings, not so much enforcement, but I've seen that before, and I simply don't see an exclusion from them doing that.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Powers?
MR. POWERS: Madam Hearing Officer, I believe
-- I hope I have a consensus with everybody here. I think $I$ would like to offer a vote of appreciation to
the Chaves County Commissioners for letting us use the courthouse here today, the Chaves County Sheriff's Office, New Mexico State Police, specifically, and all the other parties that sort of made this facility and this hearing secure and safe for all parties involved, and $I$ just wanted to express that.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Powers.
I join you in that expression of appreciation. Mr. Wagman?

MR. WAGMAN: We join the motion.
MS. ORTH: Thank you.
MR. DUNN: We do as well.
MS. ORTH: Thank you. I really enjoy being in Roswell. It's a beautiful courthouse.

Thank you.
Anything before we invite the applicant to present its witnesses? Anything else? No?

Mr. Dunn, if you would, please.
MR. DUNN: Madam Chair, would it be acceptable for me to speak just from here -- I have most of my materials here -- rather than shuffling back and forth to the podium?

MS. ORTH: Yes. That's fine, as long as the witnesses are over here.

MR. DUNN: Thank you.
(Oath administered to Mr. De Los Santos,

Mr. Wyant, Mr. Ashcraft and Dr. Blach.)

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer, if I may.

MS. ORTH: Please.

RICARDO DE LOS SANTOS, CHET WYANT,

LONEY ASHCRAFT AND LEONARD BLACH
after having been first duly sworn under oath,
were questioned and testified as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION

MR. DUNN: Could I get each of you, starting
from my left to right, to state your full name for
everybody to hear and your position or capacity in being here today?

Rick.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Ricardo De Los Santos, general manager of Valley Meat Company.

MR. WYANT: I'm Chet Wyant with
Envirocompliance Services.

DR. BLACH: Leonard Blach, large animal
veterinarian.

MR. ASHCRAFT: Loney Ashcraft, dairy consultant.

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer, if there is objection, I'd like to give the opportunity to voir dire these witnesses, but we would move their written
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testimony be accepted as part of the record, and that they be accepted as experts in the three cases of Mr. Ashcraft, Dr. Blach and Mr. Wyant.

Mr. De Los Santos is being offered more as a factual and historical witness, as he is the manager for the applicant.

MS. ORTH: Are there objections?
MR. WAGMAN: Well, Your Honor, we don't necessarily accept them as experts in their field, so the fields in which they intend to testify, but certainly we accept them as technical experts for this hearing.

MS. ORTH: So my question, more specifically, would be do you accept them as qualified to offer the opinions they've offered in the testimony that's been submitted?

MR. WAGMAN: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: All right.
Are there any objections to that?
MR. POWERS: No, Your Honor, but we do reserve the right to maybe voir dire -- if they get into specific territories of testimony, we do reserve that right to object.

MS. ORTH: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Powers.
Anything else? No? All right.

Please proceed, Mr. Dunn.

MR. DUNN: I'd like to do just a bit of voir dire, as it might be.

As I stated, Mr. De Los Santos is here in his factual capacity, so $I$ won't go into that.

Mr. Wyant, would you tell us a little bit about your background, any previous examples of where you've acted as a technical expert in a hearing, or as an expert witness in court? So a little bit of your background.

MR. WYANT: Yes. I've been working with the New Mexico Groundwater Bureau discharge permits since 1981 as a admini- -- basically an administrative assistant's capacity to numerous discharge permit holders throughout the state.

During that time, I've had occasion to be a witness in hearings in this capacity and in front of the Water Quality Control Commission a number of times. I don't know the exact number. Probably 20 or more.

MR. DUNN: Anytime in Federal or state Court as a witness?

MR. WYANT: I have in State District Court.

MR. DUNN: Were you offered as an expert in that capacity or as a factual witness?

MR. WYANT: Well, yeah, an expert on the
permitting issues of that facility that were in question.

MR. DUNN: Okay.
Dr. Blach, the same question. If you wouldn't mind sharing a little bit of your background, your associations and your qualifications.

DR. BLACH: Okay. I'm a large animal veterinarian. I've been a veterinarian for a long time, 53 years. It's -- strictly, I've been in large animals, primarily horses, and a great deal in cattle.

I belong to the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Equine Practitioners. I'm a lifetime member of both organizations.

My practice has always been large animals, primarily in horses. I've managed several large breeding farms, as well as a racetrack practice for many years.

I've done -- just being in Roswell for the last 35,40 years, $I$ did a lot of work with dairy cattle, treating different diseases in dairy cattle, and that's primarily what I've been doing the last 50 years.

MR. DUNN: Are you familiar with the physiology of cattle and horses and any differences or
-- in the livestock?

DR. BLACH: Very much so. I've been around them all these years. I have much experience with both species.

MR. DUNN: And general issues of mannerisms and cleanliness, are those areas that you're familiar with?

DR. BLACH: Yes.

MR. DUNN: You're familiar with
pharmaceuticals applied to livestock --

DR. BLACH: Yes, sir.

MR. DUNN: -- large animal livestock?
DR. BLACH: Yes, sir.

MR. DUNN: Thank you, sir.
Mr. Ashcraft, would you go -- kind of go over the same background for you?

MR. ASHCRAFT: I've worked for the NRCS, Soil Conservation Service, for 38 years, worked with numerous dairies throughout the state in that capacity.

In the last ten years, I've been a dairy consultant, working with discharge permits and different projects involving the building of ponds and so forth in facilities to maintain the dairies as well as animal waste.

MR. DUNN: Rick, let's go ahead and get into a
little bit of substance.

There are a few issues that have been raised with regards to your past and the history of the facility. So I'm going to ask you some questions now regarding those items.

The first item that's been raised in the course of public comments deals with past criminal convictions.

Could you give me a synopsis of your past criminal convictions in the last ten years?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: I have not had any criminal convictions in the last ten years at all.

MR. DUNN: Just for the sake of argument -- in arguendo, which means just for the sake of argument, what about in the last 25 years?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: 25 years -- I've had one class B misdemeanor in the last 20 years, $I$ think.

MR. DUNN: Any other previous convictions for anything?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Prior to that -- or after that, no. Prior to that, I had one in 1978.

MR. DUNN: And in 1978, what happened then? Were you -- what type of conviction did you have in 1978 ?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: I had a felony conviction
in 1978, and it was probation, and I completed that probation, and since then, I've not had anything.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Any other felony
convictions?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No.
MR. DUNN: Any other convictions of any sort
in the last ten years --
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No.
MR. DUNN: -- other than a minor traffic
citation?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No, not at all.
MR. DUNN: For purposes of kind of talking about how we're going to go through this conversation, as you heard, the burden is on the applicant to prove that the application, or in this case the renewal, should issue forth.

The Department has issued a draft renewal permit, so the burden is going to come down to what has changed, if anything, and what was the previous status of the permit. So we're going to focus our questions.

Mr. Ashcraft, you were -- could you give us a little bit of your background as to when you were involved with this permitting process and talk about the past at this point?

MR. ASHCRAFT: I was requested by Rick Robey,
who was a part owner at the time in 2005, approximately that time, to work with him to fulfill some of the obligations that was deemed necessary by the Environment Department, which included the building of a new storage pond -- in other words, we looked at the facility and the amount of water they were using and designed a pond by a state professional engineer, Stan Cook, to evaporate the water that would be generated from there so there wouldn't be any off-site use of that.

The pond was designed, sent to the ED -- the NMED for approval, was built in about the end of November, and was checked out in December of '05.

MR. DUNN: Okay.
MR. ASHCRAFT: And the pond was built to the specifications at that time and lined with a 40-mil HDPE plastic -- plastic at that time.

MR. DUNN: Perhaps a little bit of extension on the 40 HDPE.

MR. ASHCRAFT: Okay. The requirement that they -- at that time in the permit was to use a 40-mil plastic, which is a very heavy type of a plastic material, and it's checked as well as put in. Snow Industries installed the plastic, and it was certified by another professional engineer that the liner was done correctly and all of the certifications were
completed.
MR. DUNN: Okay. And so it was sufficient to meet the standards?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Yes.
MS. ORTH: Okay. Were there any monitor wells that were looked at? Was there any testing?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Monitoring wells were required to be put in, considered to be upgradient and downgradient of the facility.

Monitoring well number -- both one and number two were put in in March of '05. Monitoring well number three and number four were put in in February of ' 6 , of '06, because that was right after the pond was built, and before water was in the pond, they put a monitoring well on the -- it would be the northeast corner and one on the east side of the new pond to verify that the liner would maintain its integrity.

MR. DUNN: Did they -- was there testing done of groundwater at that point in time?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Testing was done on all four of the wells combined. The time frame I worked with them was in March of '06 and in May of '06, if I remember the dates right.

But the water levels were measured. The
lowest one on the -- the lowest water well was number
four. The next was number three, which was below the new pond.

All of the testing, the nitrates were within range on all of the wells. The TDS and the chlorides exceeded the state standards, but upgradient/ downgradient, all of those were exceeded just because the water in that area is poor quality.

MR. DUNN: Okay.
MR. ASHCRAFT: But it appears that the liner -- after the liner was being used, that none of the wells showed any increase or so forth in that, and it does appear that the liner was functioning properly as of May of' 06 .

MR. DUNN: Just for clarification, we're talking actually about two liners now at that point, is that correct, because there was a previous lagoon, is that correct?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Yes, sir.
There was a -- a previous lagoon was put in, we would say it's a little higher than this particular one, it was a . 6 -acre surface area, and this one was 1.6 -- I think 1.6, I would have to look it up, but it was built below that, yes, because the first liner that was installed didn't have the capacity to handle all the water that was generated.

MR. DUNN: Okay.

MR. POWERS: Madam Hearing Officer, excuse me, sir.

I know I have trouble hearing sometimes. I wonder if we could use the microphone from the counsel's table there to sort of -- just to make sure everybody in the back does hear.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Powers.
MR. ASHCRAFT: Yes, sir.

MR. DUNN: Can you go ahead and just give us a test on that?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Yes. There you go.
MR. DUNN: Let's see.

So in 2004, the period 2004 to 2006, you
assisted in completing the necessary requirements for that DP-236; is that correct?

MR. ASHCRAFT: That would be correct.

Mr. Robey had requested that $I$ help him on a few of the items that were required to maintain or to bring the permit up to whatever was required on it.

MR. DUNN: To your knowledge, the
specifications that Mr. Robey gave you that had been required from the state, were those all met?

MR. ASHCRAFT: As far as $I$ know, yes.
MR. DUNN: In your opinion, was there anything
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at that time that gave you cause that this would in any way present a potential harm to the environment, or was this a sufficient lagoon system and monitoring system for a permit to protect the environment from discharge?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Based on the testing and the results that we had for that, there was -- we tested monitoring well number one and two three times prior to the others being installed.

Based on the testing and so forth, I would say it was functioning as planned.

MR. DUNN: Okay.
Turning to you, Mr. Wyant.
If we could, let's talk a little bit more post
that period of time when you became involved.
Could you describe a little bit of your involvement with DP-236?

MR. WYANT: Yes.
I became involved in May of 2010 . The plant had been notified that it needed to renew a permit, I think it was past due, a renewal application at that time.

We submitted -- helped prepare the application for renewal of the permit using some information from the previous application, the current permit from 2004, interviews with the owners and operators and site visit
of the facility.
We submitted the application on June 1st. The Department received it on June 3rd of 2010 . It was declared administratively complete on June 29th of 2010, and we published public notice in the Roswell paper on August $3 r d$.

MR. DUNN: Were there any -- do you know of any protests or objections filed at that point in time?

MR. WYANT: I'm not aware that the Department received any comments or written -- in particular, written comments or objections to the permit at that time.

However, I've not looked at the administrative record for that -- for any of those items.

MR. DUNN: Did you review the previous permit in preparing the renewal?

MR. WYANT: Yes, I'm sure I reviewed the previous permit.

MR. DUNN: I'm going to have you look at what we're going to go with the Bureau's number on, which is the new draft permit. This is Bureau Exhibit 9.

If you could, could you read me this?
MR. WYANT: This paragraph?
MR. DUNN: No, this paragraph right here.
We're looking at in the Introduction section, the fourth
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paragraph down. It starts off "Up to 8,000."
MR. WYANT: Read that paragraph?
MR. DUNN: Yes, sir, if you would, please.
MR. WYANT: Okay.
"Up to 8,000 gallons per day of livestock processing wastewater is discharged from a slaughter facility. Wastewater generated from the slaughter facility and occasional washdown of the receiving pens collects in two concrete (septic) tanks for solids settling before flowing into the first of two synthetically lined impoundments for disposal by evaporation. The discharge contains water contaminants which may be elevated above the standards of Section 20.6.2.3103 NMAC and/or the presence of toxic pollutants as defined in Subsection $W W$ of 20.6.2.7 NMAC."

MR. DUNN: Okay. And you and Mr. Ashcraft can kind of tag team on this a little bit.

Is this a fairly typical system at Valley Meat Company? The two septic systems plus the two lagoons, is that fairly common for livestock processing water around the State of New Mexico?

MR. WYANT: I'm not sure that I have -- I don't do a lot of livestock slaughter processing. I've worked with three in my career.

MR. DUNN: Okay.

MR. WYANT: Two of the three were discharging to septic -- I'm sorry, septic tank type of settling systems.

So it's possible that you could say that, yes, it's -- for a low-flow slaughter plant, that that would be a typical way of designing the plant.

MR. DUNN: And maybe even expanding that just beyond livestock processing, but livestock wastewater facilities, dairies, feedlots, are you familiar -- are either of you familiar with these systems for those types of enterprises?

MR. WYANT: Well, I'm familiar with the dairies and feed yards, yes.

But, typically, you would see a -- the normal -- the typical dairy in New Mexico probably has a much larger discharge volume per day. I see anything from about 4,000 up to $140,000,150,000$, sometimes higher.

So the discharge volume would somewhat dictate the design of the facility.

MR. DUNN: And these types of systems tend to work sufficiently for those types of enterprises?

MR. WYANT: I would say that's true.
MR. DUNN: Do you have any -- do either of you have any reason to believe that that type of system, with the septic tanks or the lagoons, is an inadequate
system to prevent discharge into groundwater?
MR. ASHCRAFT: The system seems adequate to me, and that's as far as -- like I say, it's a lot smaller scale than what we usually work with, but it's the same theory behind it, yes.

MR. DUNN: Is there anything in particular to Valley Meat Company's lagoons or system that would lead you to believe it's not sufficient to protect groundwater from discharge?

MR. WYANT: No.
MR. ASHCRAFT: No.
MR. DUNN: Turning now to that document $I$
showed you a minute ago, it mentioned livestock.
Madam Hearing Officer -- I say Chair, I
apologize, too much time in the legislature.
MS. ORTH: That's all right.
MR. DUNN: Livestock is defined in state statute in NMSA 77-2-1.1. This is the Livestock Code.

Mr. Wyant, I'm going to ask you again to read this section of the code there, which is Section $A$.

MR. WYANT: Paragraph $A$, okay.
MR. DUNN: Yes.
MR. WYANT: "'Animals' or 'livestock' means all domestic or domesticated animals that are used or raised on a farm or ranch, including the carcasses
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thereof, and exotic animals in captivity and includes horses, asses, mules, cattle, sheep, goats, swine, bison, poultry, ostriches, emus, rheas, camelids and farmed cervidae" -- I've never seen that before -- "upon any land in New Mexico; provided that for the purposes of Chapter 77, Article 9 NMSA 1978, 'animals' or
'livestock' have the meaning defined in that article."
'Animals' or 'livestock'" --
MR. DUNN: That's good.
MR. WYANT: That's good?
MR. DUNN: Yes, that's good.
In your experience of -- again, Mr. Ashcraft and Mr. Wyant, do you know of anything, as far as a difference in livestock with regard to a livestock processing or livestock discharge system of any sort, whether it's processing or feedlot or dairy or something along those lines?

Is there anything different among that list of animals that was described as livestock that would -that in your experience would show any difference in a wastewater treatment facility of some sort?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Not in my experience.
MR. WYANT: Not my experience.
MR. DUNN: Okay. Then I'd like to turn,
Dr. Blach, to you, if $I$ could.
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One of the things that's been discussed is that somehow this renewal of the permit has changed and that there is a difference now, requiring that the permit not be issued or that new conditions be placed on this permit.

I'd like to discuss a little bit -- equines,
in particular, and then equines in regard to the previous things that went on at that plant.

Are you familiar with the business of Valley prior to making this switch to equines?

DR. BLACH: Yes, I'm familiar with that.

MR. DUNN: Do you know what they were
processing, in part or in general --
DR. BLACH: Yes.

MR. DUNN: -- prior to?

DR. BLACH: Yes.

MR. DUNN: What was that?

DR. BLACH: Cattle.

MR. DUNN: Any kind of specific cattle?

DR. BLACH: Mostly dairy cattle. Entirely mostly dairy cattle.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Would you mind sharing with us the difference in physiology between, let's say, dairy cattle and horses with regards to -- let's start with blood amounts and pharmaceuticals that may or may
not be contained in those animals.

I'm trying not to be redundant to your written testimony. So if there is anything you can add or you'd like to discuss, let's turn to that right away, if we could.

DR. BLACH: Well, in regard to the blood, I would say that it would be very similar.

On the average, it's known that seven percent of a body weight in animals is blood. The average size horse in shape for processing would probably weigh between 1,000 and 1,100 pounds. So seven percent of that would be blood.

A dairy cow, in good shape, that would be processed would probably weigh 1,200 pounds or more. In some cases, if we're talking about a bull, a male, he would weigh a ton. So seven percent -- roughly figuring seven percent -- or seven percent is considered blood if you rung them out, you know, to get every drop of blood out. So that would be that similarity there in regard to the blood.

In regard to the offal, in an $1,100-p o u n d$, 1,000-- or 1,100-, 1,200-pound dairy cattle, there would probably be -- it's my estimation that the offal would probably be 350 pounds, plus the large size of an udder, which sometimes would run up to a hundred pounds,
but on the average probably weigh 60 pounds.
In a horse that would weigh 1,000 to 1,100 pounds, the offal would be considerably less. That's because the cow has a huge rumen, a huge stomach, which has four compartments. That alone would probably weigh in excess of 150 pounds.

That information is based on hundreds of autopsies or necropsies that I've done on cattle and horses; whereby, when $I$ autopsy a cow, a dairy cow, which I've done many, is when $I$ pull the stomach out, it's more than $I$ can lift. Many times, I have to have somebody help me pull that from the carcass.

Where, in horse, it's entirely different.
They are a simple-stomached animal, just like we are; they have a small intestine, just like we are; and they have a large intestine, a large colon, plus a cecum.

And in comparison to the cow, after -- after it leaves the rumen, and they have the small intestine, but a huge, huge cecum and a huge, large colon.

And based on the feed on a cow, on a dairy cow, that they can eat as high as 70 pounds a day. So their colon and their large intestine sometimes will weigh as much as the rumen does. So they -- in comparison to a horse, they don't eat near that much, so the volume in the intestines is not as great.

So the offal between a cow and a horse, on a cow, it is considerably more than it is in a horse.

MR. DUNN: Before we turn to any drugs or vaccines administered to horses versus cows, could you talk a little bit about the cleanliness of the animals and, you know, what it would take to get one clean, which of the two animals is a -- if there is a cleaner animal between the two in your experience. Is there?

DR. BLACH: Yes. There is a huge difference in the cleanliness of an animal.

The dairy cow, in itself, because of the way $I$ described what they eat, is usually -- their excrement or their manure is mostly in a diarrhea nature. I mean, it's loose. You don't have cow patties like you have in the beef out in the prairies. So they are loose because of the diet they have, high in protein and the volume.

So when one of those -- and I've witnessed that, when one of those dairy cows goes to be processed, they are quite filthy behind, you know, all down the tail, and the tail usually has -- it's caked with manure in it, and sometimes clear down to the bag, and I've often spent a few hours in a number of cows that $I$ had to look at the offal at Pecos Valley Meat when they were doing dairy cattle, and they are quite -- quite filthy behind based on that.

In a horse, it's altogether different. We seldom ever see a horse eating that kind of volume, and as you know, they -- their manure is like in biscuits, like horse biscuits. Sometimes they will be loose enough to make a cow patty, sort of, but it stools up and it's not diarrhea. But they seldom ever have -unless it's a chronic case of enteritis or something do they have that manure spread through their tail where it's full of manure and it's down the rear legs like a cow.

So there is a tremendous difference between the cleanliness of a cow and the cleanliness of a horse prior to processing.

MR. DUNN: Prior to processing or prior to treatment by you, is there -- did you form an opinion as to which one would require more water to get them clean?

DR. BLACH: It definitely would be the cow.

MR. DUNN: Can you estimate how much more you think it might need? I realize this is a rough estimate.

DR. BLACH: Yeah. That, I would say that --

MR. DUNN: Twice as much?

DR. BLACH: Yeah. Three times as much, because most of those horses probably would not need
any, if they would need any. They are always clean behind.

The horses that $I$ deal with on the breeding
farms and the racetrack, you know, sometimes we have to do a lot of rectal palpations, you know, where we palpate them rectally for the digestive tract. In horses, $I$ could go back there and grab the tail and examine them with no problem. In a cow, I definitely have to have some gloves on before I start.

MR. DUNN: Sure.
Behaviorally, is there any difference in horses and cows in their cleanliness, in your veterinarian knowledge of that?

DR. BLACH: In what now?
MR. DUNN: In your knowledge as a
veterinarian, is there any difference in behavior that lends itself to cleanliness or --

DR. BLACH: In behavior?
MR. DUNN: Yes, of the animal.
Does one tend to be more concerned with its cleanliness or less concerned with its cleanliness?

DR. BLACH: I don't know that the animal is more concerned. I think it's just a natural thing for a dairy cow to be more filthy, you know, than a horse. It's just because of the way they are fed.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Turning now to
pharmaceuticals, you're familiar with the drugs administered to horses, vaccines, fungicides, those types of things, or pesticides, in dairy cattle; is that correct?

DR. BLACH: Yes.

MR. DUNN: Could you talk a little bit about, you know, the differences between those two, if there are differences, if there is similarities in how those are handled and administered by veterinarians and what you would expect to find in each of them as they head towards a processing facility?

DR. BLACH: Well, as far as the pharmaceuticals go in the dairy cow or beef cow or goats or horses or anything, we all use the same antibiotics, the same prostaglandins, which is the meclizines and the Butazolidins and the pain relievers, the antihistamines, the steroids, the antibiotics, the -- and all of those things.

We use the same drugs. We don't have any drugs specifically that's for cows or for horses, other than vaccines that we use to prevent different diseases. Of course, in horses, we have sleeping sickness, you know, it takes a vaccine. Cattle don't have that, so we don't vaccinate them for that.

But other than the vaccines, basically our drugs, antibiotics, antihistamines, we use them the same, they are interchangeable between horses and cattle.

MR. DUNN: Are there any that are used more or less in each species and -- between horses or cattle, or is there something that's more prevalently used in horses that you would expect to find potentially or be using on your horses that you wouldn't use on your cattle that has a withdrawal time or anything like that that you'd need to think about?

DR. BLACH: Not really. Speaking of the ones that we -- that are so universal, we use on both animals, is that -- the dosage may change and the duration of treatment may change, and that also reflects on withdrawal times, which are very specific.

In the dairy cows, in the dairy business, whether it be in the heifer population or the milking cow or the dry cow situation, we have certain withdrawal times that we know that we have to adhere to so that the milk or the meat is clear for edible purposes, and that all depends again upon the dosage and the weight of the animal and the duration that we give that. That's very specific.

In the dairy business, when we're dealing with
the cows that are producing the milk, then we use a lot of antibiotics in the udder for mastitis, and that's probably the biggest thing that a dairy has, the biggest problem. The biggest economical factor that affects a dairy is mastitis.

So the affected teat or affected teats are injected with an antibiotic -- commercially prepared or compounded, they are injected with an antibiotic for three or four days in a row until the animal is clear. At that time the cow is tested by itself, kind of a litmus test that the herdsman does. That cow is tested for any presence of any beta-lactams, which is penicillin derivatives or cephalosporins, and they do a litmus test there on that cow individually before that cow is put back into the line to go back into the tank. Because if just one cow that was positive for that, that wasn't tested, went into that tank, even though it's $8,000-80,000$ pounds in there -- and $I$ don't know, that's -- how many gallons that would be, but one cow can contaminate the whole tank if it's -- if the residue is still in the milk. So each cow is tested.

And then when the tank -- when it's cool and goes in the tank at the barn and then the trucking tank comes to pick it up, it's tested again to be sure that that tank is free and clear.

So withdrawal times are very important. We have to educate the herdsmen, and we have to watch that ourselves so that we do not contaminate the milk.

Along that line, on the dairy cow, it's the same way. We have different withdrawal times for the processing of the meat, so that the meat is not contaminated. And that withdrawal time, depending on the antibiotic or the drug that was given, it may take as long as 30 days before that cow can go to slaughter. We do not have any test for that, that we know that the cow is going to be clean at slaughter. We depend at the time of the slaughter where the FDA -- USDA's veterinarian at that station will check the kidney for residues, and then if that's positive, then the horse, of course, is condemned.

MR. DUNN: I think you meant dairy cow in that instance, probably.

DR. BLACH: Pardon me?

MR. DUNN: Dairy cow -- were you talking about the dairy cow?

DR. BLACH: Dairy cow.
MR. DUNN: You said the horse was condemned.

DR. BLACH: Dairy cow.
MR. DUNN: Just for the sake of the record.

DR. BLACH: Not horses. I hadn't gotten into
that yet.
So that's kind of the way it is in the dairy cows. There is really some stringent rules that we all have to abide by to make sure that the meat and the milk is edible, and sometimes that will slip by, and of course, if it does at the processing plant, being that cow is condemned, it goes to tankage or waste. And the same with the milk, the milk would be lost, too, if it wasn't free of that.

MR. DUNN: Just --

DR. BLACH: The withdrawal times is very
important.
It's all based again upon the dosage, the weight of the -- and the dosage is based upon the weight of the animal, and then the duration of the treatment.

MR. DUNN: Specifically, on dairy cattle, do you know of any substance commonly administered that remains a permanent contaminant in the meat or the milk of that animal?

DR. BLACH: No.
I have seen that statement made someplace that -- $I$ know of no drug -- no substance that we give, from insecticides to antibiotics to antiinflammatories, antihistamines, and even the aminoglycosides, all of the antibiotics that $I$ know of, I don't know of any drug
that stays in any animal -- any livestock for the rest of its life.

MR. DUNN: Let's kind of go through that with horses then.

With equine animals, is there any -- I'll ask that first question first, and then if you want to kind of go back behind it again. Do you know of any substance in horses that's commonly administered that remains a contaminant in that animal's meat or flesh of any sort, or in its blood, for that matter, for the duration of the animal's life, forever, it's never gone?

DR. BLACH: No, I don't know of any drug.
I think the same thing would apply to the horse. I don't know of any drug that would remain in that horse's -- remain in that horse for life, or it would in a goat or any other livestock that we've discussed this morning, that it would remain in there for the life of that animal.

MR. DUNN: Could you talk a little bit about the drugs administered to horses and their withdrawal times and their uses? Just maybe general ones.

I know one that's commonly mentioned is Bute. Could you talk a little bit about that and its presence in an animal after a withdrawal period and whether or not that would be present in the blood or any of the
drugs commonly used in horses?

DR. BLACH: Bute is referred to as

Butazolidin, which is an antiinflammatory drug. We have a number of those.

In my experiences, you know, how long withdrawal times are for the slaughter of the equine, I don't know what those are. I would assume they are very similar.

We would have to go by what the label says on meat residue. But my experience on residues in horses has been at the racetrack, which $I$ have spent many years there, and we do medicate racehorses for different lamenesses and illnesses, and we use the same antibiotics we do in cattle, the same antiinflammatories, the same antihistamines, the same antiprostaglandins, the same drugs, we use the same drugs.

But there we know -- again, just like in the dairy cattle, we know what the withdrawal times are -we must know -- because all those horses are tested for various drugs, including prohibitive drugs, which sometimes you hear about that there is drugs given to racehorses that should not be given, which is a Class IV drug might be in the -- say in the narcotic area, or the controlled substance area is a better word for that,
controlled substance, which we're not supposed to use. We do not use them in horses unless they are off out of training after a surgery or something like that.

So we know those withdrawal times, what they are, and how many -- and at the racetrack, we can give no medication on race day, none whatsoever, besides Lasix, which is a diuretic. That's permitted, but only at certain levels.

Then antibiotics and antiinflammatories, Butazolidin and those kind of drugs, we know what the withdrawal times are, and we know that, you know, we cannot give those kind of drugs anywhere from four to five to a week to ten days out of the time the horse is going to run, because he'll come up positive.

Now, the horses that are tested on the racetrack is always the winner, and then randomly out of every race, but every race day, they will pick four or five other horses that didn't win, but just to
spot-check, so we know that all veterinarians and all trainers are abiding by the withdrawal times.

MR. DUNN: Okay. When they test for that -you speak of tests. Is that blood tests, urinalysis? What kind of test is that?

DR. BLACH: It's blood test and urinalysis.
Now, if -- if a horse should break down on the
racetrack and be euthanized, then that animal is supposed to be autopsied and tissue samples are sent in to the -- and kidney samples, liver samples and so forth, testing for any foreign substance in there.

I might say in that -- on that line, in
horses, the withdrawal times are much more specific than in cattle, because in cattle, even at the processing plants, beef cattle or dairy cattle, sometimes it's only micrograms -- or milligrams, but in horses we -- we go -- a milligram is a thousand parts per gram, and then there is a microgram, which is a thousandth of that. But at the racetrack, a lot of our detecting drugs is a picogram, which is a thousandth of a microgram. So it's real strict testing positive of the presence of drugs.

I would assume that in a processing plant of horses that they would probably implement the same type of testing as they do at the racetrack, which is very, very specific.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Just a quick hypothetical, and then I'll pick on Rick a little bit and the other guys again.

Let's say, for instance, a horse that's bound for the race is administered Bute, let's say 30 days before the race. He ends up winning the race. They pull the blood. Would you expect to see that as a
residue in that horse's blood?

Is that within the period of time for a
withdrawal of Bute? Is there a period of time when it wouldn't show up? So if he's --

DR. BLACH: No.

MR. DUNN: -- administered the drug, when would you expect to not even be able to trace it in the blood?

DR. BLACH: Depending on the dose -- the normal dose, it absolutely would not be present in the blood or urine in 30 days.

MR. DUNN: Okay.
Rick, we've been talking about livestock and livestock watering of horses and dairy cattle.

Is it Valley Meat's intention to do livestock at this facility?

Is there a potential you could eventually go back to cattle or goats or camelids or whatever it might be that falls underneath that definition?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Well, being a federal facility, we could reapply to do cattle or goats. We cannot slaughter both horses and cattle in the same facility.

MR. DUNN: But you could -- potentially
underneath this discharge permit, you could be going
back to cattle at some time in the future for some reason --

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, sir.
MR. DUNN: -- if the law changes or whatever happens?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: We could.

MR. DUNN: You would still intend to use this permit for the discharge of livestock water, is that correct?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes. That's correct.
MR. DUNN: Would you expect to discharge more than 8,000 gallons per day no matter what the species of animal?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No, not more.
MR. DUNN: One of the things that's discussed in other written testimony is that you've exceeded the 8,000 gallons in the past.

Could you talk a little bit about the history of how Valley has been in compliance with that 8,000 , and kind of give us a little bit of the history of the facility, let's say, back to 2003 or so, or maybe 2002 to the present?

Any instances where you've exceeded what was going on? Anytime where you know there has been a discharge or there has been any sort of break in the
liner or anything like that? Anything where you would expect to see some sort of environmental harm?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No.
The liners, what -- we have visual
inspections. You can see -- you could -- you would be able to see if there was a problem with the liners, with the lagoon.

We've always got people outside our compost facility that we had out there, we had employees working out there, so there is people constantly around there. If there was an issue, it would be noted immediately.

As far as discharging -- when we've gone over the 8,000 gallons per day, what we -- we've gone at that facility -- in the whole facility, we've processed upwards of 150 animals per day. So if at a time we went over the 8,000 gallons per day, it was -- I could see that, but then there was days that we would be under the 8,000 by 2,000 or 3,000 gallons per day. So it varies.

I don't see how horses could be -- or equine be more water -- we would use more water than we do with cattle, the processing of cattle.

MR. DUNN: I know that you've been in contact with other facilities in the course of determining to go the equine route.

Have you had any discussions with them as to
what they usually have in their discharge? What would you expect your discharge to be?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: I --
MR. DUNN: I'm sorry, your usage per horse.
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: We've had -- well, it would be between 30 and 40 gallons per animal. That would be complete washdown -- and we say per animal, because we would have to do a complete cleanup of the facility after the slaughter day, after the processing day. So it would be 30 to 40 gallons per animal that it would take to process and per day.

MR. DUNN: If it seemed that you were going to exceed the 8,000 gallons per day, and for some reason you learned that it took more for horses, what would be your process?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: You know what, I don't think we would use more than the 8,000 gallons per day. We have been in contact with other equine slaughter facilities, and we've -- we've, you know, sought counsel from them, asking them what do they use, what's their process.

So we are very confident that we would not go over the 8,000 gallons per day.

MR. DUNN: Just for the sake of argument, let's say it got close or looked like you might, would
you make application to the Department to amend the permit and have them look at things and work with the Department in order to make sure that you didn't exceed that and that you -- it wasn't an issue with those lagoons?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, we could definitely do that, do an amendment.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Do you know of anything that's changed since your permit was last issued -leaving the horse debate aside for a minute, are you aware of anything livestock-wise, facility-wise, that has changed at your facility between the last issuance of this permit and its renewal now?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Nothing has changed, no. Not at all.

Our monitor wells are still in the same place. Our -- nothing has changed. We have a meter that our water flows through, and so $I$ think that's an upgrade that we've installed with our last lagoon that we put in. So, no, nothing has changed other than that.

MR. DUNN: So your last operating permit would be sufficient to still operate the facility in your opinion?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes. I believe so, yes.
MR. DUNN: Mr. Wyant, are you aware of
anything -- well, let me back up.
You saw the previous permit. You've also seen the current draft discharge permit issued by the Department.

You helped Valley draft some comments on that, is that correct?

MR. WYANT: Yes. We discussed some comments that they might want to make on the draft permit.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Can you illuminate a little bit on those comments, as to why those comments were made and, you know, what Valley was looking at doing in making those comments to the Department?

MR. WYANT: Well, primarily trying to improve the permit from the standpoint of being able to comply and operate the facility under the permit. Some -there were some areas that -- in the course of discussing the criteria put forth in the draft permit where they expressed some concern about being able to actually do what was being required, and so we talked about that.

But that's -- that would be a typical process that $I$ would go through with any of our nearly 100 facilities that we work with.

MR. DUNN: In working with the facilities that you work with, they commonly go through renewals. Is
that correct?

MR. WYANT: Yes. Yes, they would.

MR. DUNN: In this renewal process, if there is nothing really changed, do you have any idea or any belief as to why a permit would not be denied, if it was still working satisfactorily and sufficient to protect the environment?

MR. WYANT: Could you say that again?
MR. DUNN: If the facility were operating under its current permit and it came up for renewal, nothing had changed, it was still operating, it was sufficient to protect the environment, have you ever encountered an instance where a renewal was not issued because of a change in species?

MR. WYANT: No, I don't think I have.
MR. DUNN: Okay. In your opinion, is this draft permit sufficient to protect the environment from groundwater discharge?

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the form of that question. Maybe "in his opinion" might be a better way to say it.

MR. DUNN: In your opinion, I apologize.
In your opinion, is the current draft discharge permit sufficient to protect the environment from groundwater discharge?

MR. WYANT: Yes. In my opinion, it would be.
MR. DUNN: Are the facilities that you've consulted on adequate for that -- in your opinion, for protecting groundwater? The facilities at Valley Meat Company, sorry.

MR. WYANT: Yes. I've had limited experience with the facilities at Valley; basically administrative.

We don't do any monitoring assistance or reporting assistance or anything like that for the facility.

So from what experience $I$ have at the facility and experience with a number of groundwater discharge permits that deal with similar waste streams, I think that the permit -- the draft permit is consistent with a number of other permits that I've seen over the years that have been considered protective of groundwater.

MR. DUNN: Okay. Dr. Blach, are you aware of any substance -- is there anything about horse blood that is ever caustic enough to cause a breakdown in plastics or to cause any sort of damage to lagoon liners or a real threat to the environment?

DR. BLACH: No. None that $I$ know of at all.
MR. DUNN: And, Mr. Wyant (sic), one last
question for you, and then I'll pass the witnesses.
When those lagoons were constructed and those
monitoring wells were constructed, were those all to industry standard and sufficient for protecting groundwater by normal industry standards?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Yes, sir, they were. They were all certified.

MR. DUNN: At this time, I'll pass the witnesses.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Dunn.
Let me ask if any of the other parties have any objections to all of the exhibits that were listed in the notice of intent to present technical testimony by the applicant.

MR. WAGMAN: None here, Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: Objections?
MR. POWERS: None at this time, Your Honor.
MS. ORTH: All right. They are all admitted then.
(Valley Exhibits A through F admitted.)
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Dunn.
Mr. Powers, do you have questions of the applicant's panel?

MR. POWERS: Madam Hearing Officer, I've talked to my staff, and $I$ don't know if it may be appropriate, but we're willing to at least forgo our position and time of questioning until later, pass it to

Mr. Wagman, the Attorney General, and at that time -and after that -- $I$ think their questions may answer a lot of the same things we were looking at.

We would like to go after them, if that's permissible with the parties.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Mr. Wagman?

MR. WAGMAN: We'd like to maintain the order that's been described by the Hearing Officer and have the Department go first.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Mr. Powers, it is our protocol to have cross-examination in the same order as the direct examination goes.

MR. POWERS: That's fine, Your Honor.

We are prepared to move forward. If I may borrow the microphone from Mr. Dunn.

MS. ORTH: Yes.

MR. POWERS: Good morning, gentlemen, and Madam Hearing Officer. With your permission, we'll proceed.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF PANEL BY MR. POWERS

MR. POWERS: Mr. De Los Santos, I want to start with you, if that's okay.

We have a lot of the public here that may not
know exactly where this facility is located, sort of the process operations of what happens there, in general, please, and sort of the facility operations. Mr. Ashcraft, Mr. Wyant, you may chime in as you see fit. We are doing cross panel examination.

If you could just give us a general idea of what's happening out here at this facility from where it's located.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: The facility is located seven-and-a-half miles southeast of town, of Roswell, in the county, Chaves County.

It is a slaughter facility. It was built like in 1982. I leased it for a number of years and then eventually purchased it and continue to work there. I've employed as many as 50 employees, 55 employees. It's primarily slaughter of dairy cattle, bobby calves, goats, sheep, hogs. And so -- but that's what it is, is a slaughter facility.

MR. POWERS: And with that, how did you come about to decide to switch from your prior operations to what's proposed here today?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Well, the economy -- you know, with the recession, $I$ think we all got hit with that, and so it was a -- we struggled for a couple of years just trying to keep the doors open.

So the opportunity came up in November of 2011, that President Obama signed a bill that we could slaughter equine, and so we definitely looked at that very hard, talking with USDA, and USDA talked to -- you know, encouraged us to do something like this in reality. The Denver District Office encouraged us to be a plant that would -- that we could switch over to slaughter horses.

So we did -- you know, we didn't just wake up and say, "Oh, we want to slaughter horses." No, we did our homework and looked at the plants that were in existence back in 2006 and put the numbers together and looked at the transportation of the horses going into Mexico, going into Canada, and we believed it was something that was definitely worth looking at, because of the struggles we were going through at the time.

MR. POWERS: You mentioned these two facilities -- or two places where they were going, Mexico and Canada.

Is that the only places currently that are allowed to slaughter horses outside the United States?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: That $I$ know of that are slaughtering horses, yes, American horses.

MR. POWERS: Okay. If you will, Mr. Wyant, describe sort of, after leaving the facility or building
where this may occur, the general facility diagram or layout --

MR. WYANT: Yes.

MR. POWERS: -- structurally.

MR. WYANT: The wastewater from the -- it's my understanding that the layout is that the wastewater from the kill floor and the rest of the processing area in the facility goes through a common drain into two -a series of two septic tank type of concrete tanks that are buried outside -- just outside the plant wall.

MR. POWERS: And their purpose would be what?

MR. WYANT: Their purpose is primarily to settle solids that might be in the waste stream.

And then from those two tanks, it goes by a closed pipeline, buried closed pipeline, to the first process wastewater pond that was built, and then from there, it's pumped over a berm between the -- that's common to the two ponds -- into a finishing or evaporation pond, which is the one that Mr. Ashcraft described as being built in, I think, 2005 --

MR. ASHCRAFT: That's correct.
MR. WYANT: -- 2006 .

MR. POWERS: What is the purpose of that last settle? Is there a discharge point after that to any streams or rivers or any surface waters?

MR. WYANT: Not to my knowledge. It's an all
evaporation system. It's very similar to all
evaporation systems that we have on maybe six or seven dairies that $I$ work with around the state.

MR. POWERS: So unless -- and correct me if I'm wrong. So unless there is a leak with the liners or the impoundments for some reason or some piping in between the building and that location, really, there is no discharge to the groundwater or surface waters; is that correct?

MR. WYANT: That should be the case. That's correct.

MR. POWERS: At least in theory?
MR. WYANT: Yes. That's --
MR. POWERS: And that's what I want to ask you next.

So if there is a leak from these impoundments -- so if we've got wash water coming out from the facility going to these two settling tanks and then to these two lagoons -- what's the state's role -in your experience, what do we do to protect making sure that there is nothing leaking from these lagoons?

MR. WYANT: Well, the first line of protection is proscribed in the permit as monthly visual
inspections of the impoundments. This is a requirement
where the operator or operator's representative of some type is supposed to look at the liner, the visible area of the liner, to make sure there is not damage, and then obviously repair it immediately.

I've worked with liners over probably about a 25- or 30-year period of time, HDPE liners, and it's been my experience that below the water level, there is seldom damage, unless there is some catastrophic physical event that takes place.

Above the waterline is the area of most concern, $I$ think, from a practical standpoint in terms of maintaining integrity of the liner system.

The second line of defense that has been used by the state over a long number of years is the installation of monitoring wells, what's in a position called downgradient or downstream of the impoundment, and that's not surface water streams but groundwater streams.

MR. POWERS: Mr. Ashcraft, would you agree with that general assessment?

MR. ASHCRAFT: Yes. I think that's very well put.

MR. POWERS: So the purpose of a monitoring well is to do what?

Mr. De Los Santos, based on your
understanding, what are the monitoring wells there to do?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: To -- to ensure that there is no -- they are up- -- upgrade of the lagoons and downgrade. So they ensure that there is no contamination going downgrade.

If there is contamination coming into the groundwater, then it should maintain the same on the downside, also.

MR. POWERS: A couple questions, again, Mr. De Los Santos, if I may.

Let's talk about volume, if we may. I know that Mr. Dunn questioned several of you on the volumes that we've talked about.

First of all, I want to talk about the process wastewater. And for those that may not know what that is, is everything -- does every single water that's used in the facility go into that lagoon, or is this only specific water used in the facility going to the lagoon?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: All the water used in the facility is -- goes into the lagoon, yes. It goes into the septic tanks and then out into the lagoons.

MR. POWERS: Okay. Of that volume, how much is used -- is everything in the facility -- I guess what I'm getting to, and let me correct myself, can you tell
us what offal is?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: What what is?
MR. POWERS: What offal is.
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Offal?
MR. POWERS: Yes, sir.
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: It's the intestines, the guts, the skulls, feet, everything that comes off that cannot be used off -- off any particular animal.

MR. POWERS: And is that -- all of that going to the lagoon, too?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: The offal?
MR. POWERS: Yes.
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No, no.
MR. POWERS: And tell us what is required for you to do with the offal?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Offal has got to go to a rendering plant. It's got to be -- it can be composted, but it has to be disposed of.

MR. POWERS: And is this current -- is this facility currently allowed to do any composting of that material or of that type of waste?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No. No composting.
MR. POWERS: And if you can, let's talk about that.

Why is that?
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MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Because I do not have a permit to compost.

MR. POWERS: And have you approached -- have you ever approached the Department to obtain that type of permit?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Have I ever approached? Yes, sir, I did.

MR. POWERS: And are you currently allowed to do so at this time?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No composting allowed.
MR. POWERS: So what -- what do you do with
the offal, if $I$ may ask?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: It goes to a rendering plant. We have a rendering plant that will take it in Dallas.

We have all the components ourselves to build a rendering plant, pending -- you know, if we can get the work, we'll install the rendering plant. We have all the components.

MR. POWERS: Okay. And I think, Mr. Wyant, you've expressed that this permit is allowed up to 8,000 gallons per day. Is that correct?

MR. WYANT: That's correct.
MR. POWERS: And I forget if it's Dr. Blach or whom said about 30 gallons to 40 gallons -- I think that
was you, Mr. De Los Santos.
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Uh-huh.
MR. POWERS: I calculated about 228 head, is that right, at about 35 gallons per, would be about 8, 000?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, 8,000.
MR. POWERS: Does that sound about right?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, sir.
MR. POWERS: I know in the media and some of the other information I've seen, we've talked about 121 heads per day or 250 heads of processing of equines per day.

Is that about what you see?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: We have a contract to slaughter 120 head per day, yes.

MR. POWERS: Okay.
Mr. Wyant, I want to talk to you -- I know you'd had a lot of conversation with Mr. Dunn about the difference between a dairy facility or a comparison to a dairy facility.

Is this facility a dairy facility?
MR. WYANT: No.
MR. POWERS: Are they really similar, or are they inherently different in nature?

MR. WYANT: Well, the business is different.

I mean, the -- the production activity or the business is different, but $I$ think from the standpoint of handling wastewater, they have a great deal of similarities.

MR. POWERS: Mr. Wyant, what about the domestic wastewater from restrooms, kitchens, or other things like that, not processing of the material, is that going to the lagoons as well?

MR. WYANT: I don't believe it is, but that question might better be directed to Mr. De Los Santos.

MR. POWERS: Mr. De Los Santos?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, everything from the facility -- all the water from the facility that's -that is used goes into the septic tanks. From there, it goes into the lagoon. Yes, sir.

MR. WYANT: Even the restrooms?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: It's all pumped to that.
MR. POWERS: Mr. Ashcraft, I'll just pick on you for a second.

MR. ASHCRAFT: Sure. No problem.
MR. POWERS: And, Dr. Blach, we so appreciate you, and I'll be getting to you in a moment.

Mr. Ashcraft, how is the volumetric of water coming out of the facility measured before it goes into the lagoons?
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MR. ASHCRAFT: The time that $I$ was working
with them, they had two different meters on two different lines, we would call it the entry lines into the facilities, and that determined how much water came out of the facility. They were read on a weekly basis.

MR. POWERS: Is it a magno meter, a continuous flow meter or --

MR. ASHCRAFT: It was a micrometer, if I
remember right. It's not electronic. It's going to be a -- probably a micrometer, I would guess. It's been a long time.

MR. POWERS: Mr. Wyant, do you know what type of meter the facility currently has?

MR. WYANT: For the discharge volume?
MR. POWERS: Yes.
MR. WYANT: Yes, I think it's an
electromagnetic meter. Yes.
MR. POWERS: And is that a calibrated -- is
that meter able to be calibrated, to your knowledge?
MR. WYANT: I -- you know, I don't really know anything about that meter. I mean, that could be ascertained, I'm sure.

But at the time we did the permit renewal application, it was not an issue. We just noted -- just identified that the meter was there, installed and
operational.
I am aware that electromagnetic meters are bench tested and calibrated and sealed at the factory before they are shipped, so they are -- they meet a pretty strict ASTM guideline.

MR. POWERS: And I think the permit requires that that meter be calibrated within ten percent of the actual volume. Is that correct?

MR. WYANT: I think that's -- yes, I think that's in the permit.

MR. POWERS: And is that meter, to your knowledge, Mr. De Los Santos, capable of being calibrated to that standard?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Well, it sits about six feet underground and on the waterline.

I've never looked at it to see if it can be calibrated at all.

MR. POWERS: Are you aware that the permit does require that --

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: To be calibrated?

MR. POWERS: -- that condition?

Yes, sir.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: I was not aware. No.

Huh-uh.

MR. POWERS: And I'll instruct you -- this

Hearing Officer's attention to permit condition 22 of the revised current permit, and that does discuss, in general, the monthly volume of wastewater that's supposed to be metered.

And in Section 23 of the revised permit, for everyone's attention, is the method and meter calibration requirements.

Mr. De Los Santos, if this permit does issue, would you comply with the terms of those requirements?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, sir.
MR. POWERS: Okay.
And, Mr. De Los Santos, $I$ want to talk to you also -- looking back at condition 21 of the permit, there has been some concern of the actual groundwater direction. And, Mr. Wyant, Mr. Ashcraft, you can chime in as you see fit.

I think it's been undetermined exactly the precise flow direction of the groundwater. Is that correct, to your knowledge?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: That it has not been
determined?

Yes, I don't think we've seen anything that actually says the direction of the flow. I don't think we've seen anything.

MR. POWERS: If you would, take a look at
paragraph 21 of the revised permit.

One of the conditions -- my apologies,

Mr. Dunn -- is to conduct a groundwater elevation contour study to determine the actual flow direction.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Okay.

MR. POWERS: Would you be willing to comply with the terms of that requirement?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, sir.
And if $I$ may, let me ask, did we have any --

MR. ASHCRAFT: Well, the wells were surveyed when they were put in and GPS'ed and so forth. And for the two times that $I$ was involved in that, in March of '06 and May of '06, the lowest water level was in number four, the next water level was in number three, and so forth, so -- which fits the normal, we would say, topography of the land, which goes to the east/ northeast.

MR. POWERS: Okay.

MR. ASHCRAFT: But the study was only done -that was only two quarters. Was it done over a year period of time, and they don't have -- of course, I don't have what we call a potentiometric map or a hydrologic map.

MR. POWERS: Mr. De Los Santos, I just want to direct your attention to permit condition number five of
the permit.
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: I need my glasses.

MR. POWERS: I believe that may clarify -- it goes back to some of what $I$ was talking about earlier.

You indicated that all of the wastewater from the facility is going to the groundwater impoundments.

As you see in permit condition number five, any domestic wastewater -- it's only the processing wastewater that's allowed to go to these impoundments. Is that correct?

Mr. Ashcraft, I see you shaking your head.
Is that the design and layout of the facility?

MR. ASHCRAFT: I would -- I don't know how the design is or the layout of the facility is, but $I$ was under the same impression, that anything for domestic has to be separated into its own septic tank and system.

MR. POWERS: Mr. Wyant, do you have anything to add to that?

MR. WYANT: No, I don't.
MR. POWERS: Mr. De Los Santos?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Well, we do have two septic tanks. We do have two septic tanks, so -- and now that we look at it and are thinking about it, there is one septic tank that catches all -- everything coming in from the facility.

The other septic tank, the one on the west side, catches the manure and so forth coming out -coming in from the pens.

So it could be -- this could be correct here, that that is -- the one septic tank is for the product coming in from the facility, the domestic.

MR. POWERS: I guess you do understand that if this permit does issue that that may need to be verified prior to start-up or verification of the permit?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, sir. Uh-huh.

MR. POWERS: Okay.

Mr. Wyant, earlier you said this permit or the draft permit and prior permits issued to this facility are fairly consistent with other slaughter facilities that you've encountered before.

Is that correct?

MR. WYANT: Yes. I've only seen a few, but, yes, I'd say it was reasonably consistent.

MR. POWERS: When you say reasonably few, I mean, I understand, based upon my knowledge, you've been doing dairy permits and other types of permits for quite some time.

I think your testimony certified to that, correct?

MR. WYANT: Correct.

MR. POWERS: Do you know how many slaughter facilities, whether it's cattle, equine, other type of permit or activity, in the State of New Mexico?

MR. WYANT: No, I don't have perfect knowledge of the number. It's a very -- it's not a large number, I know that.

I've done some work in the past with -- the difference here would be this is a commercial packing facility, where a lot of our other work has been with small custom slaughter operators.

MR. POWERS: Okay. And I think earlier -- and I just want to make sure for the record we have it clear, the difference between an amended permit or a modified permit.

I think under the statutory or the regulatory requirements, they are distinct. Is that correct, based on your understanding?

MR. WYANT: That's my understanding, yes.
MR. POWERS: And when you talk about an
amendment to a modified permit, can you describe the difference?

MR. WYANT: Well, in my experience with these permits, a modified permit requires public notice, it's similar to the renewal process, you're materially
changing the process -- the permit, probably either in
the quality of the wastewater or an increase in the quantity or a change in the location of land application; where something other with regards to the permit might be done by an amendment that's simply issued by the Secretary.

MR. POWERS: Okay.
Mr. De Los Santos, one of the additional permit terms that we're proposing, or at least the New Mexico Department is, is addition of another monitoring well at the facility.

Are you aware of that?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, sir.
MR. POWERS: I think it's permit condition 15 for the Madam's sake.

Do you understand that within a certain period of time that the Department has asked for another monitoring well, and are you willing to comply with the terms of that?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, sir. Uh-huh.
MR. POWERS: Mr. Wyant, in permit -- in
condition 17, one of the monitoring parameters that we have this facility looking to is what's called TKN, $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{TDS}$ and Cl .

MR. WYANT: Yes.
MR. POWERS: Can you describe what those are
and how those constituents are -- what they are from, just based upon your experience and training?

MR. WYANT: Well, they -- these are groundwater samples from the monitoring well. So they -- they would either -- those constituents would either be naturally occurring in the groundwater as it is in its existing condition.

MR. POWERS: Okay. What does TKN stand for?
MR. WYANT: Total Kjeldahl nitrogen.
MR. POWERS: Based on your knowledge, is that
a regulated component under the groundwater standards?
MR. WYANT: No, it's not.
MR. POWERS: And why would we ask -- in your experience, why does the Department ask to monitor that?

MR. WYANT: You know, I'm not sure I can answer that question.

MR. POWERS: Maybe it would be a question better for my witnesses.

MR. WYANT: Yes.
MR. POWERS: Can you describe what $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ is?
MR. WYANT: That's nitrate nitrogen.
MR. POWERS: And TDS?
MR. WYANT: TDS is total dissolved solids.
MR. POWERS: And Cl?
MR. WYANT: Is chlorides.

MR. POWERS: Okay.

Dr. Blach, I'm just wondering, some of the pharmaceuticals that you were talking about -- buterol, can you describe what that is?

I think for the laymen's terms, we don't really understand some of the medication names and stuff.

So could you describe -- I think you were talking about buterol or something to that effect.

DR. BLACH: Yeah, yeah. Bute -- it's mostly referred to as Bute --

MR. POWERS: Okay.
DR. BLACH: -- B-u-t-e, but it's called

Butazolidin.

MR. POWERS: Okay.

DR. BLACH: It's an antiinflammatory drug.

MR. POWERS: Is that just for horses?

DR. BLACH: Horses and cattle.

MR. POWERS: Okay.
DR. BLACH: All livestock.

MR. POWERS: All livestock?

DR. BLACH: Yes.

MR. POWERS: I think in review of other
testimony that you've seen a list of other drugs that were represented as possibly dangerous to human health.

DR. BLACH: Pardon me?

MR. POWERS: Have you had a chance to review the testimony of other parties?

DR. BLACH: Some, yes.
MR. POWERS: And in that testimony, there was an extensive list of drugs that are used for horses, equines.

Have you had a chance to review that?

DR. BLACH: Extensive drugs used in equine?
MR. POWERS: Yes. Yes, sir, I'm sorry.

We may cover that a little bit later. I think
it may be a little premature for that at this point, Your Honor.

Do you know if, say, buterol, or the drugs that you were referencing, are they regulated, to your knowledge, by the State of New Mexico Groundwater Quality or Environment Department?

DR. BLACH: I don't know about Groundwater Quality. No, I do not know.

MR. POWERS: Mr. Wyant, are you aware if any of those drugs are currently regulated?

MR. WYANT: Not in my experience.

MR. POWERS: If I may have just a moment, Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: All right.
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MR. POWERS: We'll pass the witnesses at this time, Your Honor.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
Thank you, Mr. Powers.

Mr. Wagman, have the parties sitting at that table set forth themselves an order of presentation?

MR. WAGMAN: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer.
We'll let Mr. Holland ask any questions he has, and then $I$ will ask questions on behalf of the rest of the parties here.

MS. ORTH: All right.

If you would.

MR. HOLLAND: Thank you very much, Madam Hearing Officer. I have a short slide presentation that will speak -- I guess, can everybody hear me all right? My voice carries pretty well.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Holland, just a moment. Just a moment. This is questions of this panel.

MR. HOLLAND: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I thought you were going to us.

MS. ORTH: Yes.
MR. HOLLAND: I beg your pardon.

MS. ORTH: I'm sorry.
So to be clear, at this time it is time for
the -- let me call it the opposing parties to ask
questions of this panel.

MR. HOLLAND: I do have some questions of the panel. Thank you very much.

MS. ORTH: All right.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF PANEL BY MR. HOLLAND

MR. HOLLAND: Dr. Blach, you indicated that horses get the same drugs as cattle.

I'm a simple horse owner. I've owned horses all my life.

Why do all the boxes contain a statement that says "Not for animals intended for slaughter"? Particularly phenylbutazone, and Clenbuterol for that matter.

MR. BLACH: Well, Clenbuterol is a prohibitive substance. Butazolidin is used in cattle as well as horses, and it's just -- and we're just going by the withdrawal times.

MR. HOLLAND: It doesn't state a withdrawal time on the boxes $I$ have, sir.

And isn't it true that phenylbutazone is forbidden in meat animals -- all meat animals -- my veterinarian tells me that -- and that it's forbidden in dairy cattle over 18 years of age?

MR. BLACH: I think that's true. Anytime you give phenylbutazone, it's an off-label, and it has to be
prescribed for that particular purpose.
MR. HOLLAND: And that animal should not be sent to slaughter for human consumption?

DR. BLACH: That's right.
MR. HOLLAND: And you made a statement about race-day Bute. You said that race-day Bute was not allowed at the local racetracks. I understand that. Are you aware that that's a state-by-state issue?

I'm assuming that Mr. De Los Santos would like to slaughter horses from other states, that there are many states in which race-day Bute is accepted and that race-day Bute in fact appears on the race cards. It will have a letter $B$, indicating that --

DR. BLACH: Yeah, that used to be.
During these days, $I$ don't know of any state that relies -- that allows Butazolidin on a race day now. The Racing Commission -- Racing Commission International has prohibited that drug to be given on race day.

MR. HOLLAND: Well, sir, $I$ would dispute that, but we may check that fact.

I had another question here for Mr. -- well, hold on just one second.

You were saying that the drugs disappear from
the horse in a certain amount of time, from the animal in a certain amount of time. Right?

Are you aware that this is an exponential decay, that it doesn't just go away magically, that it goes down -- sort of like walking halfway through a wall?

DR. BLACH: Yes. Most drugs have what we call a half-life period, either a half-life, a half-life, and a half-life.

MR. HOLLAND: Right.
And that some of those drugs -- many of those drugs have metabolites, so as the half-life of the original drug begins to decay, the metabolites begin to appear.

MR. BLACH: Can you go over that again?
MR. HOLLAND: Okay. Drugs are generally metabolized in the liver, right? Is that a correct statement?

DR. BLACH: Primarily.
MR. HOLLAND: And as they are metabolized, other compounds are generated. Is that a correct statement?

DR. BLACH: Yes.
MR. HOLLAND: Are you aware that
phenylbutazone metabolizes into oxyphenbutazone?

DR. BLACH: Yes.

MR. HOLLAND: And the half-life of
oxyphenbutazone is much longer than phenylbutazone?
DR. BLACH: Somewhat longer, yes.
MR. HOLLAND: And that both have similar
toxic -- they are both considered carcinogens?
MR. BLACH: The toxic effect, I'm unaware of, but they are in the carcinogens.

MR. HOLLAND: And that they do have --
MR. BLACH: Yes.
MR. HOLLAND: Some people do have
hypersensitive reactions. Are you aware of that?
DR. BLACH: Yes.
MR. HOLLAND: So it can be an undetectable level and a person could still have a hypersensitive reaction to it, is that correct?

DR. BLACH: I don't know about that.
MR. HOLLAND: All right.
And, Mr. Wyant, you indicated that most of the damage in these ponds occurs above the waterline. To the liners.

MR. WYANT: That's been my experience over the years, yes.

MR. HOLLAND: Right.
Mr. De Los Santos tells us that the waterline
goes up and down a great deal. He said that it might be full one day and down 3,000 gallons the next. Didn't you, Mr. De Los Santos?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Well, the water level in the lagoons is -- is maintained. It doesn't -- if we use 8,000 gallons today, that's not going to -- I mean, you're talking about a one-acre lagoon.

MR. HOLLAND: But it's evaporating, right?
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, it's evaporating.
MR. HOLLAND: And so during the period when you're not putting anything into it, it's evaporating, it's got to be going down so you can put some more into it.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes.
MR. HOLLAND: So it's not constantly 8,000 gallons.

My point here is that the waterline is different on any given day, depending on whether you've just discharged into it or you're ending a period of evaporation over the weekend or whatever.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Holland, just a moment.
Mr. Dunn, do you have an objection?
MR. DUNN: That's argumentative. It's not a question.

MS. ORTH: Right.

MR. HOLLAND: Okay. I'll ask him.
MS. ORTH: All right.

So, Mr. Holland, just as a general instruction
for all examiners --

MR. HOLLAND: Yes.

MS. ORTH: -- to the extent you have points to make, I'll ask that those points be made during your own testimony. This is really purely for questions.

MR. HOLLAND: I see.

My only question was, wouldn't the waterline go up and down then?

MS. ORTH: All right. That's a fine question.
MR. HOLLAND: Thank you.
MS. ORTH: And did you get an answer? I think you did.

MR. HOLLAND: I think I got an answer. It will go up and down.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Right.

MR. HOLLAND: So that answers my question.
And that's all the questions $I$ have, Your
Honor.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Holland.

Mr. Wagman.

MR. WAGMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

I notice we've been going 100 minutes. Did you want to stop now, because I'll be up for a bit?

MS. ORTH: Can you estimate for me the length of your cross-examination?

MR. WAGMAN: Probably an hour or more.
MS. ORTH: Okay. Then let's take a break now, and we'll come back in 15 minutes.

Thank you.
(Recess held.)
MS. ORTH: Let's come back from the break,
please.
All right. When we broke in the proceedings, we were about to begin the cross-examination of the applicant's panel by Mr. Wagman.

Mr. Wagman.
MR. WAGMAN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.
Would you like me to use the podium?
MS. TOWNSEND: Yes.
MR. WAGMAN: The court reporter would like me to use the podium.

MS. ORTH: Yes, please.
MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: With all due apologies,
Mr. Ashcraft just informed me that he does need to be
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gone after lunch, so if in this period of time we could kind of just focus towards him, just out of deference for his schedule, we would appreciate it.

MS. ORTH: All right. Mr. Wagman, can you do that?

MR. WAGMAN: I will do that, Your Honor.

When is lunch? Or when does Mr. Ashcraft need to leave?

MR. ASHCRAFT: At lunch.

MR. WAGMAN: Noon, you mean, or --

MR. ASHCRAFT: Noon.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. Sometimes lunch doesn't happen until very late in the day.

Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer and the panel. I'll try to go through one at a time. Mr. Ashcraft, I'll do you second, so you can get to lunch.

I'd like to start with you, Mr. De Los Santos.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF MR. DE LOS SANTOS

BY MR. WAGMAN:
Q. Who is Rick Robey?
A. Who is he?
Q. Yes.
A. He was a partner of mine at the -- out at the plant.
Q. Okay. And what period of time was he a partner?
A. Like from 19- -- 1999, maybe -- '96 -- from 1996 up until 2004 , '5, somewhere. MS. DE LOS SANTOS: '7. MR. DE LOS SANTOS: '7? That's my wife. She knows.

MR. WAGMAN: I understand. Okay. That's fine.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) You previously had a permit to discharge wastewater in connection with a cow slaughtering operation, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did you cease operations doing cow slaughter?
A. Cease operations?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. November -- no, it was April of 2012 .
Q. And why did you cease operations?
A. Because we were applying to slaughter equine, and you cannot have a grant of inspection for both species, so --
Q. And you're referring to a grant of inspection from the USDA, United States Department of Agriculture?
A. Yes, USDA.
Q. And your prior permit for the cow slaughter operation expired in 2009, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said USDA encouraged you to start slaughtering horses, correct?
A. Yes, that it was a good idea -- that it was available and that it was a good idea.
Q. And when did you first speak with USDA about slaughtering horses?
A. November, 2011.
Q. Okay. And did someone else give you the idea to slaughter horses besides USDA?
A. Give me the idea?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Did you talk to anyone else about slaughtering horses, about the process or what it would entail?
A. Yes. I talked to a plant in Fort Worth, Texas, the former Beltex plant. I talked to the owner there.
Q. Anyone else?
A. No. No.
Q. Was the owner at the Beltex plant still
operating as a cow slaughter or other slaughter?
A. Cow slaughter, yes, sir.
Q. And was it the same owner who had done horse slaughter?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me, over the course of the time that you were slaughtering horses at Valley Meat, the number of cattle you were slaughtering per day?
A. The number of cattle?
Q. Yes.
A. We would do as many as a hundred head a day.
Q. Okay.
A. And we would process, in the whole facility, some days up to 150 head per day.
Q. And can you distinguish for us the difference between slaughter and process, please?
A. Process would -- entails slaughtering and processing, boning and cutting up and so forth.
Q. Okay. So slaughter -- sorry. Slaughter is just the killing, and processing is everything from killing to --
A. Yes.
Q. -- going out the door?
A. Process, yes.
Q. Can you describe just briefly what that process of -- well, first, the process of slaughter, how
-- from the time the cow gets to your facility to the time the cow is slaughtered, can you explain sort of the steps you take?
A. We do an antemortem inspection. USDA goes out and checks the livestock to make sure it's okay to slaughter. Then we bring it into the facility and start the slaughtering process, knocking and bleeding and so forth.
Q. So first you render the animal unconscious. Is that correct?
A. Yes. We stun them, yes.
Q. And then how does the bleeding process work?
A. You hang them up upside down from one leg, and you bleed -- bleed them out. Stick them in the jugular vein.
Q. Okay. So the blood drains out?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And what happens to the blood?
A. It goes in the barrels and goes -- it used -it was going into our compost pile.
Q. And does any of the blood go into the drains?
A. I'm sure some. We have washdown. Employees wash their aprons. I'm sure some would go into the drains.
Q. Okay. The original permit that was applied
for at NMED was based on 39.3 cows per day, correct?
A. 39.3 cows per day? That was something that we put in there. It's not -- the state does not regulate how many animals we slaughter. They do not regulate. They regulate the amount of water used.
Q. I understand. But my question was not what the state regulates; it was whether that number was in the application.
A. I'm not sure. I'm not sure.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: I'm not clear as to which original permit.

Can we get a little more specificity as to which permits we're talking about, what period of time? I think it might be easier for the witness to answer that.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.
MR. WAGMAN: Well, I'll make it easier.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Was there a permit application at some point in which you specified that you would be slaughtering 39.3 cows per day?
A. I do not recall, Mr. Wagman. No, I do not recall.
Q. Okay. Mr. De Los Santos, I'm going to show you the 2003 request for renewal of a permit. It's AR

236C-75. I'm just going to point you to 236 --
actually, I'm sorry, 236C-75 is the entire document.
MR. DUNN: May I approach, Madam Hearing
Officer?
MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: I think he might need a copy of
that, if he's going to look at it.
MR. WAGMAN: I was going to hand him a copy,
Your Honor.
MS. ORTH: All right.
MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer, I'm just trying to find the right page, because they are not specifically numbered.

Actually, just to expedite this, again, I'll represent this is 236C-75, dated August 29th, 2003. It begins with a letter of August 26 th, 2003 , to Maura Hanning of the Groundwater Pollution Prevention Section from Ricardo De Los Santos, and then encloses -- or attaches the NMED Groundwater Discharge Permit Renewal Application.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: Just for the sake of efficiency and clarity, could we go ahead and put one of those on the table for the witnesses?

MR. WAGMAN: I'm about to do that.

MR. DUNN: Can we actually put the Hearing Officer's copy on the table so that they could reference the actual copy of the administrative record?

MS. ORTH: Okay. That takes it away from me, which is why I invite people to look at it on the break, but if you have a copy for them, and unless, Mr. Dunn, there is a serious question about whether it's an accurate copy --

MR. DUNN: I'd just like to see it before.
MS. ORTH: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Mr. De Los Santos, if you look at the one, two, three, four, fifth column, where it says "Renewed permit."
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Under that it says, "Cows per day." Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that it says 39.3?
A. Okay.
Q. And then if you flip to the front of this
document that I've handed you, which again is AR 236C-75, is that your signature on that letter?
A. Yes, sir, it is.
Q. Thank you. That was a whole lot of time for a little question. I apologize.

And the amount of discharge per day that the permit application was for was what?
A. 8,000 gallons per day.
Q. Thank you.

Who is responsible for providing monitoring
reports for your facility?
A. I would, and I would designate employees, also, to pull the ground -- the monitor well water. I've had several employees do that.
Q. Great.

And how often is that done -- or was that done, I apologize, let's say between 2010 and 2012 before you stopped operating?
A. It was done maybe twice a year.
Q. Okay. The permit that we're talking about here today you applied for in 2010 , correct?
A. Yes.
Q. After you got notice that your prior permit had expired, correct?
A. It had expired, yes.
Q. At that time you were planning on slaughtering cows under that permit, correct?
A. We had been slaughtering cattle, yes.
Q. When you applied in 2010, you had no thought
about slaughtering horses. Is that correct?
A. In 2010, no.
Q. Okay. Did you ever inform NMED or the Groundwater Water Quality Bureau about your intention to slaughter horses?
A. No. I just submitted a -- no. Oh, go ahead. I'm sorry. No.
Q. No, you're good. You answered.
A. No, I just submitted the renewal application. That's all.
Q. When is the first time you discussed slaughtering horses with any member of the Bureau or the agency?
A. I am not sure when that was. It was after I submitted the renewal, though.
Q. So was it in 2012, do you think?
A. It might have been 2012, yeah.
Q. 2013?
A. '12.
Q. Okay. Do you have any experience running a horse slaughterhouse?
A. Not horse slaughter. I've never slaughtered a horse, never.
Q. But you're pretty confident there is no difference in operations, is that correct?
A. In operations, no, sir.
Q. But USDA required you to change the facility at Valley Meat in order to slaughter horses, is that correct?
A. Change the facility?
Q. Yes.
A. We had to install a catwalk, because of the inspection regimen that USDA required. We had to change our knock issue. And this is all voluntary. They don't make us change anything, it's all voluntary, and so we did the changes that we thought would help the process.
Q. And did USDA tell you that you could slaughter horses and cows in the same facility?
A. At the beginning, in 2011 , they said put in a request for a waiver to the regulation and that $I$ might be able to do both species in the same facility, and this was communication between USDA and myself.
Q. And -- sorry, go ahead.
A. And so they did talk to us about that, and so we submitted an application to do that.
Q. And what was the answer from USDA?
A. It was denied.
Q. Denied?
A. It was denied, yes.
Q. Did they tell you -- excuse me. Did they tell you why?
A. That because we could not do both species in the same facility.
Q. I understand that's what they told you. Did they tell you why, or did they just say no?
A. No, they just said that you cannot do it, it's part of the regulations and in the CFR manual of USDA that you cannot do both species in the same facility.
Q. So they said it was based on the federal regulations?
A. Uh-huh. Yes.
Q. Was that a yes?
A. What?
Q. I just need you to answer audibly for the court reporter.
A. Please repeat.
Q. Yeah.

My question was, they told you that you
couldn't slaughter both species because of federal law, is that correct?
A. Yes. Uh-huh.
Q. Now, when and if you engage in horse slaughter, will you -- you'll have different suppliers than you did for cows; is that correct?
A. Different suppliers?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you'll have different customers as well, is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And the meat will go different places than it did before, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And there are -- these are obviously a different species, correct, than cows, than you've done before?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. We've heard some testimony that horses and cows have either a little bit more -- horses either have a little bit more blood than cows on average or about the same. Is that correct? Did you hear that?
A. Yeah, that's what I heard, five percent or seven percent of the body weight.
Q. And blood is a potential contaminant for water and the environment. Is that correct?
A. To groundwater, I guess it would be.
Q. When did you first decide that you were going to slaughter 121 horses per day?
A. When we did the research of what the other facility -- the three facilities in the United States in 2006, we looked at what they were doing, and they had 50
employees, they slaughtered 120 head per day, had a comparable size of facilities, and so we thought that's what we could do.

We slaughter 80 to 100 cows a day, dairy cows, so we thought horses would be a lot easier to handle than cattle, than those old dairy cows we'd slaughtered.
Q. Okay. Have you ever been told that horses are a lot harder to handle at a slaughterhouse than cows?

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn.
MR. DUNN: I'm not sure of the relevance of that question. I'd object to its relevance, as not being relevant to what goes on with a discharge permit.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Wagman, how would you tie this to the protection of groundwater?

MR. WAGMAN: Well, first, the witness just testified that they were easier, so $I$ was trying to elicit some impeachment of that statement; and second of all, the fact that horses are harder means that there is a much greater likelihood of contamination from things like manure, saliva and blood, if horses are intended to be killed in a slaughterhouse.

MS. ORTH: All right.
And the question, $I$ think, has been answered
now in any event.
Please go ahead.
MR. WAGMAN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Mr. De Los Santos, do you have any concern about the overflow of the lagoons moving to 121 horses?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Have you had problems with overflow of the lagoons in the past?
A. No.
Q. There has never been any overflow of lagoons at your facility?
A. Overflow?
Q. Overflow.
A. No. No. Not that I'm aware of, no.
Q. Okay. And you're not aware that NMED has noted at least two occasions on which there was overflow of the lagoons at your facility, is that correct?
A. That they were -- maybe that they were full, that we needed to put in another lagoon. Maybe that. Not -- not necessarily overflowing into the ground or anything. That's not -- I'm not aware of that.
Q. Okay. Did you ever tell Mr. Wyant that you were going to begin slaughtering horses?
A. I might have. I might have.
Q. But you don't recall?
A. No.
Q. And how about Mr. Ashcraft?
A. I hadn't talked to Mr. Ashcraft in a few years before this whole process started.
Q. But something like seven or eight years, was it?
A. Maybe, yeah.
Q. Okay. When the horses are slaughtered, if there is three times as many horses than -- well, strike that.

Do horses have the same amount of offal as cows?
A. No.
Q. And can you describe why you say that?
A. Well, if you picture a dairy cow, a big dairy cows weighs, you know, 1,100 up to 1,800 pounds. They have udders that weigh 150 pounds. All of that is offal. They have a huge hide, that's usually dirty and full of manure. They have intestines that are big and heavy. Horses -- you can see a horse is lean and smooth.

So, no, I don't think horses have more than -not even close to what the cows have.
Q. And have you talked to anybody about that?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Who is that?
A. I don't think -- do I need to answer that?

MR. DUNN: Well, Madam Hearing Officer, I -again, you can't ask me if you can't answer. You have to ask her if you need to answer that.

But this goes to testimony that's already been asked and answered of a licensed veterinarian, discussing these components of animal intestines.

And if he has a question on that, I'm sure Mr. -- or, excuse me, Mr. Blach could probably best answer that question.

MS. ORTH: We did hear, I thought, a fair amount from Dr. Blach about the differences in offal.

MR. WAGMAN: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer, and I intend to ask Dr. Blach as well, but it's certainly relevant that the applicant has stated that he's going to be slaughtering three times as many horses, and all of our information suggests that that will produce the exact same amount of wastewater and roughly the same amount of offal, and so it's certainly important, since Dr. Blach, as far as $I$ know, was not involved in the application process, as to whether the applicant himself knew that he was applying for a permit that would generate far more wastewater, which is our contention,
and also a similar amount of offal and other products. So it goes directly to a material misrepresentation on the application, which we believe is grounds for denial of this permit. So it goes directly to what the Hearing Officer will need to consider.

MS. ORTH: All right. And so when you say "three times as much," you're referring to the difference from the 39.3 figure that you pointed out in the administrative record, Document 75.

Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: Again, going to his question, his question was where Mr. De Los Santos received that information, not what the accuracy of the information is or what -- how that information -- it's not the facts, just where he obtained that knowledge.

I don't see how it's relevant, where he obtained that knowledge or who he discussed it with. Facts are facts, and the fact -- and where he -- who he talked to about that fact isn't really relevant to this hearing and relevant to the discharge. It is either a fact or it isn't.

MS. ORTH: Well, actually, I don't think it's ever improper cross-examination to ask where a witness got his information.

Mr. Wagman, please go ahead.

MR. WAGMAN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) So, Mr. De Los Santos, where did you get the information that you've testified to?
A. Claude Bouvery in Canada. He's a horse slaughter. You probably know who he is. That's where I received the information.
Q. Anyone else?
A. The gentleman at Beltex also, Eric Nauwelaers.
Q. Did Mr. Bouvery give you numbers for wastewater discharge per horse at his facility?
A. He gave me the numbers that it took 35 to 40 gallons per horse through the entire process. Those are the numbers he gave me.
Q. Okay. And the Beltex gentleman or woman gave you the same information?
A. I didn't talk to him about that, no.
Q. Oh, you didn't talk to him about that?
A. No, not about the wastewater. No.
Q. And did you ask Mr. Bouvery if his facility was similar to yours?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it?
A. And he said it was definitely similar, yes.
Q. Okay. And are you aware that Mr. Bouvery
has had multiple problems with contamination at his plant?
A. No.
Q. Okay.

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: Oh, I'm sorry.
Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: I'd object to facts not in evidence and a characterization of a matter that's not before this hearing.

His knowledge of what went on in the Canadian facility really has no bearing on what the discharge will be out of this plant.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
Mr. Wagman?
MR. WAGMAN: Well, $I$ certainly disagree.
The knowledge and reliance on somebody who has been contaminating the environment for years slaughtering horses is certainly impeachable and should be considered by the Department and the Hearing Officer when they consider whether or not Mr. De Los Santos relied on any reliable information.

He could have said he asked a six-year-old outside what it takes, and that might have gotten
actually more accurate information than from
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Mr. Bouvery.

MR. DUNN: Then I object as to hearsay.
MS. ORTH: All right.

So the hearsay objection, I think, is more on point, and I'll ask you not to be argumentative, Mr. Wagman.

I was wondering where this is going to talk about the contamination of the Canadian facility?

MR. WAGMAN: No, Your Honor, this is
impeachment for the witness, and so I think hearsay is certainly permissible as impeaching him.

MS. ORTH: Okay. Please go ahead.

MR. WAGMAN: Thank you.

MS. ORTH: I'm not sure when you're going to reach the limits of his knowledge, but please go until you get there.

MR. WAGMAN: That's the only question $I$ have about Mr. Bouvery.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) When you slaughter horses as opposed to cows, you would still need to clean off the carcass for sale after the horse is slaughtered; is that correct?
A. Any animal you slaughter, you have to wash down, yes.
Q. And you will still need to wash down the killing floor as well, correct?
A. At the end of the shift.
Q. Okay. Will that washing off the floor for horses be different than washing off the floors for cows, in your mind?
A. It would be cleaner. It would be cleaner.

The whole process would be cleaner because of the type of animal you're slaughtering.
Q. Won't it take about the same amount of water to get the floor clean?
A. I don't think so, no.
Q. Okay.
A. And let me say this, I've never slaughtered a horse, so --
Q. I understand that. I was just going to ask you that. That's great.

You still need to clean the hide as well with water, is that correct?
A. The hide, no. Not the hide.
Q. What happens to the hide?
A. The hide is salted and folded.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Salted and folded.
Q. Okay. So it's not cleaned off, the blood or
anything?
A. No, no.
Q. Okay. The USDA also requires you to clean off slaughtered animals and the floor, is that correct?
A. Yes. You trim -- a majority of the cleaning is trimming. That's the majority of the cleaning of a carcass is trimming, any incidental contamination.
Q. Can you explain what you mean by "trimming"?
A. Trim, you take a knife and cut the piece off that is contaminated. That's part of the offal, goes in barrels.
Q. And then you have to wash off the place where you took off the contaminated piece?
A. At the end of the whole process, you do a final rinse and then you put your antimicrobial and put it in the coolers.
Q. You still need to wash up all the equipment used for slaughter?
A. You have to wash your hands. You have to - yes, you do a complete washdown at the end of the shift.
Q. Of the whole facility and the equipment, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So just so we're clear on your discussions with Beltex and Mr. Bouvery, can you tell us
everything you discussed with the Beltex facility owner or operator about horse slaughter?
A. Everything?
Q. Yes.
A. We talked about the slaughter of horses. They gave me some regulations. He came to visit my facility, and we talked in depth about contracts, about slaughtering for his company in Belgium. That was what our conversations were about.
Q. Okay.
A. He was here during one of the walk-throughs with USDA to answer any questions they might have had.
Q. Have you contracted with him?
A. Have I contracted? No. No.
Q. Okay. And please tell me all of your conversations with Mr. Bouvery.
A. Conversations?
Q. Yes.

Tell me the subject.
A. The same type of conversations. He slaughters horses -- he slaughters American horses in Canada, and he'd like to have a facility here in the United States that will do the same for him.
Q. Did you discuss entering into business with Mr. Bouvery?
A. A lot of business with him, yes, sir.
Q. How often does the offal get picked up?
A. The offal?
Q. Yes.
A. We were composting all of our offal, so it was removed daily to the compost site.
Q. In your plans for a horse slaughter operation here in Roswell, how often do you anticipate the offal will be picked up?
A. Every two days.
Q. Okay. And you said it was a company in Dallas that will be picking it up?
A. Yes.
Q. What's the name of that company?
A. I don't recall right offhand the name. I've got a letterhead from them that -- the agreement, but I don't recall right offhand the name.
Q. And when did you speak with them?
A. During the time Eric Nauwelaers was here from Beltex, which was a year-and-a-half ago, maybe.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. A year-and-a-half ago.
Q. And I'm sorry, I didn't catch that name, the name of the gentleman from Beltex.
A. Eric Nauwelaers.
Q. Nolin, is it?
A. Nauwelaers.
Q. Can you spell it?
A. Yeah, you spell it. Nauwelaers, $N-a-u-w-l-e-r$ (sic).
Q. Okay.
A. That sounds right.

MR. WAGMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. De Los

Santos.

I'll now get to Mr. Ashcraft before lunch.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF LONEY ASHCRAFT

BY MR. WAGMAN:
Q. Mr. Ashcraft, how do you determine hydraulic gradient?
A. The easiest way, and what most engineers would do, is they would survey the top -- we would say top of the casing, and determine the water height in the column. And based on the survey, they would determine the height of the water column, and it would be the same as doing a topog, but it's an underground aquifer that you're topogging to the surface.
Q. And I apologize, I'm not a hydrologist. I meant to cover those words.

Let's start with -- are you talking about in a monitoring well?
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. All the monitoring wells would be surveyed to a common point. Nowadays, it would be a USGS point - in other words, to a datum point, and then by --

MR. POWERS: I apologize. Could you use the microphone? I apologize.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Powers.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Maybe, for Mr. Powers'
benefit, you might start and answer the whole question again.
A. Okay. The normal procedure would be to survey the top casing -- the top of the casing of each of the monitoring wells to a datum point. USGS is usually the datum point that's used and/or a benchmark datum point.

And then from that, you measure the depth of the water in a well at a given time. So when all of the wells are sampled, it's usually on a quarterly or semiannually basis. Then they determine the water level at all of those wells based on this datum point, and you can determine which well is the highest and so forth.

As a general rule, depending on the type of material that the water runs through, whether it's real porous or not, so forth, how fast the water moves from the, quote, highest to the lowest, and that's how they
determine the direction of flow.

And in this particular case, you'll probably ask, but number four -- from a benchmark of 100 , that's how they were surveyed originally, not to the USGS, but just to pick a number from 1 to 100 , the lowest one was number four, and the next was number three, and number one, as a general rule, would be the higher one.
Q. Thank you.

MR. WAGMAN: Are you able to hear, Mr. Powers?
MR. POWERS: Yes. Thank you.
MR. WAGMAN: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) You -- Mr. Ashcraft, you received a degree in agricultural economics and agricultural business from New Mexico State, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you currently own and operate Ashcraft Consulting?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you provide dairy consulting services?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you had any education or training in water quality since 1998?
A. Yes, sir.

Through the NRCS. I retired from NRCS in

2003, 2004, I guess it was the end of 2003 , and I had numerous water quality studies and doing nutrient management plans and comprehensive nutrient management plans. So that included water quality, yes.
Q. Water quality -- I'm sorry, water quality education and training?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you get paid for your work on this case, for what you're here for today? For this hearing and for working with Mr. De Los Santos.
A. Not for this hearing, but $I$ was reimbursed for the work $I$ did back in ' 05 and ' 06.
Q. Okay. And you testified that your consulting business works with dairy farms, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you've worked with dairy farms for over 35 years?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And I apologize for the simple questions.
A. No problem.
Q. But Valley Meat is not a dairy farm, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you don't have any professional experience with horses, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And you don't have any experience with horse slaughterhouses, either; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Did you look into, when talking with Mr. De Los Santos in 2005, anything with respect to the slaughter of horses?
A. No. I worked with Rick Robey in '05 and '06, and no, sir.
Q. Okay. And prior to this hearing, did you look into whether horses who go to slaughter take different drugs or substances than cows who are destine for slaughter?
A. No, sir.
Q. And did you look into whether the nature of wastewater discharge for horse slaughter was different than that for cows?
A. No, sir.
Q. What -- and I don't want to belabor this, but just so $I$ have your understanding, what was Rick Robey's role with respect to you when you worked with him?
A. His role was trying to fulfill the obligations and the requirements of his -- I guess his 2004 permit, 2005, whichever it was issued, and a few of those were to address the amount of water that was coming out, and that was -- as $I$ mentioned, the original pond was about
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a . 6 -acre pond, and that's surface area, as a rule, and that wasn't enough volume to maintain the amount.

Originally, we'd asked to -- it asked for a design of 5,000, we went ahead and designed it for 8,000 gallons per day of evaporation, and that's the reason we built the pond next to it, I believe it's 1.62 or something like that acres, and to maintain the water flow out of the facility.
Q. And you said the original or the earlier pond was not adequate or sufficient. Is that what you said?
A. The original pond that was there, the . 6 pond, was not adequate to contain the 8,000 or 5,000 gallons a day they were producing at that time.
Q. Were you aware of any problems that arose because it wasn't adequate to contain that amount?
A. Well, it was -- when $I$ was contacted by Mr. Robey, it was nearing its fullness. In other words, it was going to overflow if they didn't do something, either reduce the amount of flow in the facility, which they did for a period of time, or build a new facility that would handle that.

And so that was the process that they asked me to help take care of, and we got the pond designed that would handle, combined with the existing pond, 8,000 gallons per day of evaporation.
Q. And what was your role? You, personally, and I guess Ashcraft Consulting in the construction of the new storage pond.
A. My role was really to get an engineer, which was Stan Cook, which is a New Mexico PE, to design the pond, and he an NRCS -- he's retired from NRCS, he used their criteria, designed the pond, and got the pond built.

Ms. Humphreys would be the person that checked out -- she's also a PE -- checked out the pond and checked out the liner to verify that the liner and the pond was built as proposed and as submitted to the Department of Environment, and make sure all of the process was done correctly and the liner specifications were done and so forth.

And so both of those -- one of them did the design -- they work together in their business, but -and the other one did the check-out, and the check-out was done in December of 105 , and then the pond -- I think they started using that particular pond around February, about the time they did the monitoring wells.
Q. But you're not an engineer, correct?
A. No, sir.
Q. You're not a hydrologist?
A. No, sir.
Q. A geologist?
A. No.
Q. And what was your role with installing monitoring wells one, two, three and four?
A. The requirement was that any new pond -- the existing pond, first of all, had to have monitoring wells installed to verify that it was functioning properly; in other words, put in what we call an upgradient monitoring well and then verify -- and test that water as compared to a monitoring well what we would call downgradient of the pond. So that was wells number one and two -- one being upgradient, that's -- we would say to the west side of the facility, two being on the east side of the existing pond, the small -- the small pond. Those were put in in March of '05.

And then when the other pond was completed in December, and checked out in December and January, the number three and four were put downgradient of it to verify that that pond -- that the integrity was maintained.
Q. And based on your knowledge and expertise, you can't certify that the evaporation pond was installed correctly; is that right?
A. No, sir. That's the reason that we had an engineer do that.
Q. Right.

And the same goes for the monitoring wells, correct? Based on your experience, you can't certify that they were installed correctly?
A. No, the monitoring wells were done by Atkins Engineering, which does follow the procedures and the guidelines that are required by NMED.
Q. You submitted a letter to Ms. Kirby of NMED on March 4th, 2005 .

Are you familiar with that letter?
A. You'd have to remind me.
Q. Okay. I'm happy to do it. It's AR 236C-94.

This is a letter on Ashcraft Consulting
letterhead of March 4th --
A. Sure.
Q. -- 2005 .
A. Yes.
Q. I just --
A. This is it.
Q. -- need to get entered in court what we're looking at together.

It's dated March 4th, 2005, received maybe March 6th, 2005, signed by Mr. Loney Ashcraft.

Is that your signature at the bottom of that page?
A. Yes. Yes, sir, it is.
Q. And you stated in that letter that Valley Meat was at that time producing less than 5,000 gallons per day, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And what did you base that conclusion on?
A. That particular date would be the amount that was coming out of the facility if he didn't have the meter -- if $I$ remember right, but you're asking several years ago. But the readings I took after this time showed that one of the months was -- the average was 45 -- 4,510, if $I$ remember right, per day at that time, and that's one reason the facility -- the request that we had looked at -- originally, you notice on there that it says 5,000, because that's -- the meter reading showed that, and so we wanted to design it for 8,000 in case they ever wanted to expand, because they are not concerned about the number of animals, they are concerned about the volume of water.
Q. And the calculations of that volume submitted with their permit application contemplated 39.3 cows per day, is that correct?
A. Cows - the number of cows was never mentioned.
Q. Okay.
A. The only thing I have to work with is what's required by NMED, which is the volume -- total volume per day.
Q. Okay. Did you perform any calculations on whether the evaporation pond could properly contain discharges of much greater than 8,000 gallons per day?
A. Greater than 8,000 ?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. No, sir.
Q. Okay.
A. It was designed just for 8,000.
Q. Okay. And you assisted Valley Meat with their quarterly monitoring reports, it sounds like, from 2005 to 2006. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Have you assisted Valley Meat with their reports after May of 2006?
A. No, sir.
Q. Have you done anything for Valley Meat since then?
A. No, sir.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. Have a good lunch.

Okay, lunch.
MR. ASHCRAFT: Okay.
MS. ORTH: Excuse me.

Mr. Wagman, I'm not quite ready to excuse

Mr. Ashcraft unless $I$ break into your cross-examination for a moment.

Shall I do that?

MR. WAGMAN: Please, Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: All right. Is there anyone else with a question of Mr. Ashcraft based on his testimony?

And, Mr. Dunn, do you have redirect?
MR. DUNN: No, Your Honor.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Now you're excused.
MR. ASHCRAFT: Okay. Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Thank you very much.
MR. WAGMAN: My apologies.
MR. ASHCRAFT: No problem.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Ashcraft.
(Mr. Ashcraft excused.)
MS. ORTH: Mr. Wagman.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF CHET WYANT

BY MR. WAGMAN:
Q. Mr. Wyant, you are president and CEO of EnviroCompliance Services, Inc.; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you are an environmental consultant, correct?
A. We're essentially administrators.
Q. Can you explain -- there are so many administrators in this world.

Can you explain what you do as an
administrator?
A. We provide administrative assistance to a number of permittees who hold permits under the regulations of the New Mexico Environment Department.
Q. Okay. I don't want to belabor it, but give me a few top examples of the types of administrative assistance or services you provide.
A. We -- well, for instance, the preparation of the application in this case.
Q. Okay. You're not a hydrologist, is that correct?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Not a geologist?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Toxicologist?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Engineer?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Do you have any experience with horse slaughterhouses?
A. No, I do not.
Q. And I think you testified earlier very limited experience with custom slaughterhouses?
A. Custom slaughterhouses, where they are not specific -- well, species specific, that's true.
Q. And custom slaughterhouse refers to slaughterhouses that do a very small number of animals, is that correct?
A. Well, it depends on the location, I think. I don't know what you'd consider small.
Q. Have you been involved with any commercial slaughterhouses?
A. Not -- only this one. Only this one.
Q. Okay. Have you looked into whether horses who go to slaughter take different drugs or substances than cows who are destine for slaughter?
A. No, I have not.
Q. And have you looked into whether the nature of the wastewater discharge from horse slaughter is different than that from cow slaughter or other species?
A. I've not studied that.
Q. Okay. And you prepared the permit application submitted on June 3rd, 2010; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Who assisted you with that?
A. The plant owners. I did -- I did a site
review with them, and we collected some prior records for assistance in knowing what had already been submitted, what hadn't been, that kind of thing, but --
Q. And can you tell us the names of the plant owners? I think we know, but just for the record.
A. Yes. Rick and Sarah De Los Santos.
Q. Thank you.

And were you paid for that work?
A. Yes.
Q. And who paid for your services?
A. If I recall correctly, the name was Pecos Valley Meat.
Q. Okay. And how much were you made?
A. I have no idea.
Q. Okay. How many water permit applications have you prepared for commercial slaughterhouses?
A. One.
Q. This one?
A. Yes. For commercial?
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.
Q. When you prepared the permit application for Valley Meat in 2010 , were you aware that its permit that was previously issued had expired?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And how did you learn that?
A. I was provided with a notice of noncompliance from the Department.
Q. Okay. The permit application, in Part B.2, states that the discharge quantity is 8,000 gallons per day. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's the same as the previous permit in 2004, correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. What was the basis for that statement? If you know. What was the basis for that statement?
A. In the application?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. When I interviewed the -- Sarah and Rick, they had no desire to change it.
Q. Okay. When did you first learn of Valley Meat's intention to slaughter horses?
A. I really don't know when it was. I'm pretty sure it was some kind of a news announcement.
Q. I see.

You learned it through the media?
A. The media, yeah.
Q. Okay. When did you first -- did you ever
talk to Mr. De Los Santos or Mrs. De Los Santos about
the fact that they were intending to slaughter horses?
A. Not prior to hearing about it in the media.
Q. Subsequent to that?
A. Well, yes. When I -- and I -- I mean, I don't have my daily logs with me or anything, but I -- I couldn't say when.
Q. Okay. Do you think it was 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If Valley Meat informed you that they were intending to slaughter three times as many cows as they previously had slaughtered, would you think that would change the amount of wastewater generated?
A. It could possibly change it.
Q. And why do you say that?
A. Well, the multiplier factor, of course.
Q. Okay. So probably roughly three times as much?
A. It's possible it could be three times as much. However, that does not account for efficiencies in -for the scale of the operation. So it wouldn't necessarily have to be. It's not a direct multiplier, I don't believe.
Q. And what do you base that belief on?
A. Just scales of efficiency.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wyant.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF LEONARD BLACH, DVM
BY MR. WAGMAN:
Q. Dr. Blach, is it?
A. Blach, yes.
Q. Blach, yes. Better take that microphone from Mr. Wyant, please.

Dr. Blach, you've authored numerous articles related to large animal veterinary medicine, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Any on horse slaughter?
A. No.
Q. Any on the concentration of drug residues in horses going to slaughter?
A. No.
Q. Any on levels of chemicals in horse flesh or horse blood?
A. No.
Q. Any on potential water contamination from horse slaughter?
A. No.
Q. What studies did you rely on, if any, in
preparing your testimony for today, the written
testimony in your direct testimony?
A. Primarily personal experience.
Q. So no studies?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do you -- are you getting compensated for being here today?
A. Pardon me?
Q. Are you being compensated for being here
today?
A. No.
Q. And were you paid for preparing your
declaration?
A. No.
Q. And did you prepare that declaration?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you raise horses?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you thought at any time about selling any of your horses to Valley Meat?
A. To who?
Q. To Valley Meat for slaughter.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do you have any experience with horse slaughterhouses?
A. No.
Q. I'm just going to go through your declaration a bit and ask you if you can help explain a few of the
statements.

Do you need a copy, or do you --
A. Probably not.
Q. Okay. Paragraph three states, quote, "My career as an active practitioner has been considered to meet all regulations from a -- from a gated facility of USDA in regards to therapeutic medications, their dosage, and withdrawal times," unquote.

Can you explain what that sentence means?
A. Well, it just means that the practice -- I practice medicine according to the USDA regulations and the state regulations.
Q. Okay. So - - okay.

Which regulations are you referring to?
A. Well, the USDA is in regard to federal health certificates, livestock inspection and vaccinations and several diseases that are monitored by the USDA.
Q. Okay. And those are with respect to animals, I assume, such as cows who are going to slaughter; is that correct?
A. Eventually, yes.
Q. Okay. And have you any experience with any other species who are going to slaughter?
A. Other than cattle?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. No.
Q. And paragraph four says you're knowledgeable of the regulations imposed on the movement and transportation of horses internationally.

Which regulations are you referring to there?
A. It's all the health requirements to ship horses internationally, and we've done that occasionally to -- a few times to Europe and most of the time to South America, which just requires that -- those countries may require some special tests to be run before a health certificate can be issued.
Q. And those were not horses going to slaughter, correct?
A. No, sir.
Q. You state in your declaration that you understand half-lives and withdrawal times, and Mr. Holland asked you some questions about those.

You say there are, quote, "stringent withdrawal times to ensure there are no detectable amounts," unquote.

Can you explain that for us?
A. Yeah. Well, that varies again, like I think I mentioned before, was that depending upon the dose, the dosage -- the recommended dosage and as to whether that's been followed and then the duration of time would
depend upon the half-life or the duration of that drug to remain in the body.
Q. Okay. And so how do you determine what the withdrawal time is for a particular drug?
A. In most drugs that we use in food-producing animals or even -- in all food-producing animals, there is a recommended withdrawal time based on the dosage that they -- that the pharmaceutical company recommends.
Q. Okay. So the withdrawal times themselves, you get from the pharmaceutical companies or from regulations? I'm just unclear.
A. From the label that's put on the drug from the pharmaceutical company.
Q. Okay. What's the purpose of withdrawal times for drugs, if you know?
A. The purpose is -- in most of the time in food-producing animals, it's for the reason that they be free of that drug by the time it's processed.
Q. And why would we want the meat to be free of the drug before it's processed?
A. Because you'd want your processed product to be free of drugs.
Q. And why?
A. Well, I don't know why -- I don't know why we wouldn't want it. I mean, you try to make a product or
a processed piece of meat or milk or cheese or whatever you're talking about, you want it free of drugs.
Q. Because drugs could be dangerous to the consumer, right?
A. You want it drug-free.
Q. Because drugs could be dangerous to the consumer?
A. Yes.
Q. How is the withdrawal time monitored? How do you monitor withdrawal times in the herds or animals you're dealing with?
A. Well, I think I explained that earlier.

In milk that -- the milk, when they finish treating the cows, then that is monitored there. By litmus test, they check and make sure the milk coming from that cow is clean before it's put in the tank, the cooling tank, and then it's monitored again before it's put into the transport tank.

So I don't know if that answers your question, but that's the way it's monitored.
Q. It sounds like -- you're talking about testing the milk for some kind of residue, correct?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. How do you -- is there a point in time at which you say, "Okay, the withdrawal time is $X$ number of
days, and this drug was given to this cow on Monday; therefore, the withdrawal time ends"?

MR. POWERS: Your Honor --
MS. ORTH: Excuse me, hold on.
Mr. Powers?
MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I have two motions for objections, and, hopefully, Mr. Wagman will understand.

First, repetitious, needless information. I think what we're getting to -- and I want to make sure we don't stray into that territory of the USDA/FSIS regulations on meat safety. I don't think we're here today for that matter.

So I understand Mr. Wagman's point, I think he's going in that direction. If he can just speed it up, I'd certainly appreciate it, as well as I think some of this is repetitious. I think Dr. Blach has already testified to some of these items, and I'd just ask that Mr. Wagman be cautious of that.

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.
Mr. Wagman, similar thoughts were going through my head, that this is not the hearing on -- the USDA hearing, for example.

MR. WAGMAN: I have no intention of going that direction, Your Honor, I'm trying to establish the basis
for withdrawal times of drugs in animals, USDA or otherwise.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
MR. WAGMAN: As Dr. Blach has indicated, it's on the label, so I'm just trying to figure out how we do that and why.

MS. ORTH: All right.
And you're moving on then fairly
expeditiously, correct?
MR. WAGMAN: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) So you -- but you -- just to be clear, you monitor withdrawal time by noting the date of the administration of the drug and then counting a certain number of days until the withdrawal time would be over, is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And withdrawal times are of no use if they are not enforced, correct?
A. Pardon me?
Q. Withdrawal times are of no use and no value if they are not enforced, is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And they can't be applied if you don't know when an animal has been given a drug, correct?
A. Pardon me?
Q. If an animal -- if you don't know when an animal has been given a drug, you can't determine the withdrawal time for the drug that's been given, correct?
A. No, if we don't know when an animal has been drugged, $I$ wouldn't know about the withdrawal times, you know.
Q. And not all drugs have withdrawal times, correct?
A. Pardon me?
Q. Not all drugs that animals are given have withdrawal times, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And, in fact, there are many drugs that are prohibited for use in horses going to food based on federal law, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And those, therefore, have no withdrawal times, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. For example, phenylbutazone has no withdrawal time for horses who are going for food; correct?
A. No, it's not approved for -- I don't know that it's approved for horses going to slaughter at this point.
Q. Therefore, a horse --
A. There is no regulations as to that.
Q. Therefore, a horse who has phenylbutazone cannot become food, correct?
A. Pardon me?
Q. Under federal law, a horse who has been administered phenylbutazone is prohibited from becoming meat; correct?
A. I don't know that that would be correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know why -- are you aware that there are roughly 20 to 50 drugs in the code of Federal Regulations that say prohibited for use in horses going to food?
A. Yes, there are a number of drugs that are prohibited.
Q. And do you know why they are prohibited?
A. For going to food?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. No, sir, I don't.
Q. Okay. And could it be because that no level of concentration of it is safe for human consumption?

MS. ORTH: I think you've reached the end of his knowledge on that point already.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Do you medicate horses in your practice?
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A. Pardon me?
Q. Do you medicate horses in your daily practice?
A. Absolutely.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Absolutely.
Q. I'm sorry. I'm just having trouble hearing. When you medicate horses, do you consider
whether the horse you're medicating is going to slaughter for food?
A. Not at this time.
Q. Not at this time?
A. Not at this time.
Q. Thank you.

When you medicate horses, do you pay attention
to the laws concerning the administration of drugs given
to food animals?
A. Yes.
Q. When you administer the -- when you medicate horses --
A. When I medicate horses?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Do I pay attention to what?
Q. To the laws and regulations concerning the administration of drugs to food animals, such as horses.
A. No, I don't -- I don't -- am unaware of any
food regulations as far as horses at this time.
Q. When horses are medicated at racetracks, do the owners and veterinarians consider whether the horses are going to be food?
A. Not at this time.
Q. Okay. Paragraph six of your declaration says, quote, "All medications used on racetracks are tested for permissible therapeutic medications and prohibited medications."

I think the first "medication" in that sentence is supposed to be "horses." Is that fair?
A. Pardon me?
Q. I'll read you the sentence again. I think it's just a typo. It says -- I just want to be clear on that.
A. I got the sentence, but I didn't get your question.
Q. There is -- the sentence reads, "All
medications used on racetracks are tested for permissible therapeutic medications and prohibited medications."

Did you mean to say "All horses used on racetracks," or if not, can you explain that sentence?
A. All horses on the racetrack.
Q. Okay. Are permissible medications for
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racehorses also permissible for horses going to be food? If you know.
A. I don't know that at this time.
Q. Okay. So that statement in paragraph six doesn't relate to horses as food animals, correct?
A. Your question again, please.
Q. That statement that $I$ just read to you does not relate to horses going to be food, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. It only refers to horses at racetracks.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I'm going to have to renew my objection. We're not talking about food and animals and equines at this point. I mean, I --

MS. ORTH: But hasn't -- isn't he, though now with these last questions, merely trying to ascertain the contours of the statements made by Dr. Blach in paragraph six of Dr. Blach's testimony? That is to say, I think he's trying to see how far those statements go.

MR. POWERS: Yes, ma'am, for impeachment evidence, $I$ believe that's proper, I believe, but for the nature of the hearing, I believe it may be a little improper, so I'd caution the Court at this time, if that's permissible.

MS. ORTH: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Powers.

I'm listening carefully, Mr. Wagman.
MR. WAGMAN: I'm doing my best, Your Honor, Madam Hearing Officer, and you're correct in these statements reflect specific areas and not horses going for food, which is certainly what the water permit reflects here.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Moving to paragraph seven, Dr. Blach, I'll quote again, "In the dairy industry, there are stringent regulations by regulatory agencies that ensure that milk and beef products are safe for human consumption."

These regulations that you're referring to don't refer to horses going for food, correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that horse owners who do not know their horses are going to be slaughtered would not be thinking about these regulations you referenced in this paragraph; correct?
A. At this point, that would be true.
Q. Okay. I'd like to move to paragraph eight. You say, "In comparison, the substances found in both horses and cattle are very similar." That's a quote. What is the basis for that statement?
A. Because we use the same pharmaceuticals primarily in cattle as we do horses.
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand.
A. We use the same pharmaceutical products in horses that we do in cattle.
Q. Okay. And are you sure that the same biochemical and biological processes occur in horses as in cows when they are administered these drugs?
A. Depending on the drug, but it would be pretty much they'd have the same response, because we're giving it for the same reason.
Q. Okay. Can you cite any studies that reflect your opinion there?
A. Reflect what?
Q. The opinion you've just stated.
A. Well, by and large, you know, any -- whether it be a horse or cattle, if it was running a fever, you know, we give the same medication, prescribed, whether it be antibiotics, antiinflammatories, whatever that might be.
Q. I understand.

Can you cite any studies that support your opinion that it's the same treatment and the same processing within the animal once they are administered the drugs?
A. Well, I think every pharmaceutical --

MR. DUNN: Wait, wait, wait.
MS. ORTH: I'm sorry.
MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: This is again repetitive. He was asked if he'd signed this, and he said that -- in the discussions that he said no, he's relying on his
practical experience as a long-standing, well-respected licensed veterinarian here in the State of New Mexico. He's not relying on studies. That's already asked -that's already been asked and it's already answered it.

MS. ORTH: That's true, Mr. Wagman.
MR. WAGMAN: I didn't recall that question. MS. ORTH: Yes. It was earlier.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. That's great.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Are you aware that the USDA has recently come out with documents that state that horses and cows get different drugs?
A. Get different drugs?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. You are aware of those?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. DUNN: Your Honor --

MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn?

MR. DUNN: -- could we get a citation to those documents if we're going to refer to them?

I'm not sure that's a correct characterization of those documents. I'm not even sure what he's talking about.

He's asking the witness to talk about something, but we don't even know what it is.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Dr. Blach, will you clarify for the rest of us what you and Mr. Wagman were just talking about?

DR. BLACH: What was the question again?
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) I was asking if you are aware that the USDA had recently come out with documents that say that horses and cows get different drugs, and you responded yes, and the Hearing Officer is asking if you can cite those documents.
A. Yes. We've always had some different drugs that would apply to horses and not to cattle and some that would apply to cattle but not to horses.
Q. I understand that.
A. They've always been in existence.
Q. I understand.

The question that Mr. Dunn and the Hearing

Officer were asking were if you could recite the documents that you relied on in answering the question. So the question is, can you cite those documents?
A. No documents $I$ relied on. It's from personal experience and the labeling that -- and the instructions that the pharmaceuticals give us on a new drug.
Q. Okay. So maybe you misunderstood my earlier question. I said, were you aware that USDA had recently published documents that said that horses and cows received different drugs, and you answered yes, which is --
A. Yes, I know they do. I know they do. I don't know what document -- USDA document you're talking about.
Q. Okay. Great.

Cows who go to slaughter have producers, the owners of the herds who watch them and regulate them as they -- before they go to slaughter; correct?
A. Go over that again.
Q. Sure.

Who are the producers of cows for slaughter?
A. Dairy -- the dairies.
Q. Okay. And the dairy owners and employees
monitor the drugs that are given to cows who are going
to slaughter. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Horses for food don't have producers like that, correct?
A. Not at this time, that $I$ know of.
Q. You're not aware of anyone raising horses for food, are you?
A. No.
Q. Okay. There is a significant body of bovine law and equine law that are -- I'm sorry, strike that, wrong profession.

There is a significant body of equine medicine and bovine medicine that are separate, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you tell us a couple of big distinctions between those two areas?
A. In the physiology of them?
Q. Okay.
A. Well, some of that we went over this morning, is that the digestive system is completely different. You know, one has a rumen, one has a simple stomach. One has a different temperature than the other temperature. Some of them have different breathing rates, respirations per minute, than the other one.

So $I$ don't know if that explains it, or $I$
don't know what you're getting at.
Q. That's great.
A. But, physiologically, there is a difference between a cow and a horse.
Q. Great. Thank you.

And you -- strike that.
You said that, quote, "Withdrawal times and testing ensures that the meat consumption by humans is safe," unquote.

On what do you base that statement?
A. The statement was what?
Q. Quote, "Withdrawal times and testing ensures that the meat consumption by humans is safe," unquote.
A. And what's your question?
Q. What's the basis for that statement?
A. Well, it's exactly what it says, that the withdrawal times and the testing is proscribed by law or proscribed by -- it's proscribed by the pharmaceutical company, the withdrawal times.
Q. Okay.
A. So the meat is -- and so that the beef is clear and clean.
Q. And do the slaughterhouses need to know whether an animal has cleared his or her withdrawal times?
A. At what point do you mean?
Q. When the animal is --
A. When the animal arrives there?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. They probably don't know.
Q. Okay. So do they rely on the producers to do the right job?
A. No. They rely on the USDA testing at processing time.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of anyone who is ensuring compliance with withdrawal times for horses, if there are any established?
A. No, the only -- the only withdrawal times that I'm familiar with in horses is the ones we described earlier in the hearing today at the racetrack.
Q. Okay. And so those drug limitations are given to horses because of Racing Commission rules or something like that, correct?
A. Yes. Correct.
Q. Okay. But they are not focused, those rules, on food safety; correct?
A. No.
Q. And that's a yes, they are not; right? That's a yes, correct?
A. They are not based on, no.
Q. Thank you.

Do you know if all drugs administered to
horses will be tested for if horses go to slaughter?
A. I would assume that they would be.
Q. Okay. You stated, quote, "The risk of contamination in the environment by byproducts of the slaughter process is identical in horses and cattle, and unlikely to occur."

Do you have any expertise in the area of environmental contamination?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Any experience in hydrology?
A. No.
Q. Geology?
A. No.
Q. Toxicology?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Water contamination?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And just to confirm -- I think this has been asked and answered, but I want to establish it.

You did not look at the list of drugs given to equines that was submitted with Mr. Olson's testimony, is that correct?
A. No.
Q. That's not right?
A. Did I look at the list of drugs?
Q. Yes, sir.

It's just it's an awkward way of questioning.
I just need to get --
MR. DUNN: And it's been asked and answered.
Q. -- a correct answer.

Did you look at the list of drugs that was
submitted with Mr. Olson's testimony?
A. In whose testimony?
Q. Mr. Olson, who is sitting over there. There
was an exhibit with a list of 115 drugs.

Did you look at that list?
A. I think I looked at the list, yes.
Q. You did look at that list?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did you look at the declarations
that were submitted along with that that said that most of those drugs were given to horses in America?
A. Yes, I think $I$ read that.
Q. Okay. Do you disagree with those declarations?
A. No, not really.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of any studies analyzing the byproducts of horse slaughter?
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q. Okay. And you stated, quote, "All medicines are under strict regulations of $U S D A$ to ensure body fluids and tissues are free of any residues," unquote. What's the basis for that statement?
A. The mandatory clearing times or withdrawal times that they give us, which assures us that there are no drugs left in them -- in the body tissues or in the blood.
Q. Your statement, I think, is not about withdrawal times, but actually testing for residues. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. It says, "All medicines are under strict regulation of USDA to ensure body fluids and tissues are free of any residues."
A. Yeah.
Q. Is it your understanding that USDA tests for some drugs in animals going to slaughter?
A. Yes, the USDA does.
Q. Okay. But they only test for a small sample, correct?
A. They only test what?
Q. A small sample of drugs in animals going to slaughter.
A. I don't know how small their sample is, no.
Q. You don't know, okay.

Do you know what percentage of animals they
test within a given facility?
A. USDA will test every cow that's getting processed.
Q. Okay.

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer --

MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn?

MR. DUNN: -- Mr. Powers had an objection just a little bit ago that we were getting far afield into, again, food safety regulations and testing by USDA.

I renew his objection, which you already ruled was appropriate, and ask that we move along past FDA and USDA food testing.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Again, I'm trying to walk this line between
not going too deeply into the USDA testing, but also allowing Mr. Wagman to explore the basis for the statements that are actually in the testimony.

Mr. Wagman, it's been more than an hour. Are you nearly done?

MR. WAGMAN: If Madam Hearing Officer would
like a break, it might be appropriate. It could be 20 minutes more or something like that. I'm not
positive.

MS. ORTH: Is everyone okay if we keep going?

Yeah? All right.
Please keep going.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. I'll try to shorten it up.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Are you aware that USDA
doesn't test for anywhere near all the drugs that are given to animals who are going to slaughter?

MR. DUNN: Objection. It's argumentative.

MS. ORTH: Actually, I think it -- I think he just answered that right before we started talking.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. I'll rephrase it.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) Are you aware that the USDA has set up a new procedure for testing horses who will be going to slaughter?
A. I'm not aware of that.
Q. Okay. You stated, quote, "My expert opinion, as a veterinarian specializing in equine medicine, is that the equine species going to slaughter would be free of any medications for 120 days prior to slaughter, which would render the carcass free of any residue," unquote.

Can you explain what that means?
A. Yes.

Based on all the drugs that we use in the --
in horses and cattle, that if they -- if we had a withdrawal time of 120 days, that the drugs, based on their therapeutic dosage, should not be present in the body or body fluids any longer.
Q. But you lumped in cows and horses there. How would cows be monitored for that?
A. At slaughter.
Q. At slaughter, they'd be monitored for when they took drugs 120 days earlier? Is that what you're saying?
A. They would just be monitored for the presence of a foreign substance.
Q. For residues?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But you say they would be free of any medications, and we're talking about horses here, for 120 days prior to slaughter.

So let's focus in on that particular part of the sentence or your statement.

On what basis are you saying that horses going to slaughter would be free of any medications for 120 days?
A. Well, based on my personal experience and the requirements of all the pharmaceutical drugs that we give, that based on those withdrawal times, that is like
eight to ten to twenty times beyond the withdrawal times. So those animals, in my opinion, should be free and clear of any residue.
Q. But why are you assuming that horses will be? Are you aware of how horses -- what kind of horses go to slaughter?
A. Well, I would imagine the horses that go to slaughter are going to be horses that haven't been on drugs for at least 120 days.
Q. And why would you assume that?
A. Because that's the -- the same thing is true in cattle feedlots.
Q. Please explain.
A. Pardon?
Q. Please explain that.

Are you suggesting there are horse feedlots for horse slaughter?
A. Yes, I think there will be, or there are now.
Q. Okay. So if -- just a hypothetical, assume that a horse comes from a home or a racetrack and ends up in a slaughterhouse, and nobody had monitored the drugs they took for their entire lives, would that horse have been -- had the appropriate withdrawal time?
A. Those kind of horses are probably not going to be up in slaughter. It's like cattle feed, you know,
it's going to take horses that -- most racehorses do not go to slaughter. And the other horses that probably will go to slaughter are back in the country, backyard horses, or horses off the reservation, and they must be fed up properly before they are slaughtered.
Q. And maybe given medications by a veterinarian, such as yourself?
A. They probably do not have any medications going into slaughter for maybe 100, 120 days, $I$ would assume. I don't know.
Q. Okay. And what do you base that assumption on?
A. I said I don't know. My personal experience that 120 days would be a proper withdrawal time for any drug.
Q. Okay. But you don't have any experience with horses who have gone to slaughter?
A. No. Not at this time.
Q. Okay. You stated, quote, "To my knowledge there is no medication that would remain in the system of an equine for the life of the animal, thus rendering it permanently unfit for human consumption or a threat to contaminating the environment."

The drugs that are prohibited, you're aware of those, we've discussed those. Yes?

Do those render the animal permanently unfit for human consumption because they've been given those prohibitive drugs?
A. Has it rendered them unfit?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. For human consumption?
Q. Yes, sir.

In other words, the prohibitive drugs say if a horse gets this drug, they can't be used for human consumption; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. That's fine.

You said it would take roughly three times as much water to slaughter a cow as opposed to a horse. Is that correct?
A. No, I don't -- I don't know that. It would take three -- what did you say? -- three times as much?
Q. I thought that's what you testified. If I'm not correct, please correct me.
A. Possibly. It takes more water -- I don't know, I'm not into that, but $I$ know it would take more to clean up a cow for it to be processed than it would a horse.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. Madam Hearing Officer, I'm going to need to ask Dr. Blach the same questions I
asked Mr. De Los Santos with respect to the cleaning up in the slaughterhouse, if that's okay.

So they are not asked and answered with
respect to Mr. Blach, and it will be very short.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. WAGMAN) In the slaughterhouse, you still would need to clean off the carcass before you could sell it; correct?
A. That's not my expertise, to be in a slaughterhouse. I don't know, but I would assume that would be correct.
Q. Okay. You would still need to clean off the floor at the end of the day and after slaughter, is that correct?
A. I would assume that would be correct.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of any of the USDA regulations around the cleaning of animals who are in slaughterhouses?
A. No, I'm not.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. Okay.

Dr. Blach, I'd like to thank you for your
time.

I'm done, Your Honor, or Madam Hearing

Officer.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Wagman.

Are there any other questions of the applicant's panel based on their testimony?

Mr. Dunn, do you have any follow-up?
MR. DUNN: Very, very brief.
MS. ORTH: Okay.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF THE PANEL BY MR. DUNN MR. DUNN: Rick, the -- Mr. Powers mentioned some numbers -- or it might have been Mr. Wagman, but I think it was Mr. Powers -- the number of head, and I know that we're talking in terms of total gallons and not number of head, but they said the number 250 head.

Have you ever said 250 head on any sort of application or anything of that nature?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: 250?
MR. DUNN: Yes, sir.
MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No, sir.
MR. DUNN: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify for the record that that was not something that you had ever attributed to being able to do.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: No.
MR. DUNN: There was a question about the condition of the permit that discussed domestic water. If it is found that the domestic water from the facility can't be commingled, and it is currently being commingled, would Valley Meat Company be willing
to install an additional septic system to do whatever was necessary to be in compliance with the permit?

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, we would do whatever we needed.

MR. DUNN: Okay. The same with, you know, the requisite field testing and to make sure -- that if there another monitoring well, you said you would be happy to do that.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: We would do that, yes.

MR. DUNN: Very briefly, Mr. Wyant, in your extensive experience in doing these types of permits, has a renewal ever -- do you generally see on a renewal the applicants retain a geologist or hydrogeologist just to renew a permit?

MR. WYANT: I can't say that it's necessary to retain a hydrologist or geologist to renew your permit.

There may be conditions in the permit that would require the expertise after the permit has been issued.

MR. DUNN: But just simply through the renewal process, it's not common practice?

MR. WYANT: But just to renew it, no, I wouldn't say that's necessary.

MR. DUNN: So some sort of material change is
what would necessitate the need for a hydrologist or a geologist?

MR. WYANT: The response to a condition in the permit.

MR. DUNN: Dr. Blach, we've talked quite a bit about prohibitive substances.

If it says on the label that it's not intended for human consumption, is it possible that an animal could not be intended for human consumption at the time that that drug is administered and then years down the road it will become intended for human consumption?

Do you -- do veterinarians interpreting the statute -- and specifically you as a long-standing veterinarian -- attribute that to mean that once an animal is given a substance that it's forever condemned from being a food animal?

DR. BLACH: No, it's not.
MR. DUNN: Okay. As a veterinarian, through your training, of course, and vet school and, you know, any subsequent continuing education or just your day-to-day operations, you're constantly looking at and learning about drugs, pharmaceuticals, you know, and the -- the not required but necessarily the suggested withdrawal times and half-lives of medications.

You're familiar with those in the course of
your practice, is that correct?
DR. BLACH: Absolutely.
MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I'm going to object
to that. That's a little bit of a leading question. I
know the rules don't apply here, but maybe you can break that down, counsel.

MR. DUNN: Okay.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Powers.
MR. DUNN: That's fine.
As a -- well, I think he's an expert, too.
As an expert in equine medicine, are you
familiar with the drugs that are coming out and suggested withdrawal times and half-lives of those types of drugs? Do you make yourself familiar with those drugs?

DR. BLACH: Absolutely.
MR. DUNN: Any of the drugs that were discussed here today, are there any that you're unfamiliar with?

DR. BLACH: No.
MR. DUNN: Okay. In your practice as a veterinarian, would you say that all horses are given Bute?

DR. BLACH: No.
MR. DUNN: Are all horses necessarily
administered drugs?

DR. BLACH: No.

MR. DUNN: Of any sort? Are there horses that
are not administered drugs that currently may not be
intended for food but may at some point become for food?

DR. BLACH: Yes.

MR. DUNN: Okay. I think that's all I have.

MS. ORTH: Thank you very much, Mr. Dunn.
Is there any reason not to excuse the
applicant's panel at this time?

No?

Mr. Wagman?
MR. WAGMAN: No, Your Honor --

MS. ORTH: Okay.
MR. WAGMAN: -- Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.
Mr. Dunn?

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer, I would like
to reserve the right to call them as a rebuttal witness at a later date.

MS. ORTH: Yes. Absolutely.
MR. DUNN: Okay.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.

Mr. Powers?

MR. POWERS: No objection.

MS. ORTH: So Mr. Blach, Mr. De Los Santos and Mr. Wyant, you're excused, and thank you very much for your direct testimony.

We will break for lunch until 1:30.
(Recess held.)

MS. ORTH: Mr. Powers, if you'd ask your
witnesses to sit at the witness table.

MR. POWERS: Yes, ma'am.

Kim Kirby is on her way back, You Honor. If we can give her a moment to arrive.

MS. ORTH: All right.
MR. POWERS: With your permission, Madam

Hearing Officer, I shall begin.

MS. ORTH: Yes, please.
MR. POWERS: Counsel, everyone, good
afternoon.
(Oath administered to Ms. Kirby and

Mr. Schoeppner.)

MS. ORTH: Please go ahead.

MR. POWERS: Thank you, Your Honor, or Madam Hearing Officer.

## KIMBERLY KIRBY

after having been first duly sworn under oath, was questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. POWERS:
Q. Good afternoon.

Ms. Kirby, please, state your full name for the record.
A. Kimberly Kirby.
Q. And how are you employed?
A. I'm a geoscientist with the Groundwater

Quality Bureau of the New Mexico Environment Department.
Q. And how long have you been employed with the New Mexico Environment Department?
A. I have been with the Department for about 13-and-a-half years.

MS. ORTH: Ms. Kirby, would you pull the microphone closer to you?

MS. KIRBY: Sorry.
MS. ORTH: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. POWERS) And I think you indicated your current position is geoscientist. Is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Are there any other positions or titles you hold at this time?
A. $\quad \mathrm{NO}$.
Q. And have you worked in any capacity on the matter we're here for today?
A. Yes. I'm the permit reviewer for this facility.
Q. And did you prepare written testimony covering your general involvement in this matter?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do you hereby adopt that testimony as being a true and accurate representation of what you considered then for this case?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And has anything significantly changed or altered your views since the time of that filing until today's date?
A. No, not significantly.

There was a suggestion made by Mr. Olson in his testimony.
Q. And could you please elaborate on that just briefly?
A. He -- there was a suggestion in his testimony to do a leak detection test of the existing concrete solid settling tanks.
Q. And I'm sure Mr. Schoeppner -- who is with you today, if $I$ may ask?
A. Jerry Schoeppner. He is the Bureau chief of the Groundwater Quality Bureau.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Kirby.

Regarding the position of Mr. Olson, as you just referenced, are you suggesting any changes or modification to the proposed draft permit?

I think we've also referred to that as the revised draft permit.
A. That is correct.

We were -- we were considering changes to the revised draft permit to add a condition for leak detection. We have such a standard condition that we use in domestic waste permits.

MR. POWERS: Your Honor -- or Madam Hearing Officer, at this time we would admit, pending any objections, the testimony of Ms. Kirby as a true and accurate representation.

MS. ORTH: Are there objections?
No? It's admitted.
(Bureau Exhibit 8 admitted.)
MR. POWERS: And with your permission, I shall move to Mr. Schoeppner.

## JERRY SCHOEPPNER

after having been first duly sworn under oath, was questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. POWERS:
Q. Mr. Schoeppner, good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Please state your name for the record.
A. Jerry Schoeppner.
Q. And how are you employed, sir?
A. I'm employed with the New Mexico Environment Department, Groundwater Quality Bureau.
Q. And with that Groundwater Quality Bureau, what position do you hold?
A. I'm the chief of the Groundwater Quality Bureau.
Q. And what does the chief of the Groundwater Quality Bureau do, generally?
A. Generally oversee all the activity in our four programs, which includes Superfund, the Mining Section, the Mediation Oversight Section and Pollution Prevention Section.
Q. And how long have you been employed in this position?
A. I've been in this current position for just
over two years, and $I$ was in this position back another year, between 2003 and 2004 .
Q. And did you prepare written testimony
regarding the matter before this court or this Tribunal?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Has anything significantly changed?

I think you've heard Ms. Kirby reference a condition that she would like to add to the revised draft permit.
A. Yes. Nothing other than what Ms. Kirby mentioned.

MR. POWERS: And pending any objections, Madam Hearing Officer, we would move to have Mr. Schoeppner's testimony entered into the record.

MS. ORTH: Are there objections?
MR. WAGMAN: No.

MS. ORTH: Hearing none, it is admitted.
(Bureau Exhibit 3 admitted.)

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, at this time we would open Mr. Schoeppner and Ms. Kirby up for crossexamination.

I believe that the statements and testimony filed already cover the exhibit -- or cover the testimony of the Department.

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Dunn, do you have questions of the Bureau panel?

MR. DUNN: Your Honor, I don't have any questions for them at this time.

I'd reserve the right to ask any sort of rebuttal questions that may come up, but we agree with the sufficiency of the draft permit as it was propounded and also the written testimony that was provided as being sufficient.

MS. ORTH: All right.

So this isn't rebuttal, this is direct, and this is your opportunity to ask cross-exam.

MR. DUNN: Then we're fine, Ma'am.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.

How are the opponents set? How have you set yourselves for cross-examination of the Department panel?

MR. WAGMAN: I've got a few questions, Madam Hearing Officer.

MR. POWERS: Oh, Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Powers.

MR. POWERS: I'm sorry, Mr. Wagman, I do
apologize.

I just want to make sure -- it's my
understanding that since all exhibits that were referred
to by Ms. Kirby and Mr. Schoeppner were part of the administrative record, those have already been officially introduced, I don't believe we have anything outside of that, so $I$ just want to verify that with the Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: Yes, that's correct, that's correct for everyone, to the extent there are records that are not contained in the administrative record, then it need not be separately moved, and the fact that you might have broken it out as an exhibit is fine for ease of reference, but the administrative record is definitely part of the record already. And with that being said, it will be admitted.
(Bureau Exhibits 1,2, 4-7 and 9-14 admitted.)

MS. ORTH: So, Mr. Wagman, are you and

Mr. Holland doing the questions again?

MR. WAGMAN: Mr. Holland, do you have any questions?

MR. HOLLAND: I don't have any questions.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Holland doesn't have any
questions.

So go ahead, please.

MR. WAGMAN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.

I will be very brief here.
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CROSS EXAMINATION OF KIMBERLY KIRBY

BY MR. WAGMAN:
Q. Ms. Kirby, the permit application allows up to 8,000 per day of discharge, is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you've stated in your testimony that it is important to understand that the proposed discharge permit limits the maximum daily discharge volume to 8,000 gallons per day, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that, quote, "This proposal is unchanged from the previous discharge permit," correct?
A. As far as the discharge system and the maximum discharge volume, that is correct.
Q. Okay. Are there any ways in which the proposal has changed?
A. Their proposal hasn't changed; the type of livestock apparently they are going to be slaughtering has changed. But it doesn't necessarily change the permit.
Q. Okay. And when did you first learn that they were going to slaughter a different type of livestock; specifically, horses?
A. I really don't recall. It seems like I heard it when it first kind of came out in the media, maybe

2000- -- spring of 2012, I'm guessing.
Q. Okay. Were you aware at any point that

Mr. De Los Santos was testifying that he was intending to slaughter 121 horses per day?
A. No, I was not aware.
Q. When did you first learn that?
A. In the written testimony of Bill Olson.
Q. Okay. Did that concern you at all?
A. Not -- no, not necessarily.

Our permits are written based on an authorized
maximum daily discharge volume. So if they can
slaughter two horses at 8,000 gallons per day or 120 horses at 8,000 gallons per day, we're concerned about the maximum daily discharge volume.
Q. Thank you.

The regulations that the Department relies on only provide authority over certain constituents, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. If there is a new kind of operation, new kind of business, new kind of facility, does the NMED ever investigate on its own to determine if there may be a different type of discharge in a new type of facility?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by a new discharge. We typically look at an application from a
technical standpoint. If it's something we haven't seen before, we will do research on that facility and the potential contaminants that may be associated with it.
Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that you did not do that here with respect to horse slaughter, because you weren't aware that horse slaughter was involved?
A. I didn't at the time, until $I$ understood that, that there was -- that until the time that $I$ knew that horse slaughter was involved. I can't say that it would -- I can't say that $I$ have found any information to change the contaminants that we would regulate based on what we have the authority to regulate.
Q. Okay. But an investigation was done with respect to horse slaughter operations and the potential wastewater discharge from horse slaughter?
A. There were questions that were brought up on the amount of blood and the amount of offal, and as due diligence, I researched those items. However, the permit limits how those things are handled, so --
Q. And did the agency make any evaluation of the potential water contamination from horse slaughter operations outside of offal and blood volume?
A. Only in the instance of the contaminants that we regulate and the amount of wastewater that they are discharging.
Q. And did the agency consider the potential for toxic pollutants that are regulated under the NMAC?
A. I didn't -- I'm unaware of any of the -anything associated with slaughter facilities that would be associated with our toxic pollutants list.
Q. Okay. And Valley Meat presented no evidence to the NMED that this operation would not lead to the discharge of toxic pollutants, correct?
A. Could you restate your -- redo your question again, please?
Q. Sure.

Valley Meat presented no evidence to the Department that this operation would not lead to the discharge of toxic pollutants, correct?
A. There was nothing in their application to indicate that there were toxic pollutants associated with it.

MR. WAGMAN: Great. Thank you.
CROSS EXAMINATION OF JERRY SCHOEPPNER
BY MR. WAGMAN:
Q. Mr. Schoeppner, in your testimony, you stated that NMED performs regular facility inspections at facilities such as Valley Meat. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you define "regular"?
A. Well, that varies with our resources. If we have vacancy rates, which we do right now, then we like to get out to a facility on an annual basis, but if we have a high vacancy rate, then sometimes we can miss our annual inspections.

It's not a requirement to be out there annually, but it's something that we like to do to keep up with the facilities, see if there is any changes, and check on the conditions that are in the permit.
Q. Is it -- is there any kind of protocol?

Is there -- do you like to do more frequent inspections for facilities that have been in violation of the regulations or the laws?
A. Typically, that can be the case. You know, higher priority sites are the case, large facilities, because we have anything from a small RV or mobile home park up to very large facilities. So we prioritize based on the threat to the environment.

MR. WAGMAN: Okay. Those are all the questions $I$ have, Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: Thank you very much, Mr. Wagman.
Are there other questions for the Bureau panel based on their testimony?

Mr. Powers, do you have follow-up?
MR. POWERS: At this time I don't have any
follow-up questions.

Thank you.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Thank you very much, Mr. Schoeppner and

Ms. Kirby.
Mr. Dunn?

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer, I'd just
like to reserve the right to recall these witnesses as
rebuttal witnesses at a later time as well.

MS. ORTH: Would you take that up with
Mr. Powers, please?
MR. DUNN: I will. I will.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Mr. Wagman, have the parties at your table decided on an order of presentation?

MR. WAGMAN: Mr. Holland.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Holland first.
Do we need a few minutes to set you up?

MR. HOLLAND: Yes. He'll help me set up my equipment.

Is it all right if $I$ testify from the podium here?

MS. ORTH: Absolutely.
MR. HOLLAND: Thank you.
MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn.

MR. DUNN: If I might suggest, since we're going to be cross-examining him, if we could have his testimony from here, so we could see both the screen and we could see him when we're questioning him. If he wants to do his presentation from here, that's fine, but we're --

MS. ORTH: He's going to go through his presentation there.

MR. HOLLAND: Yes, I'll do that and take the stand.

MS. ORTH: So shall we take -- do we need a few minutes to set this up, or are you ready?

MR. HOLLAND: It should come right up here.
MS. ORTH: Oath.

MR. HOLLAND: I'll start by saying that, first
of all --

MS. TOWNSEND: Wait, wait. You need to be sworn in.

MS. ORTH: You need to be sworn in.

MR. HOLLAND: Oh, yes.
(Oath administered to Mr. Holland.)

MS. ORTH: All right.

JOHN HOLLAND
after having been first duly sworn under oath, was questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

MR. HOLLAND: Sorry about that. These legal proceedings are a little bit strange to me. I haven't been in court for a few years.

My expertise is a combination of technical and horse knowledge and the study of statistical evidence from both the record on horse slaughter plants as well as other aspects of equine abuse and neglect.

If you'll look at this, this first slide, I'll just go real quickly through my qualifications. Yes, that's it.

First of all, the Equine Welfare Alliance is a nonprofit $501(c)(4)$. We're not related to anyone else here at the meeting.

MS. ORTH: Hold on one second.

Mr. Powers?

MR. POWERS: I'm sorry, Mr. Holland, I do apologize.

I just want to remind that if there is any photographs -- I think there might be, there were some filed with your prefiled testimony -- that the Court alert anyone with a sensitive nature that there may
be --
MR. HOLLAND: Yes, sir, I will let you know.
I certainly hope I will.
MR. POWERS: Thank you, Mr. Holland.
MR. HOLLAND: My assistant here is supposed to remind me, too. It's toward the very end of the testimony.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
MR. HOLLAND: We will look at the Valley -Natural Valley Farms, and at that point, there is one graphic slide.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.
Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: Do you intend -- does the -- does Mr. Holland intend to supply these slides as exhibits to the record, or are they just for demonstrative purposes today?

MR. HOLLAND: You're welcome to them. I have -- you know, they are basically a summary of what I put in my written testimony.

MS. ORTH: Right.
So demonstrative exhibits don't need to be admitted, but it sounds as though he's willing to send them to you as a courtesy.

MR. DUNN: Well, I'd like to file an objection
if we're going to -- if any of these pictures or slides do not directly pertain to Valley, I'd like to lodge an objection as to relevance at this point.

They may become part of the record, but I'd like to have that objection on the record as well.

MS. ORTH: All right.
So let's take that up when we have heard from Mr. Holland.

Please go ahead.
MR. HOLLAND: Thank you very much.
First of all, $I$ appreciate the -- the ability to testify here, and what I'm going to testify to is indeed rather indirect, but it's also very important, I think, for the record to show what has happened in the past. That's a specialty we have.

But to get back to my expertise, our organization is all nonprofit, all volunteer, and we do research and investigations in matters of equine welfare. That includes slaughter.

Our studies and investigations are used by law enforcement, and we have made them freely available to the public. Anything that's in my slide presentation here can be found by citation.

The next slide.
As a horse owner, I've had horses for 40
years. I run a small sanctuary. I'm a founding officer of Equine Welfare Alliance. My specialty is -- in the Equine Welfare Alliance is statistical studies and data analysis, and that's partly because of what $I$ do professionally.

I'm widely published on the subject of equine welfare, including an article that just came out in the Kentucky Journal of Equine, Agricultural and Natural Resources Law.

The next slide.
My training is as an engineer. I'm an old electrical engineer from Virginia Tech. I have 40 years of experience. I have 12 patents and three books.

I worked with DOE and DOD, and here is where my expertise is tangential to this issue, working in survey and decontamination and remediation systems.

I'm currently a consultant. I do what's called knowledge-based engineering -- that is the digging of data from records of the past -- for instance, performance of machines, performance of operators, performance of materials -- and then $I$ apply them to real-time controls in factories so as to maximize the operation of factories.

The next slide.
I worked on a lot of remedial projects, and
here's what $I$ found in them: that most of them were caused by poor decision making up front. That's why I'm so glad to be here. They were exacerbated by political and budget pressures, and they often resulted in scandals and cover-ups.

I'm going to use this one example to prove my point here. The remediation costs were out of all proportion to the original costs of having done it right and all of them had long-term environmental consequences.

So if we can look at the next slide.
This is -- that's a younger me, standing behind a well that we developed for Fernald. Fernald was a complex northwest of Cincinnati about eight years ago. It may have been as much as 10 or 12 miles. Very close to Cincinnati. It was a complex that processed uranium ore into mill uranium rods during the Cold War, and it began to come under criticism in the late '80s, after a whistleblower was found to have accidentally fallen into a furnace. They never did prove it was murder, but there were suspicions, and now all of a sudden, there were a lot of investigations.

We were called in in the mid-'90s because at that point they had to dig up all of the contaminated material, and that's just a little bit of it you see
behind you. It's all what's called mixed waste. It may have radioactive components or caustic components, and they stored it while they were destroying this facility. It's now the entire facility. It was so contaminated by that point that they turned it into a nature preserve. People can never inhabit this area in the foreseeable future.

This was just one of many, many, many things that I did. It doesn't bear directly on this, but the water from that facility did get into the aquifer and the Great Miami Aquifer was contaminated. They had to drill, I think, 16 wells to pump the water out of the aquifer to try to decontaminate it. They recovered about three tons of uranium from the aquifer. The water also contaminated the Miami River, which is nearby, which ironically $I$ played in as a child.

The next slide.
So now to the horse slaughter operations.
That wasn't, as I said, directly to it, but $I$ feel that this hearing needs to know what has happened in the past, because there has been a lot of statements here about what's going to happen in the future, and I don't see it as jibing at all with what's happened in the past.

We've been told that this is just like cows,
and that there won't be any problems, that treatment is pretty much routine. I don't believe that at all.

And there is two reasons. There is no market for the byproducts of equine slaughters. Mr. De Los Santos was talking about rendering, and $I$ wish him luck, but most of the plants that I've studied, the rendering plants turned down their offal because it was contaminated with drugs.

There are many, many examples of people not being able to get rid of those, but I'm just going to prove it by showing what happened.

Systems designed to treat wastewater from cattle slaughter operations do not work for horses. It's just a fact.

The next slide.
So let's look at Cavel. It's owned by Velda, which is a corporation out of Belgium. It burned down -- the next slide. You can see it's a very modern facility. It burned down Easter Sunday of 2002. It was rebuilt to the most modern standards.

Now, from the front, you could see it looked like a high-tech industry. It does not look like Mr. De Los Santos' operation. It was quite well designed in a lot of ways. The horses disappeared into it at the back. They went down a ramp, so that nobody
could take pictures of them.
I have to admit, for the most part, they controlled odors, which has been a big problem with the other plants, because they had a big ventilation system.

It reopened in the summer of 2004 .
The next slide.

It operated for three years, until it was shut down by Illinois law banning horse slaghter for human consumption. It was not shut down by the lack of federal inspectors, but that was also a pending issue at the time and the -- it went through the courts about the same time, and the Illinois law beat the inspections. They were not in compliance a single month in three years.

Next slide.

That's the first warning that they got on the plant, and that was -- it was a slap on the wrist for the first year. It was a $\$ 500$ fine, and they were given time to correct it. They announced that they were bringing in a new bug tank -- and a bug tank is a processing tank where the compounds are broken down by chemical reaction. They brought in a new one, and the next year they found they also couldn't get it to work.

The next slide. So they were then fined --
and the next slide -- an increasing amount of money.

1

This is the second year. They were in violation every month. By now, $I$ think the fine was up to $\$ 5,500$.

The next slide. The third year, that's the record of the year for the testing on the plant. Yellow and red are -- yellow are averages that are out for the week and red is averages that are -- or values that are out of compliance for the month.

The plant -- and you can't read the columns very well there, but they are the typical waste processing things, suspended solids and the oxygen demand -- chemical and biochemical oxygen demand and pH.

They had a lot of problems with their
discharge, and they were then fined $\$ 100,000$. They didn't pay any of these fines until well after they closed down. They wanted to free the property up and they then made a deal with the Water Board, the Sanitation Department.

Okay. The next plant -- oh, by the way, this is their treatment system that they said would fix the problem. Now, this was a very professional organization. They knew what they were doing, and they had money for experts. That tank you can see is overflowing with a reaction that we don't -- no one will ever know for sure, but we believe that it has to do with the fact that this blood contained a lot of
chemicals, particularly antibiotics, and the blood tank depends on bacteria and the antibiotics would kill them. Now, that is speculation on my part. If
somebody has a better explanation for that slide, please let me know.

The water from it did get into the ground. They did not have an adequate attachment on the bottom of the tank, and you can see the tank beginning to split.

Next slide.
Now, if we look at Dallas Crown, Dallas Crown is a lot more along the lines of Mr. De Los Santos' operation, it looks like. It was a -- you can take the next slide. I took that picture myself, incidentally. I visited Dallas Crown. It was a cow plant that was converted to slaughter horses. They had been okay as a cattle plant. There were comments about smell, but there are no wastewater problems.

When they opened, they said that we will -- we will do our treatment in accordance with, you know, the necessary ordinances, and there will be no problem with disposal of waste.

On March loth, the Board of Adjustments ordered Dallas Crown closed, unanimously. I was at that hearing. The plant challenged the town in court,
insisting each violation be tried as a separate court case. In a minute, you'll see why that turned out to be a problem. And of course, as I said, it was converted from cattle to horses.

The next slide.
In a 19-month period of operation, Dallas Crown committed 481 violations of their discharge permit.

Here is a series of sheets. If you want me to stop at any point, I will, but I'll go through them rather quickly. These are the violations during an 18 -month period. In all the years they were in operation, they were never in compliance.

Go ahead.
Now, this plant was particularly bad, in that they tried some rather unorthodox methods of getting rid of their waste. One of their techniques -- that's good. Hold it right there. Okay. One of their techniques was to install a pump that would force it down the sewer line, but the sewer line had branches in it, and when the clog went past the branch, the discharge from the plant rose into the bathtubs of the neighborhood. Some people think that's, you know, a myth, it's not, because I actually interviewed the people who had that
experience. There was a Robert Eldridge, who lived
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directly behind the plant, and a delightful wife, who keeps Christmas decorations up all year. Anyhow, they -- they adjusted to that.

I found the conditions around the plant abysmal. But right here they are trying to get rid of blood by a mucking truck, as we call it in the nuclear business, but, you know, I think Mr. De Los Santos called it pump and haul, you pump the stuff into a truck and haul it away, and the truck turned over on its side. This was all blood right here, and the blood ran down into the drainage system.

Okay. Next slide.
Now let's talk about Natural Valley Farms.
When Cavel closed -- they already knew it was coming, they were under a lot of pressure, and they knew they would have to close.

Natural Valley Farms had been constructed as a cattle slaughter operation, and it had only operated for a few years with cattle. It was built in 2005 , part of the EFC problem. There was a lot of pressure -- in some cases, the borders were closed and they couldn't take their cows to Chicago for slaughter or to the northern US and they built this plant.

When the border was reopened, it was having trouble making ends meet, and it was contracted by

Cavel, as they left their DeKalb plant, a nice plant, to do this slaughter under contract, and very much $I$ think like Mr. De Los Santos indicated his relationship would be.

They used an evaporation pond, supplemented by a muck and truck disposal. After just two years, they were closed by the CFIA. Now, before they were ordered closed, the operating company itself went bankrupt, with 42 million dollars in losses. They went closed, and shortly thereafter, the parent company of Cavel put them -- bought the property -- leased their property, I should say, and put it in operation, hired the people back, and they slaughtered for about another six months before the CFIA demanded they would be closed.

Now, we're coming up on a graphic picture. I think it's the one after this, but it might be this one. No, this is the blood, muck and truck. Well, it turns out that one of our investigators watched from a high vantage point. Now, this isn't very clear, but the video is on YouTube, and all you have to do is say "Natural Valley Farms pouring blood in the river," and you will get the whole YouTube video, and you can watch this truck discharging blood along the bank of the river, it's a tanker truck, and then returning and parking back in the parking lot of Natural Valley Farms.

This was part of the evidence that was just overwhelming in making them close.

Finally, the next slide -- and this is a graphic one -- is this is what they did for organ disposal at Natural Valley Farms.

Mr. De Los Santos has indicated that he intends to send that material to a renderer. I didn't hear him say if he had any renderer agree to take it. But the history of these plants is that the renderers do some testing on the materials, and if drugs show up in the materials, they won't take them.

In fact, the horse slaughter, horse manure, you know, they are not -- they are not well received by rendering plants, and even the -- the racetracks report to me, in about 2005, that the truck that took away their manure would not even take away the manure anymore, because it was used to raise mushrooms and that the mushrooms had tested positive for drugs.

So if all that we've heard earlier was true, then why do these problems occur, because these people had every chance and every resource to do something about it, and they apparently couldn't.

So, finally -- the last slide -- these examples really prove that you can't -- they are not the same -- horse waste from a slaughter plant is not the
same. If it were the same, these examples wouldn't exist.

Of course, as I said before, the most feasible cause is drug residues. There is no reason whatever to believe that Valley Meats will be any better that its predecessors. I just don't know. I haven't seen any evidence that they would be. I fear that the residents of the area would suffer the same consequences as those people in those communities, and $I$ got to know many of them personally.

So at this point, that concludes my testimony, and $I$ appreciate you very much allowing me to give it.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Holland.
If you'll go that witness table, I'll ask the other parties if they have questions of you.

Would you like to start, Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.
Before I begin, I would like to lodge a series of objections to the testimony as to relevancy, as to being based upon hearsay, inadmissible hearsay, tending to be more prejudicial and not probative, not based upon actual knowledge, and not of an expert opinion nature and not anything which he is qualified to give technical testimony on.

I'd just like to go ahead and put those on the
record. I understand that this is a broad hearing, and we want to have people participate, and I'd just like to have those noted.

MS. ORTH: All right.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. DUNN:
Q. Mr. Holland, you said in your slides in there that it's just a fact that cattle systems can't handle equines.

Are you qualified to evaluate cattle systems?
A. Sir, I believe what $I$ said or what $I$ meant to say was that they have never been able to. I don't know that they can or not, but $I$ have never seen an example where they could.
Q. You say "never."

Can you qualify your knowledge base as to
never?
A. I have not -- to my knowledge, I have not seen a plant that did not have pollution problems.

I only have really details on the three, but what $I$ have heard directly from the others is the same story.
Q. So you don't know anything beyond those three?
A. No. And I'm relying on public records here. I mean, those reports are not mine. I didn't make them
up. Those are public evaluations or evaluations by water boards.
Q. In forming that opinion, did you look at any of the preceding plants from the previous 75 to 100 years?
A. I looked at some of the operations record for cow slaughter before they converted to horses.
Q. What exactly?
A. Well, Dallas Crown, they slaughtered cattle before horses, and they did not show any particular problems with wastewater disposal.
Q. But that's just that one plant. There is nothing outside of that one?
A. And Cavel had -- this is a rebuilt Cavel. The original plant was much more along the lines of Dallas Crown. It was an outdoor, it was out of tin and pipe structure, and they had slaughtered cattle for a number of years, and $I$ could find no record of any major problems, but --
Q. Well, then let's talk about Cavel for a second.

You showed the slide of the tank. You said "I don't know, but I believe." Is that fair to say that you --
A. Yes, that's a another sample of --
Q. -- did not --

MS. TOWNSEND: You're both talking at once.
Q. That's a factual determination by you on your opinion, that's not an actual expert's opinion, that's just yours?
A. That's mine as an engineer saying that $I$ - you know, we solve problems, and when we have a problem like that, we look at possible reasons, and $I$ can't think of any other feasible reason. But if you think of one, I'll be glad to take it into account.
Q. How many things have you evaluated?
A. In my life? Thousands.
Q. How many at processing facilities?
A. Thousands.
Q. At a cattle process?
A. Not cattle. No, not horse and cattle processing, no, but processing other things.
Q. What other things?
A. Oh, all kinds of materials.

For example, $I$ work in automation and, you
know, automated different systems, and they use
materials, and sometimes those materials are
contaminants, and the company worries about, you know, whether they will get discharged into the water, and we work on systems to assure that they won't.

For instance, we -- $I$ work right now for Optical Cable Corporation, and they have quite a few dangerous chemicals that -- you know, that go into making optical cable, and they are very, very diligent about not allowing them to become part of the discharge stream.
Q. You heard the definition of livestock earlier in our New Mexico statutes. Is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many of those plants, these processing plants that you've worked on, fall within a facility --
A. Well, that --
Q. -- that processes anything off of that list?
A. No, of course, livestock -- are you using the USDA definition or the FDA?
Q. I'm using the New Mexico statutory definition.
A. The FDA or USDA?
Q. No, the New Mexico statutory definition.
A. They are all different. You know, horses are not livestock to the FDA.
Q. But my question was, you're familiar with our New Mexico statute because you heard it read --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and equines are considered under livestock
in New Mexico, is that correct?
A. Yes. And $I$ have no experience with that.
Q. So you don't have any livestock experience?
A. No. I have horse experience.
Q. Okay. You spoke that there was -- you offered that you had heard Mr. De Los Santos talk about the fact that, you know, no rendering facility would take this material.

Are you aware that he may have?
A. No, that's -- I stated that he indicated he was going to take the offal to a rendering facility, and I just questioned whether he had told the rendering facility that it was horse and whether he had, you know, really gone through checking it out, because I think he's going to have a problem.

The products at rendering facilities are things that often end up back in the food chain. For instance, blood meal is one of the main products for disposal of blood, and it's a fertilizer, and it -- many of the drugs that are in the blood will end up in the fertilizer and that, of course, can be taken up into the plants.
Q. What's your basis for that opinion?
A. It's just studying it. I've studied -- I've read deeply on the subject.
Q. Can you give me a little bit more specifics?
A. What would you like?

You know, I assisted Dr. Marini in her paper on the presence of phenylbutazone in horse meat, you know, and she looked at 18 thoroughbreds, and we tracked their records back to the slaughter plant and proved that all 18 of them had been given Bute before being slaughtered.

I've done other studies that --
Q. Permit me to interrupt you.
A. Yes.
Q. We're getting beyond the scope of my questioning.

Specifically, are you aware of any rendering plants that have an environmental issue? So if they'd taken this stuff in the past, is there anywhere where there has been some sort of finding of environmental violation?
A. That's indirect knowledge, not direct knowledge. I didn't talk to the rendering plant, although $I$ tried to, but the -- yes, the Dallas Crown operation was --
Q. Let's just keep it to direct knowledge. If you have direct knowledge, let's do that --
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}$.
Q. -- if you don't, then I'd rather --

MR. POWERS: Madam Hearing Officer - -

MS. ORTH: Mr. Powers.

MR. POWERS: -- and I apologize, but,
Mr. Dunn, if you can ask a direct -- I'd ask that the Court ask Mr. Dunn to ask a direct question, give the witness a chance to respond to that before interrupting, and then $I$ think we can make objections, but if he can finish his statements.

MS. ORTH: Yes. Thank you.
MR. DUNN: That's fine. I'm happy that he answer the question.

MS. ORTH: Well, the dialogue was speeding up pretty fast, so let's just slow it down.

MR. DUNN: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) Mr. Holland, are you familiar at all with biofuel plants?
A. Yes. I worked on biofuel plant project many, many years ago. It was -- it took wood pulp, sawdust, and blasted it into a furnace to create electricity.

Is that what you're talking about?
Q. Or something that turned it into a biofuel of some sort.
A. Yes, sir, $I$ worked on that for about nine months.
Q. Are you aware they do commonly use animal waste and animal byproducts in a --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I'm sorry -- in the biofuel?
A. Yes. Yes, sir. I am familiar with that. It is -- it's commonly used even by Native Americans. I mean, the Tibetans used yak poop to cook their meals.
Q. Would it be fair to say if one of those two options were available to Valley, and they confirmed that, that they really do have an end-product or an end destination for the byproducts?
A. Well, yes. You know, I would still question whether that end destination is fully aware of what the end-products are going to be and whether they'll still feel the same way after they have tested them.

MR. DUNN: Okay. No further questions.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Dunn.
Mr. Powers, do you have questions for
Mr. Holland?
Oh, Mr. Kendall.
MR. KENDALL: Madam Hearing Officer, the New Mexico Environment Department would like to join in the objections from Valley Meat on relevancy grounds, both for what was presented and what was submitted --
MS. ORTH: All right.

MR. KENDALL: -- prehearing.
We have no further questions for Mr. Holland.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.
Mr. Wagman?

MR. WAGMAN: No questions, Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: All right. Mr. Biernoff?
MR. BIERNOFF: None, Your Honor.
MS. ORTH: All right.

Thank you, Mr. Holland, very much.
MR. HOLLAND: Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Certainly some of the material presented was attenuated relevant to the example of the material about Fernald, for example.

But the material about problems at other slaughterhouses, I think although it's not about this slaughterhouse, which hasn't opened for horses at this point, is acceptable, and to the extent that your cross-examination shows the appropriate weight to go to the observations, to the extent the facility operations can be distinguished, permits can be distinguished, that is sometimes quite useful in our permitting hearings.

So I'm not going to -- I'm not going to exclude it.

Who is going next?
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MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer, we have our witness, Mr. Olson.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Olson, all right.

MR. WAGMAN: Could we take a moment to switch seats and that kind of thing?

MR. BIERNOFF: I can do the examination from here.

MS. ORTH: All right.
(Oath administered to Mr. Olson.)

WILLIAM C. OLSON
after having been first duly sworn under oath, was questioned and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BIERNOFF:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Olson.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Can you indicate to the Hearing Officer for which parties you're presenting technical testimony today?
A. I am presenting testimony on behalf of the New Mexico Attorney General, Front Range Equine Rescue, and six residents of Roswell, and that includes Ramona Cordova, Cassie Gross, Tanya Littlewolf, Sandy Schaefer, Krystle Smith and Deborah Trahan.
Q. Okay. And you've already submitted written
testimony. I'll try not to make you repeat too much of that as we get into this discussion.

I just want to ask you, though, are there any changes to your filed written testimony that you'd like to make at this time?
A. Yes, there was a couple minor errors that were in the testimony.

In the NOI on page three, it lists Exhibit 35 and a date for that document. It lists the date as May 7 th of 2012 , and that should be May 7 th of 2010 .

And then also on Exhibit 1, page one, which is my resume, at the -- towards the bottom of that page, on the term of employment for the New Mexico Environment Department as Bureau chief, it lists an error. It still says it's from October of 2004 to the present, and it should be October of 2004 to October of 2011.

And then also the Exhibit 24, which was submitted with the document, it wasn't the complete copy, it was a partial of that -- a partial copy of that paper, and that was the paper on "Activated Sludge Systems Removal of Efficiency for Veterinary Pharmaceuticals from Slaughterhouse Wastewater."
Q. Okay. You've actually provided me with copies of the complete Exhibit 24 that I'd like to pass to the Hearing Officer and to counsel.
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MR. BIERNOFF: Madam Hearing Officer, may I do that?

MS. ORTH: Yes.
Q. (BY MR. BIERNOFF) Okay. Mr. Olson, subject to some of the -- well, subject to all of the changes that you mentioned, the minor changes, do you adopt the written testimony that you filed?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. Can you give the Hearing Officer just a quick summary of your educational background?
A. Yes.

The full information of that is in my direct testimony, but I've been working on water quality issues related to the Water Quality Act/the Water Quality Control Commission for about 27 years.

25 years of that occurred as an employee of state government, for both the New Mexico Environment Department and the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division.

At the end of my service for the state government, I served for seven years as the Bureau chief of the Groundwater Quality Bureau, and in that position, I was responsible for the oversight of those programs and the permitting of wastewater discharges under the Water Quality Act and Water Quality Control Commission Regulations.

Prior to that -- or $I$ should say, I'll add to that that during that time $I$ also served as the expert witness for the Department in adjudicatory hearings, as well as rule-making hearings, which included the Dairy Rule, which was adopted a few years ago.
Q. And an adjudicatory hearing would be a hearing like this one?
A. It was a rule-making hearing in front of the Water Quality Control Commission in that case. There were actually several hearings that occurred.
Q. I appreciate that overview of your professional experience.

Just really quickly, can you mention your educational background as well?
A. Yes.

I have a bachelor's of science in geology and a master's of science in hydrology.

I would like to add, as well, to the professional experience was that $I$ served on the Water Quality Control Commission for approximately 13 years and also had served on the Oil Conservation Commission for a period of about five years.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Can you summarize the history of discharge permit DP-236? That's the permit that's before the
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Hearing Officer now.
A. Basically, the first permit application occurred in 1982. It was permitted for the slaughter of cattle, as well as it mentioned some -- potentially some sheep and hogs.

The permit was renewed in 1998, and at that time it required installation of a single-lined synthetic impoundment.

The permit was then again renewed in 2004 . At that time it required the placement of a clay-lined impoundment at the facility with a synthetic-lined impoundment.

That's kind of the very brief version of that.
Q. Okay. And from your review of the record, what animals did Valley Meat process during this time frame?
A. Largely what was referenced in the applications was the slaughter of cows.
Q. Okay. Is there any evidence in the record that Valley Meat was processing horses during that time frame?
A. No, there is not.
Q. Okay. And did Valley Meat apply for a renewal of the 2004 permit?
A. No, it did not actually. That permit expired
in 2009 .
Q. And how did the Environment Department respond to the expiration of the permit?
A. The Department issued a notice of violation in 2010, asking the applicant to submit a renewal application and telling them they were in violation of the Water Quality Control Commission rules.
Q. Okay. What is the significance of Valley Meat having failed to apply for the renewal before the expiration of the permit in 2009?
A. Well, the implication is that the permit has expired and no longer exists at that point.

There is provisions within the Water Quality Control Commission rules that allow for a permit to continue and to be allowed to continue to discharge if you submit an application for renewal at least 120 days in advance of the expiration of the permit, as well as you are required to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit that you are operating under at that time.
Q. And were those conditions met in this case by Valley Meat?
A. No, they were not.

The permit application was not submitted until after it was noted by the Department that it had
expired, as well as they were not in compliance with their -- the terms and conditions of their permit at the time that it expired.
Q. Okay. Based on your review, how is Valley Meat's contemporary permit application, the application that's before the Hearing Officer now, different from its past applications?
A. Well, now it's proposing to slaughter horses at this point, and that's a significant difference from its prior applications; largely due to the presence of drugs that may be present in horses sent to slaughter --
Q. Okay.
A. -- which would not be present most likely in cattle.
Q. Okay. And does the contemporary permit application, the one that's in the administrative record in this matter, indicate on its face that Valley Meat is going to be slaughtering horses?
A. No. The application itself does not. It's just a renewal of the prior applications for a discharge permit.
Q. To your knowledge, has the Environment Department ever received an application for wastewater discharge from a horse slaughter facility?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. And you had mentioned that there are salient differences between slaughtering horses and slaughtering cattle, and I'd like you to summarize your understanding of those differences.
A. It's detailed in my testimony, Exhibits 7 through 26, I believe.

There is a number of -- as we discussed earlier this morning, a number of antibiotics and other types of drugs that are actually prohibited for use in food animals that are given to horses.

So there is a potential problem for --
MR. POWERS: Objection, Your Honor.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Powers?
Excuse me, Mr. Olson.
MR. POWERS: Before getting into, much like the testimony earlier, the regulations regarding food -pharmaceuticals and food and other FSIS/USDA issues, I'd ask the Hearing Officer to limit any testimony on that matter.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn, do you join in that?
MR. DUNN: Yes, I'd like to join in that, and add that Mr. Olson has not been qualified as any sort of expert in veterinary medicine or animal physiology, toxicity, or pharmaceuticals.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Mr. Biernoff.

MR. BIERNOFF: Madam Hearing Officer, we do not introduce Mr. Olson's testimony for the purposes of establishing facts about veterinary medicine or toxicology.

Mr. Olson has testified in written format, and we'd like to briefly discuss it here today, some of the salient differences in horses and cows, and it may have implications for groundwater contamination, and to therefore explore whether the agency has considered those differences.

MS. ORTH: That's what I thought I heard you and Mr. Olson doing.

So please go ahead.
MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. I believe that Mr. Olson was in the middle of answering the question.

MS. ORTH: That's right.
MR. BIERNOFF: Madam Court Reporter, could you read back the question, please?

MS. TOWNSEND: "A. It's detailed in my testimony, Exhibits 7 through 26, I believe.
"There is a number of -- as we discussed earlier this morning, a number of antibiotics and other types of drugs that are actually prohibited for use in food animals that are given to horses.

KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS
110 Twelfth Street, Northwest, Albuquerque, New Mexico
"So there is a potential problem for --"
MR. OLSON: I was going to say potential
problem for these chemicals to be present in the wastewater that would be discharged to the impoundments, which then makes it a potential problem for contamination of groundwater and public exposure if these things are released from the impoundment.
Q. (BY MR. BIERNOFF) Okay. Mr. Olson, did you consult any scientific literature to make that determination?
A. Yes. That is in my Exhibits 7 through 26. There is the list of banned substances for -- that are actually given to horses that would not be allowed for meat animals.

So these are potentially present -- to be there and be present in horse slaughter operations and can be discharged to the impoundments.
Q. Okay. Now, do you also have personal knowledge about drugs that are given to horses?
A. Yes. I've -- I had horses for about 20 years. I trained and raised horses myself.

The list that was provided in Exhibit 7, in review of that, I'm familiar with -- personally familiar with about 27 of the drugs listed in that exhibit that $I$ have personal experience with their application;
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especially through those applications, the labels of those drugs clearly state that these drugs are not to be used for food animals.
Q. Okay. In your opinion, if a permit applicant told you that they were going to be conducting a new kind of business enterprise, different from the business that they had conducted under the previous permit, would it be appropriate to inquire into the nature of that new business operation?

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I'm going to object
to that.
Mr. Olson is not currently in a position of permitting action. I don't believe his opinion would be reflective of any current regulations. It's been a couple of years. It's a -- it's not necessarily a policy issue.

I mean, he can opine maybe during his administration or maybe during his policy, but $I$ don't believe currently that's correct.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Biernoff?
MR. BIERNOFF: If I may, thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.

I hope that I -- the way I phrased the question indicates that $I{ }^{\prime} m$ asking Mr. Olson for his opinion, and certainly we all understand that Mr. Olson,
nor any of the rest of us, other than yourself and the Cabinet Secretary, are ultimately responsible for making that determination here, but based on Mr. Olson's extensive past experience as a regulator and as a scientist, it's my intention to ask him generally if a permit applicant embarking on a new business operation is an appropriate area for inquiry.

MS. ORTH: Right. I think his biography was set out fairly clearly and that it would be apparent that Mr. Olson is speaking on his experience, which as a regulator ended about two years ago.

Please go ahead.
MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. So if I can just have the question read back or $I$ can read it again.

MS. TOWNSEND: "Q. Okay. In your opinion, if a permit applicant told you that they were going to be conducting a new kind of business enterprise, different from the business that they had conducted under the previous permit, would it be appropriate to inquire into the nature of that new business operation?"

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I'm going to object at that point, too. That's speculative.

I mean, if he can tack it down a little bit, but that's any type of business operation conducting a new type of operation, would you investigate. I think
that's a very highly speculative question.
MS. ORTH: Okay. And so in this case, Mr. Biernoff, I think you made the point earlier that they were switching from cows to horses.

MR. BIERNOFF: I'll be glad to be more specific.

I'd also request that other counsel, if they have additional objections to this particular question, that they voice them now so we can address all of them now instead of having a serial series of objections.

MS. ORTH: All right. Mr. Olson, do you
remember the question?
MR. OLSON: I think it's the question -- let me see if I've got this correctly, is should the Department be concerned and look at differences that might occur through different types of discharges, especially through new types of discharges. Does -MR. BIERNOFF: That's right.

MR. OLSON: -- that characterize it?
I would say yes, the Department should, and I can think of one experience where there was a new facility that hadn't been previously in this state that was permitted and that took some extensive time to look at, and that was the LES facility out in the Hobbs area, which was a nuclear fuel enrichment facility. There had
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never been one of those before in the state, so it took some time to look at the facility and evaluate potential contaminants that are going to be generated from that facility.

It's not typical water contaminants that you would see generated from other facilities, such as a, you know, dairy or wastewater plant or other type of activity.

So I think it is prudent to look at things, especially if there is a potential for -- for threats to public health from discharges into the groundwater.
Q. (BY MR. BIERNOFF) Okay. And just getting a little bit more specific for a moment, would it be appropriate, in your opinion, for the Environment Department to inquire as to whether or not any of the drugs or other chemical substances that might be present in horse flesh migrate from slaughter operations into wastewater?
A. I think it's prudent, as well as evaluating whether or not there is any toxic pollutants that might be generated as part of that, which the Department clearly has authority over.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Let's go back to the permit application and
the draft discharge permit for a moment.
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Based on your review, what's your understanding of the volume of wastewater that the draft permit allows for?
A. It's clear throughout the various permits and the renewals is that the permit allows for a maximum daily discharge of 8,000 gallons per day.
Q. Okay. And how does that volume compare to the discharges allowed under Valley Meat's past permits?
A. They have exceeded, actually, the permitted volume $I$ think about 13 percent of the time in their monitoring reports, the ones that have been submitted. There is a lot of monitoring reports that are missing, so we don't know what happened in those other periods.

But out of the ones that are submitted, about 13 percent of the time, they've exceeded their permitted volume.
Q. And when you say "permitted volume," you're referring to the 8,000 gallons a day?
A. Yes, the 8,000 gallons per day. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And based upon your review of the permit history, was there a point in time that Valley Meat indicated how many animals -- how many head that it intended to slaughter?
A. Yes. It shows up in their calculations
through their permit renewals, especially in 2003. They also had discussed it in their original application in 1982.
Q. Okay.
A. And that's never -- at least there has been no mention in the permits of any activities greater than 39.3 cows per day.
Q. Okay. And based on your review of the record here, before today, was there any indication that Valley Meat communicated to the Environment Department how it would be able to slaughter three times as many animals without generating any additional wastewater?
A. Actually, there was no discussion from Valley Meat in their applications about the changes to the volume or changes to their operation to slaughter more animals at that point.
Q. Okay. You were here for this morning's testimony by Valley Meat's witnesses?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And did you hear witnesses from Valley Meat indicating a different figure for how many animals they would slaughter under the proposed permit?
A. Yes. They said that -- I think I heard testimony at times they've slaughtered up to 150. I think that was the testimony --
Q. Okay.
A. -- this morning.
Q. Okay. Based on your review of the record, did Valley Meat provide any supporting evidence of how it could slaughter a larger number of animals than listed in its 2003 renewal application without generating any additional wastewater?

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn.
MR. DUNN: Again, this gets into being argumentative and mischaracterizing the evidence before the Court.

Right now, the only thing before the Court is that it's 8,000 gallons per day. There is not a number that Valley has attested to that says that's what they were going to do and that there was any sort of plan to exceed that and that they needed to provide any additional information that they were going to exceed that number. There is not a hard-and-fast number in the record right now.

MS. ORTH: Do I not remember Mr. De Los Santos using the 121-horse-a-day number?

MR. DUNN: Yes, but that's -- they are talking about previous numbers, and $I$ think that they are trying to say that this -- the 120 proposed is somehow
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different than what it was in the past. There is not a past number.

MS. ORTH: The 39.3?
MR. DUNN: Yeah, and that -- we still can't find that. I apologize. We've looked through -- even if that was in there, their permit is for 8,000 gallons per day, whatever number of animals that was, that was not their intention they were going to do the 39.3 animals per day.

I don't even know how they arrived at that
number, but it's really not --
MS. ORTH: So, Mr. Dunn, this seems to be one of the more important points being made by the opponents.

So, Mr. Biernoff, is it worth taking a moment to go back to the document number 75, where $I$ think it was Mr. Wagman that elicited --

MR. BIERNOFF: That would be very -- I'm sorry, Your Honor.

MS. ORTH: -- the testimony showing that number of 39.3 as being in there?

MR. BIERNOFF: Thank you, Your Honor. That would be very helpful.

I'm glad to point out, with the assistance of Mr. Wagman, where in the record this number appears.

So it's 75, as you mentioned, Madam Hearing Officer, and it is Table 2, Evaporation Calculations.

MR. DUNN: Can we get a page number?
MR. BIERNOFF: Yes, it looks like it has a page number of one.

MS. ORTH: No, it's five something.
MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: Yes.
MR. WAGMAN: It's also -- I object, because this is asked and answered of Mr. De Los Santos. I showed him the document, and he said the number was there, and so I'm not sure why we're going over this again, although I'm happy to, but $I$ just want to point out it's asked and answered and admitted by Mr. De Los Santos.

MS. ORTH: No, I understand. Sometimes we have to back up for a moment.

MR. BIERNOFF: And so is that enough guidance for everybody to find it? It doesn't look like there is a Bates number on it. There is a --

MR. DUNN: I still don't see it.
MR. BIERNOFF: Excuse me?
MR. DUNN: What page?
MR. BIERNOFF: It is 236C-75, Table 2,
Evaporation Calculations, page number one of that
spreadsheet. Table 2, page one.
And if everybody looks at the second column that says "Renewed Permit," underneath that it says "Cows per day."

MR. DUNN: About what page is Table 2? I'm not finding Table 2. I apologize.

MR. BIERNOFF: Well, let's take the time we need to find it.

MR. DUNN: Do you have a page in the document?
MR. BIERNOFF: The document hasn't been prepared that way.

MS. ORTH: I believe mine says 517. Try that. Is it -- Mr. Powers or Ms. Kirby, is it 517?

MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer, there is no Bates number on the document we're looking at, that's for sure, but it is --

MR. OLSON: I can point out --

MR. BIERNOFF: Again, maybe another way to find it would be counting back from some readily identifiable document.

So if we look -- if everybody is looking at this document in the record, 236C-75, if you're looking at the page where Mr. De Los Santos signed, dated 8/26/03, it's Section 10 of that application, okay, so if you're on that page, you're then going to count one
-- four pages past that.
MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer, it's also Exhibit 27 of the Bureau's submission, and if you count three pages back from the end -- from the last page, you're there, too.

MR. BIERNOFF: That's true.

MS. ORTH: Okay.

MR. DUNN: Okay. I can clarify a little bit, Madam Hearing Officer, now that I've found it.

MS. ORTH: Okay.

MR. DUNN: As far as my objection goes, that's an average and an estimate. It is not a business plan. It is not a proposed number and $I$--

MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer, I object --

MS. ORTH: Hold on. Hold on.

MR. DUNN: So to characterize it as their number that they gave that they were only going to obtain to is a mischaracterization of the evidence.

If they'd like to say that that was an estimated number in the application, that's fine, but we just don't want it to be showing up that somehow that's the number they agreed to be bound by.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
Mr. Biernoff?

MR. BIERNOFF: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer.
Mr. De Los Santos testified that this was the
number. I don't think that it's appropriate for counsel representing Mr. De Los Santos to testify on his behalf. Certainly, Mr. De Los Santos is entitled to make whatever testimonial statements are appropriate today, but --

MR. DUNN: Your Honor, if I might.
MR. BIERNOFF: -- I think we should proceed.
MS. ORTH: Okay. Mr. Dunn.
MR. DUNN: Just very quickly. That's the
point. He testified that it was a number in the document. He didn't testify that that was the number that they agreed that they were going to do. That's the mischaracterization that $I$ 'm trying to get to here.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
MR. DUNN: I don't have a problem with him saying that he did testify that that was the number in the application, but that it means something other than that is simply more than it should be.

MS. ORTH: All right. So the transcript will reflect the testimony that Mr. De Los Santos gave this morning, and it may be appropriate to bring Mr. De Los Santos back to make whatever clarification you believe is necessary, but I'm going to let Mr. Biernoff continue
his questioning of Mr. Olson, now that we are all looking at the same page and that number.

So, Mr. Biernoff, please go ahead.
MR. BIERNOFF: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.
Q. (BY MR. BIERNOFF) I believe the question that was pending was to Mr. Olson whether, in his review of the administrative record, there was any indication that Valley Meat had provided any supporting evidence to explain how it would be able to slaughter three times as many, or in this any case, many more animals than it was slaughtering according to this document at the time of its 2003 permit renewal.

So that's the question $I$ want to pose to you.
A. Was that a question? Can you try that
again --
Q. You bet.
A. -- as a question, please?
Q. Is there any evidence that you've seen, in your review of the record, any supporting evidence that Valley Meat submitted, to explain to the Environment Department how it could slaughter many more animals but only generate the same amount of wastewater?
A. What I've seen in the record is that the evaporation calculations list out the number of cows per
day that they are looking at for the expected discharge volume and then how they are going to accommodate that volume with the impoundment that they are proposing to operate, and that's the way I interpret this document.
Q. Okay. And are you aware of other evidence in the record that indicates the number of cows that Valley Meat either was slaughtering or stated that it was slaughtering prior to this application?
A. Well, I do recall there was -- and you have to piece it together from two documents that are within the administrative record, but $I$ believe it was in February of 2005 that there was an inspection report which talked about the number of animals they were actually processing per day at that time, and if you'll bear with me a second -- yeah, I think that was the -- it looks like it's document 236C-92, and that's a field trip inspection report of the Environment Department of February 3rd, 2005 .

At that time it notes in the inspection report that the kill rate at the facility -- it was down at that point, but it was running at 100 head per week.

There is a subsequent document on March 4 th of 2005, which is document 236C-94, which is the -- came shortly after this inspection, and that said that they are currently producing less than 5,000 gallons per
day.
So they've got -- they are running -- if you take it at a six days per week, they are running about 16, 17 head per day, and at 5,000 gallons per day, that's going to be a discharge volume of around 300 gallons per head that was being run at that time.
Q. Okay. And in your preparation for preparing your testimony, your written testimony and giving testimony here today, did you consult with any studies regarding volume of wastewater that's generated from slaughter operations?
A. Yes. I'd looked at a study by the European Commission that was specifically looking at slaughter facilities, and there is some extensive tables in there on discharge volumes of wastewater from slaughter facilities.
Q. Okay. And what conclusions did you make from reviewing that study?
A. Well, you had to do some conversions, because they based things on metric tons and liters.

But in looking at the conversions and the data that the European Commission had generated, they generated a number of ranges of discharge volumes per animal type based on a pound kind of of live weight, and they generated ranges from cattle wastewater generation
of about 429 to 2,378 gallons of wastewater per -- that was per 2,205 pounds, which is a metric ton.

So that, you know, generally equates down to around 200 gallons of wastewater per thousand pounds.
Q. Okay. And did this study also examine wastewater generated from slaughter operations for other animals?
A. Yes. It also looked at ranges of generation of wastewater for sheep and pigs as well. There is a large range within those, but the lower range on those is significantly higher for sheep, about -- you know, approximately three times the amount for cattle, and then the amount for pigs is about the same wastewater generation as cattle.
Q. Okay. And did the study include any reference to horses?
A. No, it did not contain a reference to horses. So in my testimony, I had looked at taking the low end of those ranges as a low end of wastewater generation and applying that to the proximate weight of a horse and came up with numbers of approximately about 195 gallons per day per thousand pound live weight.
Q. Okay. So I understand that the study did not look at wastewater generated from horse slaughter, but it did look at wastewater generated from cattle
slaughter.
Based on your review of that study and Valley Meat's prior permits, permit applications, is the rate of wastewater generation that the study found consistent with Valley Meat's past permitting history?
A. Well, I think it's -- it looks like it's slightly less than what I'd just -- the example I'd given a little while ago when they were slaughtering a hundred head per week and generating 5,000 gallons per day. That was generating 300 gallons per animal at that point. And then you get a little bit less -approximately 200 gallons per animal from horses.

So there is a slight difference over those numbers, but $I$ think the numbers show that it's quite comparable to the information provided in the European Commission study.
Q. Okay. There is a lot of ground to cover, and I want to be mindful of the time that's allotted and keeping things moving.

So I'd like to ask you -- I know there is a lot that we -- that we weren't able to talk about that's in your written testimony, but how would you summarize the concerns that you've indicated in your written testimony about Valley Meat's permit application?
A. I think the main concerns are -- is reflected
in the Department's application, that there is a shallow depth to groundwater and there is a high potential for groundwater contamination as a result of discharges at the site.

I think the other thing -- I'm sorry, maybe I'm getting a little off the question there.
Q. Oh, no, that's okay. You answered it just fine.

I was going to ask you, though, do your concerns that you've articulated rise to the level that, in your opinion, the permit should be denied?
A. That, and especially some of the compliance history $I$ see as a significant issue that would warrant denial of the permit.
Q. Okay. And in your testimony, I think you indicate that if the permit is granted that there is additional steps, additional best practices, that you believe should be taken in order to bring this permittee into compliance. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Can you outline those additional measures that you're recommending?
A. It's laid out in more detail in my testimony. But just due to the shallow groundwater
conditions and also the uncertainty of the potential
effects of these chemicals if they are released into the groundwater, $I$ included in my testimony a recommendation for installation of double-lined impoundments for wastewater to ensure that there are not releases, especially in this shallow groundwater setting, because any release from those impoundments would be directly -virtually directly into groundwater, considering the shallow nature of that groundwater.

That's based upon a lot of the history of groundwater contamination at agricultural facilities, which have nitrogen compounds as well. There is a significant number of those types of facilities.

Also, the Department itself has recognized problems with liners, and recently in the Copper Mine Rule hearings, their professional engineer testifying on their behalf provided testimony on leakage of liners.

So I think there is significant concern over a single-lined impoundment that's going to take wastes, with some type of drug compounds that have essentially some type of effect on humans, although it doesn't seem that that's really clear from a lot of the information out there as to what exactly those effects are, because it seems like they just haven't really been studied as to what their effects on humans are, just the fact that
they are hazardous to human ingestion.
Q. Now, you mentioned a concern for potential negative effects on human health.

Are there other risks that are implicated here?
A. Well, there is also the potential for a release from the impoundment migrating from the site and posing undue risk to property. There is a clause within the permit approvals that you're not allowed to actually have an undue risk to property from a discharge.

So if these are released and have potential
impacts on human health, then this would cause an undue risk to neighboring property.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. Thank you.
Madam Hearing Officer, may $I$ have a moment to just confer with co-counsel?

MS. ORTH: Yes.
MR. BIERNOFF: Thank you.
(Confers.)
Q. (BY MR. BIERNOFF) Mr. Olson, before I pass you along to other counsel, is there anything from your written testimony that we didn't get a chance to discuss today that you'd like to -- just to articulate for the Hearing Officer in this proceeding?

I know there is a lot of detail we're not
going to be able to get into, but $I$ just want to give you that opportunity.
A. Yeah, there were just two issues which were two further recommendations, and that was for the concrete below-grade septic tanks that are at the facility. Things have been in place for extended periods of time, concrete cracks and leaks, and so they should be inspected for leaks and replaced, if necessary. And $I$ gave recommendations for that in my testimony.
Q. Okay.
A. I also had some testimony for expanding the groundwater monitoring to include the -- other potential contaminants to look at, as well as installation of monitoring wells downgradient of the concrete tanks. These things have a higher potential to leak even than the impoundment that's at the facility. So there should be some type of downgradient monitoring from those concrete tanks. I think that's the main issues.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. Thank you very much.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Biernoff.
Mr. Dunn, do you have questions of Mr.
Olson?
MR. DUNN: Good afternoon, Mr. Olson.
MR. OLSON: Good afternoon.

MR. DUNN: Before $I$ get into the questions, actually, Madam Hearing Officer, I know we placed objections on the record at the beginning of his testimony regarding the conflict of interest. I'd also like to lodge an objection on the basis of relevancy. As an example, the 24 that was discussed, that we just received a complete copy of, deals with activated sludge systems removal efficiency of veterinary pharmaceuticals from wastewater -slaughterhouse wastewater. We're not talking about an activated sludge system here.

I just think that something along those lines tend to be more prejudicial than probative, especially since it's not really relevant.

So I would just like to lodge that objection at this point.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Shall we take the exhibits, then, before you conduct your questioning?

MR. DUNN: If the rest of counsel wants to talk about them.

MS. ORTH: Mr. -- I'm sorry?

MR. DUNN: If it's the pleasure of other
counsel to go ahead and talk about them, that's fine.

MS. ORTH: Why don't we do that before you ask
your questions.
MR. DUNN: That's fine.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Biernoff, do you move for admission of the exhibits?

MR. BIERNOFF: I'm sorry, Madam Hearing Officer?

MS. ORTH: The exhibits.
MR. BIERNOFF: Yes.
MS. ORTH: All right. There were a lot of
them.
MR. BIERNOFF: I didn't completely hear your question, Madam Hearing Officer.

Yes, we do move for admission of these exhibits.

MS. ORTH: All right. And I've heard an objection just now from Mr. Dunn concerning number 24, I believe it was.

MR. BIERNOFF: Right.
MS. ORTH: Do you have a response to that objection?

MR. BIERNOFF: I do.
Exhibit 24 is one of a series of exhibits that
Mr. Olson considered for purposes of evaluating the background science here; and even if Valley Meat is not conducting exactly the same kind of operation, certainly
there is background information that's relevant to a scientist, to a hydrologist, that's contained in this article and it's appropriate for him to consider.

I don't think that $I$ asked any questions of Mr. Olson asking him to adopt specific findings of this article, and so there shouldn't be any concern with that.

MS. ORTH: All right.
And I guess I didn't necessarily see that the article was summarized or statements in his testimony were drawn from this research article in particular, although he may have relied upon it to reach the conclusions that were stated there.

Is that true?
MR. BIERNOFF: I guess that's another way of phrasing what $I$ was hoping I'd said.

MS. ORTH: All right.
So, Mr. Dunn, it needn't be admitted for any purpose other than showing that it was an article that Mr. Olson read on his way to reaching a conclusion.

MR. DUNN: That's fine, as long as the record notes that we objected, that he used irrelevant information for the formation of his testimony and his opinion.

MS. ORTH: All right.
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Mr. Powers, do you have anything?
MR. POWERS: Your Honor -- in addition to that, Madam Hearing Officer, I would object to number 24, as amended, being timely filed. That was supplied previously, and it was only two pages long, and now we're looking at -- to be honest, there is not even page numbers at the conclusion of it that $I$ see.

I would just object on the timeliness of it to be submitted into the record.

The first two pages were previously submitted in the admin record, we had time to review that. Unfortunately, here on the day of the trial, we were presented with the fuller article, specifically an article of -- Exhibit 24.

MS. ORTH: Right.
MR. POWERS: In addition to that, Madam Hearing Officer, I would recommend that -- we had previously in our motion to exclude portions of Mr. Olson's testimony, 7 through 20 and 21 through 25 were requested to be struck because of several bases. One is the hearsay objection; two, reliance on unfounded and unsupported or authenticated documents.

And so we would renew those motions as well.
MS. ORTH: All right.
Mr. Biernoff, any response?
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MR. BIERNOFF: I do. Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.

So let's talk about 24 first. Just in
response to Mr. Dunn's objection, I think I've already covered our position on that. I don't want to rehash that.

We certainly disagree with his objection and believe that it's perfectly appropriate for Mr. Olson to have read and considered this material and for it to be admitted as an exhibit on that basis.

As far as Mr. Powers' objection to this being an incomplete version of the article that was in the prefiled testimony, certainly that was an inadvertent mistake.

Mr. Powers has an opportunity now to take a look at the article and to ask Mr. Olson any questions that he has about it. Certainly, if he discovers anything that gives him pause -- Mr. Powers, that is -he should be able to ask the witness about it on cross-examination. It's not a basis for keeping this exhibit out of evidence.

And are we now going to address Mr. Powers'
larger objection to --
MS. ORTH: 7 through 20 .
MR. BIERNOFF: Yeah.

So there is -- there is specific responses that we have about some of these individual exhibits, but let me just say, generally, the same proposition really applies to this larger set as to 24.

These are materials that Mr. Olson consulted with as a scientist, as a former regulator, and these are the kinds of materials he testified would be appropriate to look at to educate one's self about what by all accounts is a new industry, at least in New Mexico.

And so Mr. Olson, in reviewing these exhibits and in reaching his conclusions, is not simply rephrasing any content from the exhibits. This is part of his process of understanding what the problem is and developing his testimony and his recommendations that have already been submitted.

Exhibit 7, I want to just note that one of Valley Meat's own witnesses has referred to this and doesn't have any -- at least $I$ don't think $I$ heard any disagreement that he had, this is Dr. Blach, with that exhibit.

This is an exhibit that has been part of
multiple regulatory proceedings at all kinds of different levels of government, and certainly there will be plenty of opportunities for any counsel to ask

Mr. Olson or any other witness about the content of this exhibit, but $I$ don't think I've heard from Mr. Powers what is the basis for striking this exhibit from the materials that Mr. Olson considered and that should be part of the record.

MS. ORTH: All right. So -- Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: Just very quickly, Madam Hearing Officer.

In response to the Exhibit 7 issue -- I believe that's the list of pharmaceuticals, is that correct?

MS. ORTH: "Banned and Dangerous Substances Commonly Given to Horses Sent to Slaughter."

MR. DUNN: I don't believe that the current witness is qualified to opine on horse pharmaceuticals or those types of things, so we really can't cross-examine him with regard to the veracity or the credibility of that study because he's not qualified to offer an opinion.

So again if he's not qualified as an expert in those fields, he should not be allowed to opine in them.

MS. ORTH: So let's go to foundation then.
Mr. Biernoff, I don't remember that you asked
Mr. Olson where this document came from.

MR. BIERNOFF: We did not review that in our live examination.

MS. ORTH: Okay. Can you establish that now?
MR. BIERNOFF: I'll be glad to do that now with Mr. Olson. May I do that from here --

MS. ORTH: Yes.
MR. BIERNOFF: -- or shall I go back to the podium?

MS. ORTH: Okay.
MR. BIERNOFF: Mr. Olson, can you tell the Hearing Officer where you obtained this exhibit?

MR. OLSON: Yes. I obtained this exhibit from counsel, from a list that they had prepared of chemicals in -- that are given to horses, pharmaceuticals, other drugs.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. And do you have an understanding of where this list has been used?

MR. OLSON: I understand this has been used in the District Court proceedings that have been going on, and $I$ also have personally reviewed this list and have personal knowledge of the use of $27--\operatorname{of}$ at least 27 of these drugs.

MR. BIERNOFF: And I believe that we actually did establish that a moment ago, that you, as a person who has raised and trained horses, are personally
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familiar with a number of the drugs that are on this list.

MR. OLSON: That's correct.
MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. And can I ask you just one follow-up question?

For what purposes did you consider this list
in arriving at your testimony and your conclusions?
MR. OLSON: Well, it's looking at these compounds, you don't find a lot of human health effects that have been just actually studied from these compounds.

So the concern $I$ had, in looking at this list and having personal familiarity with quite a number of these chemicals, is that in my use of these drugs, with my horses, typically the labels of these drugs specifically say "Not intended in animals for human consumption."

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. And you're talking again
about the 20 or 27 drugs --
MR. OLSON: That I'm familiar with, yes.
MR. BIERNOFF: -- that you're personally
familiar with?
MR. OLSON: Yes.
MR. BIERNOFF: Can you give just a few examples of the drugs that are on that list of about 27?

Take a moment, if you need to.
MR. OLSON: There is Acriflavine -- where I
come to these is through -- typically through their product name --

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay.
MR. OLSON: -- which is what I'm familiar with. But then amoxicillin, which is an antibiotic. Avermectin, which is in, you know, Farnam Ivercare. Butoxy polypropylene glycol, which is in different types of fly wipes. Diflubenzuron, which is in, again, some different types of fly wipes. Dipropyl
isocinchomeronate -- I guess I said that properly -which is in fly repellant roll-on. Equine influenza vaccines, there are several of those. Fenbendazole, which is in dewormers. Some different NSAIDs, which I'll refer to as Banamine. Again, there are some other chemicals, I guess, listed as gentian violet, specifically Blue-Kote, which is an ointment.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. That's probably sufficient.

I just wanted to make sure that you did recognize, in fact, some of the drugs that you mentioned being familiar with from your personal experience on this list, and it certainly sounds like you do.

MR. OLSON: It was from personal experience
and actually going back through some of my old vet bills and looking at the chemicals used in -- used with my horses.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. Okay.
Madam Hearing Officer, I think that the witness has demonstrated ample understanding of the information that's contained in this document.

Again, $I^{\prime} m$ not -- none of the attorneys at this table are asking Mr. Olson to adopt or to confirm the truth of the contents of this document, but it is to show that there is -- certainly this information is publicly available, and it should be considered, and Mr. Olson is familiar with it and has considered it and that it's part of a reasonable inquiry into these operations.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Thank you, Mr. Biernoff.
Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer --
MS. ORTH: Yes.
MR. DUNN: -- could I get into some reasonable inquiry and voir dire the witness -- could I get into a reasonable inquiry and voir dire the witness on this subject?

MS. ORTH: Yes. Let me just tell you where

I'm headed, even before your voir dire. I think Mr. Biernoff just used a phrase $I$ was going to use, which is that $I$ guess $I$ draw a distinction between the laying of a foundation that would allow all of us -- me, you, the Cabinet Secretary, the Court of Appeals -- to accept the truth of everything that's stated here, as opposed to what was effectively a disclosure on Mr. Olson's part of what he looked at on his way to his conclusions.

That's the distinction $I$ draw, and $I$ think what we have in front of us is the latter there. He didn't prepare this document.

MR. DUNN: But, Your Honor -- and $I$ can prepare a follow-up or do some case research, but my recent memory serves me that scientific evidence presented unfounded on any basis -- there has to be some reasonable basis. As we know under Daubert, that you cannot just rely on any document out there, that document must be independently and scientifically valid before that expert can offer testimony or opinion based upon those documents.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
MR. DUNN: And that's my concern, Your Honor.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Dunn.
MR. DUNN: And under Daubert, the expert has
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the opportunity to make that a credible document, to offer through his expert testimony and his background as to why that is.

He does not have a background in these, and so as Daubert pointed out, he can't reach the conclusion that that is a credible exhibit.

MS. ORTH: All right. And we don't do formal Daubert analyses in the administrative -- in administrative proceedings.

Again, I believe what we have here is more a disclosure of what Mr . Olson looked at and relied on in his conclusions. You're going to be able to conduct cross-examination, which will reveal whatever the appropriate weight is to be given to Mr. Olson's testimony, but as far as I'm concerned, documents 7 through 20 and -- well, 24 is a different matter, but 7 through 20 certainly, and to some extent 24 , are here to reflect what Mr . Olson looked at, and are not in the record because everything in them must be taken as true by, again, the Secretary or a reviewing court.

As to 24, I'll put it in the same -- I'll put it in the same category.

Thank you.
(AGO/FRER Exhibits 1 through 45 admitted.)
MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn, would you like to do your
cross-examination, which can include voir dire?
MR. DUNN: I think that that sufficiently ends it. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BIERNOFF: Madam Hearing Officer, before Mr. Dunn begins, I'm just wondering about if the Hearing Officer -- if Your Honor would be willing to adjourn for just a few minutes, and if not right now, perhaps after Mr. Dunn is finished with his cross-examination.

MS. ORTH: Yes. We're within ten minutes of when I'd be taking a break anyway.

Shall we take the break before you begin?
MR. DUNN: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer.
MS. ORTH: All right. So let's take
15 minutes.
MR. BIERNOFF: Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Thank you.
(Recess held.)
MS. ORTH: Let's come back from the break, please.

All right. When we broke, Mr. Dunn was about to question Mr. Olson.

MR. DUNN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer. CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. DUNN:
Q. Hello again.
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A. Hello again.
Q. First, I'd like to talk a little bit about your time previous with the Department and previous permits that you oversaw.

Were you -- did you preside -- or not
necessarily preside, but oversee the issuance of livestock permits, wastewater permits, before in your capacity as Groundwater Bureau chief?
A. There was the -- it was mostly dairy
facilities, yes. Uh-huh.
Q. Okay. Were any of a similar nature to what Valley proposed here, as far as, you know, distance to groundwater, lagoon systems, liners, those types of things?
A. Yes. There was -- that was -- with every facility, that is an issue.
Q. Again, what was your time as Bureau chief?
A. From 2000- - October of 2004 to October of 2011 .
Q. So during that period of time, the testimony has been that the construction of the second lined impoundment was put into effect pursuant to the request of the Department, and that would have been underneath your purview?
A. I believe some of it was constructed at the
time under when $I$ was Bureau chief, that's correct.
Q. And the as-builts and whatnot were supplied to the Bureau when it was completed, and that was ultimately given to somebody within your supervision?
A. Yes, it was done by the technical staff of the Bureau. That's correct.
Q. If there were issues concerning the sufficiency of those impoundments or tanks or whatever else, that was done -- reviewed under your supervision?
A. It was reviewed by staff that were under my supervision, but not necessarily by myself.
Q. Were you responsible for the actions and decisions of your staff?
A. I'm responsible for the actions of my staff. They are typically done through their team leaders and their program managers and a lot of the time do not rise to the Bureau chief level, because it's dealt with at a staff level. It's operational issues dealt with by the staff.
Q. Can you recall any similar permits to this one with short depths to groundwater and single-lined impoundments?
A. Can you say that again?
Q. Can you recall any similar permits with
similar depths to groundwater or single-lined
impoundments above that groundwater?
Is this -- are there others like this one that were permitted underneath your supervision?
A. Yes, there are systems that have been permitted as single lined that were done under my supervision. There was also a double-lined facility that was permitted under my supervision, as well, under -- under not my direct supervision, but the time I was Bureau chief.
Q. So as Bureau chief, if those were insufficient at that point in time, you would have raised that issue, then?

You probably would have said something to the Cabinet Secretary or done something to say, "Hey, we're permitting these facilities and they are a threat to the environment, they are not sufficient to protect the environment"?
A. I raised those issues at the time, yes.
Q. You raised those issues and those permits were issued anyways?
A. I raised issues about the adequacy of single liners when $I$ was Bureau chief.
Q. Were single liners in keeping with the code?
A. I'd say they are in keeping maybe with the political realities of what was going on at the time.
Q. So would it be your testimony that the Secretary was in error in permitting these single-lined impoundments at that period of time?
A. Personally, $I$ believe they should be -- in a lot of these instances, they should be double-lined facilities, but the Secretary has the discretion to exercise his judgment, and that was his judgment that he exercised.
Q. Well, let's talk about your professional experience.

From a professional standpoint, what's your basis for these single-lined impoundments not being sufficient?
A. Because, typically, they will have some leaks over time. There is that potential. Especially in shallow groundwater settings.

I have less of a problem with it in some of the deep groundwater settings, but especially in the shallow groundwater settings. The Department had actually recommended that for dairy facilities in the -in their proposed rule that was proposed to the water Quality Control Commission for dairies and proposed double-lined systems.
Q. But, ultimately, the Secretary at that time disagreed with you?
A. The Secretary at that time did not disagree with me. It was not a decision of the Secretary.

That's a rule-making, so that was the decision of the Water Quality Control Commission.
Q. And the Water Quality Control Commission is appointed, and the rest of us are bound by that decision. That is the code on which the public can rely on, is that correct?
A. For dairy facilities, they have specific requirements. There is a specific rule, which doesn't apply to this facility, but applies only to dairy facilities.
Q. And in dairies, they are the decision-making body in that instance, and they feel that this is sufficient, the rest of us should follow that, is that correct, including you as Bureau chief?
A. That's correct. That's -- they adopt the rules. That's correct.
Q. So if Valley constructed a single-lined impoundment in keeping with the rules, and the Commission decided that that was sufficient to protect the groundwater, that is the law of the case at this point. Is that correct?
A. Yes, but there is no rule for slaughterhouse facilities that says they must be single-lined
facilities. They must make a demonstration under the rules that they will not cause an impact to groundwater. It's a little different than the dairies.
Q. And your Bureau would evaluate those potential impacts, especially in the case of Valley, and decide that -- whether or not it was sufficient and whether or not something else needed to be done. And your Bureau did that in this instance, is that correct?
A. That's what the Bureau has always done, yes.
Q. And the permit was issued underneath your supervision?
A. The 2004 permit was -- I don't believe -- that was issued before $I$ was Bureau chief.
Q. And the impoundments and whatnot were overseen -- again, I'm sorry, I'm replowing here -- but were overseen by somebody on your staff?
A. That's correct.
Q. And inspected by somebody on your staff in that period of time?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, I'd like to turn now to the fact that you've discussed -- you discussed the Copper Rule as some sort of basis for this belief that these impoundments that are single lined might not be sufficient.

Could you expand on that a little bit?
A. Sure.

That was a Department expert witness, professional engineer, and he provided the rationale for why liners leak, and $I$ presented that in my testimony, and $I$ have a piece of some of his testimony as well on that issue.
Q. Was that based upon a review of inorganic compounds associated more with mining activities, or was that based upon livestock organic processed waste?
A. It wasn't based upon the waste type. It was based upon why liners leak. There is defects in seams, liners have inherent permeabilities themselves, and damage that can occur to liners, punctures, things that can happen.

So it was -- it wasn't based on his -- his assessment there wasn't based on a type of waste; it was based upon why there is a problem with liners.
Q. So the type of waste doesn't really matter to the liner?
A. To the liner, it can. But in most cases, it's resistant to, say, chemical degradation which might occur through different compounds, yes.
Q. Are you familiar with any livestock components -- I know I got a chuckle out of the room when I asked
this question, so I'm going to ask it again.
Are you familiar with any livestock-based compounds that have the ability to deteriorate or are caustic to the plastic of a liner?
A. No. I think, as Mr. Wyant expressed, the biggest issue usually is ultraviolet degradation from being exposed, from where the liners are exposed. That's the biggest degradation that occurs with probably the dairy facilities and agricultural-type facilities.
Q. So it's really not a difference in, you know, livestock water versus, you know, copper tailing water?
A. There is in terms of -- it depends on what some of the waste types are. With the tailings, there is a lot of issues with sulfates, some of the same type of concerns that come with ag facilities, there is inorganics and total dissolved solids, some of the salts, like that, as well as metals. In some cases, there are acids as well, and they are using similar types of liners for those which are resistant to the acids.
Q. Now, I'm a little confused.
A. I'm not sure what --
Q. Well, could you point to an organic compound from the slaughter process that poses a threat to liners?
A. I'm not -- I think maybe you're misunderstanding what $I$ was saying.

I'm not saying that the organic materials in the ag facilities are going to cause degradation of the liners themselves. So I'm not making that assertion.
Q. Okay. You're familiar with the code that was read earlier, $I$ can provide it to you again if you'd like, it's 77-2- -- and now $I$ forgot it, I apologize, but it's the definition of livestock from the state statute. You're familiar with that?
A. I'm not. I'm not familiar with that. I heard it earlier, but $I$ 'm not familiar with it.
Q. This is 77-2-1.1. It's part of the Livestock Code. It describes a list of animals there under livestock. I'm not going to ask you to read the list again, because there is a whole bunch that $I$ think people didn't realize there.

But do equines fall underneath that list and do they fall as an animal classified as livestock in the State of New Mexico?
A. Yeah, horses and asses, I guess, would be the equines.
Q. Okay.
A. And they are listed there, yes.
Q. Thank you.

So the permit for Valley Meat Company is a livestock processing facility. Is that correct?
A. Well, the way it's been represented through the permits is that -- or the applications -- is that they are slaughtering cows. So I don't know if that's -- equines fall in the same category as the application. I mean, it -- it does say that they are slaughtering cows.
Q. Well, let's talk about the permits instead. Do the permits reference this as a cattle processing facility permit, or do they classify it as a livestock processing facility?
A. The permit itself, I believe, says livestock. I believe it does.
Q. Can you point me to anywhere in the Administrative Code, either existing at the time when you were Bureau chief or today, or in state statute, that differentiates, for the purposes of groundwater and the Environment Department, between horses and cattle?
A. I think the distinction that I'm making is based upon the chemistry of what may occur in these activities. That's the issue.

MR. DUNN: Madam Hearing Officer, I'd ask that he answer the question $I$ asked, and $I$ would strike that answer.

I asked him if he could point me to anywhere in the code or statute where it differentiates between horses and cattle. That's it.

MS. ORTH: Can you answer that question, Mr. Olson?

MR. OLSON: What I'm saying is, is that the Water Quality Control Commission does not distinguish between animals and mining and a lot of other things in its standards or how it applies its rules.

It applies them in terms of you have to make a demonstration that whatever this activity is that it's not going to cause an exceedance of the water quality standards.

It doesn't reference the actual activity, with the two exceptions now, and that's specific rules for dairies and specific rules for copper mines.
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) But you -- you don't know of anywhere in the code where it says, for purposes of a groundwater discharge permit for a livestock permitting facility, that horses are different than cattle?
A. It doesn't say that. It says -- what it's doing is basing things based upon the contaminants that are in the wastewater discharge.

If it's different for different animals versus different industries, then you consider the contaminants
that are associated with the industry, not the activity itself.
Q. But you're familiar with the fact that cattle and horses are both classified under livestock, so that's both part of the same industry underneath the law.
A. Yes, but as I've testified, there is differences in the drugs that are going to be potentially discharged from horses. It's different than they are from cattle. That's -- that's what I was testifying.
Q. Let's talk about that for a minute.

How did you reach that conclusion?
A. I reached that conclusion based upon the sum of the information that you're seeing through the exhibits that we were discussing earlier; Exhibit 7, which lists chemicals or drugs that are present and given to horses; also the declarations of a large number of vets about these chemicals are given to horses; and then there is the studies that were appearing in Exhibits -- I believe it's 21 through 26 , which looks at what -- where they are trying to study the fate of veterinary chemicals.
Q. Mr. Olson, are you a veterinarian?
A. I've never maintained to be a veterinarian.
Q. What's your background in large animal physiology?
A. My only background in it is as personal knowledge as owning horses and veterinary applications that I've made to my own horses. That's my only experience.
Q. You don't have any formal education in veterinary medicine or in pharmacology?

MR. BIERNOFF: I'm going to object. I think that's been asked and answered already.

MS. ORTH: All right. Mr. Dunn, I think his biography --

MR. DUNN: I didn't -- you gave me a definition. I didn't actually ask those questions of the witness at this point yet.

MS. ORTH: All right.
You can go ahead.
MR. OLSON: So what was the question again?
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) Do you have any formal
education or training in veterinary medicine, pharmacology? We'll just start with those.
A. No.
Q. So when you make the leap from these drugs are administered to these animals to their present at slaughter, what forms your basis when you do that?
A. I'm basing it on the -- the studies raised looking at their -- seeing the presence of veterinary chemicals in stream systems and in wastewater.
Q. But you don't have any formal background in pharmacology, so how do you reach the conclusion that those studies are valid?
A. They are essentially studies looking at the prevalence of contaminants through wastewater treatment systems, et cetera. That's -- I evaluate them as a scientist. That's what I evaluate them as.
Q. How did you come by the list of these compounds? How did you come by these studies? How did you reach this information?
A. Some was provided to me, and I've looked at other studies myself as well.
Q. So you, as a geologist and hydrogeologist, have formed an opinion as to what would be present in an animal at slaughter; is that correct?
A. No, I made my assessment that these are potentially going to be in the wastewater discharges. I don't think this issue has really been thoroughly studied, as shown by some of the lack of information that you -- when you look for studies on these types of chemicals. This is an emerging field. It's the same as what's been happening with pharmaceuticals and
wastewater plants for people.
Q. How do you reach the conclusion that they will be in wastewater?
A. Because they are going to be -- they are used in animals, and they are potentially going to be there in the slaughter. If you're looking at cutting up animals that might have some of these drugs, then they could be in the wash water that ends up in the impoundment.
Q. They could be.

You don't have any real knowledge or no veterinary or pharmaceutical background to say that they would actually be there at the point of slaughter.

That's just your opinion based upon opinions of people who are not present?
A. No, it's my own opinion based upon what I've -- the information that I've looked at that these could be present, and the fact that they are looking at studying these issues -- the USGS as well, you know, has looked at these things in the stream systems.

It's one of the exhibits that's in here, you know, looking at veterinary pharmaceuticals downgradient of CAFO and animal management facilities.
Q. Those studies are based upon horse slaughter facilities?
A. They are based upon animal wastes, is what they are based on.
Q. But it doesn't differentiate which type of animal, does it?
A. I don't know that they do.
Q. So then how do you form the basis to say that horses are somehow going to contribute to this contamination that's present in the stream systems studied by USGS when there is not any going on right now?
A. Well, what they are showing is that there is a prevalence of these chemicals to migrate in the environment and get into our surface water and groundwater systems. They are present in use of chemicals within the horses that could end up at the horse slaughter facility.

So it's -- I'm taking this on -- this is a logical progression of a scientific assessment of it.
Q. So let's back up a little bit.

How is that stuff getting there now?
A. How is the stuff getting there now?
Q. Uh-huh.
A. It's getting there from -- I don't think they are entirely sure how it's all getting there. They are -- right now, we're doing some of the monitoring, like

USGS did, and discovering some of these chemicals.
I think the point now is they are trying to figure out some of the exact mechanisms for the transport of those chemicals, but they are appearing.
Q. Would it be safe to say it's not based upon horse slaughter because horse slaughter is not going on right now?
A. I can't argue with that. It's not going on.
Q. Is a likely potential source of these contaminants dairy or some other industry?
A. That's a possibility, too. Yes.
Q. So there is a chance that these types of contaminants or pharmaceuticals are present in dairy cattle or -- you know, in all of agricultural animals, antibiotics are commonly used.

Is this stuff showing up as a result of other animal operations?
A. It's a possibility.
Q. So if it's showing up, and that forms a basis for your opinion that somehow horse slaughter is causing or potentially causing this stuff, in the instance of Valley Meat, they were slaughtering dairy cattle and had an approved permit.

How is -- how do you reach the conclusion that somehow horses pose a greater threat?
A. Because if you look at the list, there is a large number of compounds that are not given to food animals, that now you're looking at horses that would have these chemicals, it's different, they are not being given these -- some of these chemicals to -- for the purposes of animals that go for food.
Q. Did you hear the testimony of Dr. Blach that a lot of the same chemicals used in horses and cattle exist?
A. I heard that. I also heard him say that there is chemicals and veterinary chemicals that are given to horses that are not allowed to be given to food animals.
Q. Do you know which ones those are?
A. Off the top of my head, I don't think he listed them.
Q. No, I'm asking you, in the course of your testimony, do you know what they are?
A. I know a number of them, from the ones I'm familiar with, because they say so on the labels of the chemicals that $I$ give to the horse. It says "Do not use for food animals."
Q. Did you base your testimony on the ones specifically for horses or on all of them?
A. I based my testimony on these are present and
can be prevalent in the wastewater that might end up in the impoundment.
Q. But they are also potentially used by cattle, right?
A. If they are going for food purposes, they are not supposed to be.
Q. But you don't know, do you?

I mean, you don't even know which ones -- you can't tell me which ones are used for cattle off that list, can you?
A. Which ones are used for --
Q. Which ones are used for cattle, dairy cattle.
A. No. I mean, I'm not a veterinary expert to tell you which ones are used on cattle and which ones are used on horses.

I have a list of things that I'm familiar with, as well as declarations that these are used in horses, and they could be in the wastewater that ends up at the impoundment.
Q. You mentioned amoxicillin. Do you think that's used across species?
A. Probably as an antibiotic, it probably is.
Q. It's a potential contaminant to the groundwater?
A. I would say it is from -- as a drug, yes, it
is.
Q. Do you think it's used in cattle, horses, humans, for instance?
A. Yes, it's used in humans as well.
Q. So you -- really, as an expert opining on what drugs are used in horses and cattle and how somehow these drugs used in horses are of a greater threat, you can't tell me which ones they are in your testimony today?
A. I think what $I$ was saying in my testimony, all of these are potential concerns and they are applied to -- as applied to horses for slaughter.
Q. Do you think you're limited in the fact that you're not a veterinarian as being able to speak to these drugs?
A. Well, of course, I'm not a veterinary expert. I'm just talking about -- to it from personal knowledge and then declarations that are given from vets that these chemicals are routinely given to horses.
Q. So do you think that the testimony of a veterinarian about what of these chemicals might be present at the end of their life, in a slaughter process, would probably be a better indication of what potentially could contaminate the environment than your testimony?
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A. I don't know if $I$ would carry it that far to say as to whether they are potentially a threat to the environment. Whether they are present maybe. The vet -- I don't know they are qualified as a geologist/ hydrologist to look at contaminant migration. But whether they are present or not, I would say that, yes, you know, veterinarians would have an adequate opinion on that.
Q. When it comes to determining -- let's call it the point source, rather than where it migrates after that, $a$ veterinarian or a person in the equine pharmaceutical or cattle pharmaceutical or veterinary pharmaceutical of whatever animal it is, is probably better able to determine what is a potential contaminant that could then enter the system?
A. Yes, I think that's what these declarations go towards, declarations from veterinarians that these chemicals are present and could.
Q. So without those declarations, you don't really have any other evidence to support your position that those contaminants are present?

It's strictly what you've read in those materials and those declarations and those affidavits from people who aren't here, that's what you're relying on in forming the basis of your opinion?
A. That's correct.
Q. I have a theoretical question going back to your time as a Groundwater Bureau chief.

Have you ever seen a third of a cow slaughtered?
A. I wondered what a third of a cow was myself when I saw that, yes.
Q. Does it make sense that that number really doesn't reflect that that's the number of cows that they are going to kill in a day, because it's really pretty tough to just halfway or a third of the way kill a cow?
A. Right. You know, looking at it, I would assume it's probably -- when you come up with a third of a cow, you come up with some type of average that you're looking at.
Q. So it's some number that's generated on the spreadsheet as some sort of average for whatever the computation was? It's not really an indication of the number of cattle or horses or whatever it is that they are going to be doing, it's just something that is derived from that spreadsheet? Is that probably more accurate?

MR. BIERNOFF: I'm going to object. That question is really compound, and it's also, I think, pretty poorly formed. So I'm wondering if counsel could
rephrase it.
MS. ORTH: All right. And actually while we're on this point, $I$ had meant to say earlier that notwithstanding the fact that there may be copies of the administrative record that don't have Bates stamped numbers on the bottom of them, the copy of the administrative record that is part of the Hearing Clerk's file, the page in question is 532. 532.

Mr. Dunn, maybe you --
MR. DUNN: I'll rephrase. That's fine.
MS. ORTH: Maybe we show it to Mr. Olson and ask him what he understands it to be.
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) Are you familiar with what I'm talking about, where that number in the table is? We went over that.
A. Yes, the 39.3 cows that's listed in the -that permit application.
Q. So it's really not saying that that's the number of cows that they plan to do, that's some sort of average or something derived potentially from a spreadsheet that shows that number of cows for whatever that spreadsheet was made for?
A. Well, I expect they are making a projection of what their average number of cows per day is. That's the only way you come up with a third of a cow.
Q. Does -- in your experience, past experience as the Groundwater Bureau chief, is this generally a per cow or per animal unit limitation in the permit, or is it a total gallons per day discharge?
A. The permit itself -- that's the most critical part of the permit, is the discharge volume. Everything in the permit is based on discharge volume, and that's why $I$ was raising concerns, is you need accurate assessments of that maximum daily discharge, because of the effects on liners, the -- a lot of things.
Q. But for purposes of the permit, if they are not exceeding their 8,000 gallons per day, then they are in compliance with the permit, and there is really not an issue, is that -- and sufficiently protecting the environment that way.
A. Technically, but if they are having a significant increase, where the calculations for capacity are based upon processing, then $I$ think that is a concern.
Q. Did you hear Mr. De Los Santos point out that he wouldn't be exceeding that 8,000, and if he did, he'd go back to the Department and work on that? So there is really not an issue, they are not going to discharge more than 8,000, and if they did, they'd do whatever it took to limit that until they discussed that with the

Department and looked at their impoundments.
A. I heard that testimony, but then $I$ also heard him saying that he's looking at processing 121 horses a day, which is -- which is a significant number more than 39.
Q. But those were 39 dairy cows, right?
A. That's 39 dairy cows, that's correct.
Q. So let's talk about horses again.

Are you an expert in the cleanliness or in
veterinary medicine as it relates to cleanliness of animals and to the amount of water it needs to clean a particular animal?
A. No. I based my information on the -- on studies that have been done on wastewater generation in the slaughter industry.
Q. Of which horses were not included?
A. Horses were not included, that is correct.
Q. So you extrapolated for horses based upon -- I think you said the average -- the lower averages of the different species?
A. Well, they are based on live weight of animals, is what they are looking at.
Q. Do you -- obviously, there was a difference between species. It wasn't just strictly calculated on live weight between the different species, is that
correct?
A. Yeah, for the study that was provided there, the only difference was really with -- the major difference was with sheep. They had a larger wastewater generation, $I$ guess, you know, from cleaning operations with sheep than with cows or with pigs.
Q. And in determining this and extrapolating this, did you contact any known operating horse processing facilities around the world to see what their usage was?
A. I did not. No, I did not.
Q. Could you have?
A. What's that?
Q. Could you have?
A. I don't know that, considering whom I'm representing, that they would even talk to me. But I assume $I$ could have, yes.
Q. But there is --
A. I don't know who they are, to tell you the truth, in other countries.
Q. But there probably is that information out there as to what actually is the gallons per usage of a horse. We don't really need to extrapolate, right?

MR. BIERNOFF: I'm going to object to that as calling for total speculation on the witness' part.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Mr. Olson, unless you can answer the question without speculating.

MR. OLSON: I just don't know. I don't know.
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) Okay. So you don't really know about how the cleanliness of the animal plays into your calculation and how the differences in animals happen? You're not an expert in animal physiology, but you still arrived at a number far in excess of what we heard in previous testimony from Mr. De Los Santos and his discussions with the plant in Canada.

How do you rectify that?
A. I think, as I testified earlier, it's within the same range of what $I$ see from -- reported from slaughtering activities that occurred at the facility when compared to those numbers of the European Commission study. That's very comparable -- very comparable numbers.
Q. But that's still based on a guess and an assumption by you. Not actual facts. Correct?
A. No, it's based on actual data.
Q. The actual data on horses?
A. What's that?
Q. On actual data?
A. On actual data on live weight of animals.
Q. No, I'm asking about horses.

Do you have actual data on horses?
A. I don't have actual data on horses, as I said earlier.
Q. So it's based upon an assumption on the fact that horses would be the same as other animals on the live weight?
A. It's - yes. I don't see a lot of difference.

When I look at the live weight that was going for pigs and for cattle, you generate the same amount of wastewater.

You don't have -- they are totally different animals, $I$ think as we were hearing this morning, but you're generating the same volume of wastewater.
Q. Do you think it takes more water or less water varying on the species? Are pigs dirtier than horses?
A. I --
Q. In your opinion.
A. Most likely, they are.
Q. Do you think it would take more water to clean a dirty pig than a dirty horse?
A. Depending on the size of it, and so --
Q. So the --

MS. ORTH: Mr. Dunn, let him finish his
answers.
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MR. OLSON: Depending on the size, but I, you know, don't have any -- I don't know what the exact number is going to be for washing a pig versus washing a horse or versus washing a cow.
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) So if you have a thousand-pound horse, a thousand-pound cow and a thousand-pound pig, do you expect a difference in the amount of water it would take?
A. I expect there is some difference. I don't know that it's -- I don't know how significant that is, but I would expect there is some difference.
Q. You don't know because you're really not an expert in animal physiology or cleanliness or anything like that, you're a hydrologist and hydrogeologist; is that correct?

MR. BIERNOFF: I'm going to object.
Mr. Dunn has asked this question about ten times. I'm also not sure there is such a thing as an expert in animal cleanliness or that anyone here has been qualified for that purpose, so I'd ask that that question be stricken.

MR. DUNN: Actually, we did discuss that with Dr. Blach, and he is a veterinarian, and that animal cleanliness and animal behavior are something that -are parts of veterinary science.

MS. ORTH: I understand, but you don't have to repeat it with Mr. Olson.

MR. DUNN: I'll pass the witness.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Powers, do you have questions of Mr. Olson?

MR. POWERS: Yes, Your Honor.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. POWERS:
Q. Good afternoon -- or good evening, Mr. Olson.
A. It's afternoon.
Q. I guess one of the -- several of the things we wanted to talk about -- you have quite an extensive testimony that's been prefiled, and $I$ think you said at this time nothing much has changed in the substance of your arguments.
A. I'm not sure $I$ understood your question again.
Q. From the prefiled testimony that you filed with this case, has anything substantially changed in your testimony?
A. I don't recall any substantial changes in my testimony from what's in my written testimony.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about how did you get involved in this case, if you don't mind me asking.
A. I was contacted by one of the parties.
Q. By who, sir?
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A. By one of the attorneys to the hearing.
Q. And who is that?
A. Well, originally, I was -- for this hearing, I was contacted by Ari Biernoff to --
Q. So that's with the -- Ari Biernoff is with the Attorney General's Office?
A. Yes. For the purposes of this hearing, yes.
Q. And are you -- I think you indicated earlier that you're a horse owner yourself.
A. Yes.
Q. How long have you had horses?
A. 20 years.
Q. I guess with being a horse owner and owning horses 20 years, you personally support horses?
A. Yeah. I would say so.
Q. Would the contrary, that you oppose horse slaughter, be accurate?
A. I don't know if -- I have kind of mixed feelings on the issues. I don't like seeing the abandonment of horses, and there has been a lot of that that's occurred. I don't like seeing inhumane treatment of animals, either.

So I don't -- that wasn't an issue for why I was hired for this.
Q. And were you hired as a paid consultant?
A. Yes.
Q. And who is paying those fees?
A. The Attorney General's Office.
Q. And is there a contract between you and the Attorney General?
A. Yes, we have an agreement. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's go back to your prior work experience with the Department.

I think you indicated you did remember dealing with Valley Meat at some point.
A. Yeah. The only -- actually, when $I$ was originally asked about this case, I didn't really remember it, but then once I looked at some of the documents from the administrative record, I saw the 2010 -- the May 7th, 2010, notice of violation that was in there, which was issued under -- you know, when I was Bureau chief.
Q. And I think if - correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. George Schumann actually signed that on your behalf. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And who is George Schumann?
A. George Schumann was the program manager for the Pollution Prevention Section, which does discharge permits.
Q. And that's part of the Groundwater Quality Bureau that handles these types of permits?
A. That's correct. He's the program manager for that section.
Q. Do you happen to remember having a conversation with Mr. Schumann about the issuance of that NOV?
A. To tell you the truth, I really don't.

There was a lot going on back then. We were in the middle of all the Dairy Rule issues, so I'm kind of guessing that's why he signed that for me, because there was other things that were going on.
Q. And, $I$ guess, did you talk with your staff or have weekly meetings regarding permits such as this or renewals or situations, issuance of NOVs?
A. No, not weekly meetings.

There would be typically regular meetings with the program managers, looking at the programmatic issues.

I believe at that time George Schumann might have been having weekly meetings with his staff, with the technical staff, but they weren't meetings that $I$ was attending.
Q. Was it common practice for him to sign off on permits or other things like that for you, like the NOVs
specifically for Valley Meat?
A. It wasn't unusual, if there was a lot of things going on, that they would contact me and let me know something was going on that needed to be signed.
Q. If we were to offer testimony that it was -that, in fact, Mr. Schumann will remember talking with you, and due to the compliance issues, you instructed him to sign off on that document, would that be a fair and accurate statement?
A. It's probably likely, yes. That's --
Q. So --
A. He would do the --
Q. -- did you have substantial involvement with Valley Meat?
A. I never had any substantial involvement with the Valley Meat site, outside of that issue being brought to my attention that their permit had expired.
Q. Let's move on, if we may.

I guess as somebody that's worked in the regulating community you understand that all actions by a Department such as ours have to have a basis in law and regulations?
A. Yes.
Q. You would agree with that statement?
A. Yes.
Q. Earlier, you referred to this being sort of a new business. Is that correct?
A. I think it's a new type of discharge activity with different contaminants, yes.
Q. But I think Mr. Dunn talked to you a little bit about how livestock processing has been around for quite some time.

Would you agree to that?
A. I would agree that livestock processing has been around, but, you know, if horse slaughter has been around, not that $I$ know of in New Mexico.
Q. But it's been done in the United States before?
A. Yes, there have been some other facilities, yes, that -- in other states, yes.
Q. And I think Mr. Dunn had talked to you -you're not a certified wastewater treatment plant operator, are you, by the State of New Mexico?
A. No, I am not.
Q. Have you ever operated a horse slaughter facility?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Operated a livestock processing facility?
A. No.
Q. Worked at any of those types of facilities?
A. Actually, I worked as a butcher as a youngster, but -- you know, when $I$ was in high school, but $I$ don't know if you want to call that livestock processing --
Q. Certainly --
A. -- getting sides of beef and making steaks and et cetera.
Q. Definitely.

In your testimony, you talked a lot about pharmaceuticals impact to the groundwater.

I'm just wondering, have you run any
independent tests yourself to determine that?
A. No, I don't have any resources to do that.
Q. Are you a chemist or toxicologist or otherwise a veterinarian, a doctor of veterinary medicine, to really be able to determine that?
A. No. At least for groundwater geochemistry, I have a lot of background in groundwater geochemistry, but not as a chemist, per se.
Q. And have you ever testified or consulted with as being a -- someone to talk about horse contamination or potential contamination from horses to groundwater?
A. No. This is the first time this has been raised with me.
Q. Okay. A lot has been made today about the
volumetric and the amount discharged from horses versus cattle. But based on your understanding -- I know Mr. Dunn was trying to get this to you, and I'm going to try to hammer this home, too, so forgive me, Mr. Olson.

Is it true or incorrect that the Department can only regulate the volume of discharge -- not the number of animals being processed, but only the volume coming out of the facility? Is that correct or incorrect?
A. I'd say in general. It's -- I don't know -- I mean, volume is the major portion of the permit, it's volume and the quality of the discharge.
Q. And would --
A. That is the two major concerns under the permit. That is correct.
Q. And you know I'm going to push you for a yes or no and then you can explain.
A. All right.
Q. The Department is limited -- yes or no -- to regulating the amount of volume coming out of the facility -- beside quality, let's just talk volume. Is the -- do we regulate the number of things being -- or processes going on inside?
A. I would say it's the volume.
Q. Yes or no again, please. I apologize.
A. Well, I'm just saying it's the -- you know, I'm agreeing with you. The volume is the major consideration of the permit.
Q. It sounds like that is a yes.
A. Yes. That's fine.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And I'll elaborate on that. I think in
talking to my staff, correct me if I am wrong, different
facilities can do different -- things differently.
Would it be your -- your experience that one
facility could do the same number of things with different discharge volumes than another facility?
A. Yeah, I think that's been evidenced by a lot of the dairy facilities. Some recycle some waters and are more efficient with their use. That's correct.
Q. I think some people may call that best management practices. If they institute those, they can reduce their volumes?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay.
A. Some have water rights issues, and they need to do that.
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Looking at your testimony, and I think we've
raised this before, on page three of your testimony, you say, "It is well-known that horses in the United states are treated with many drugs that would lead to contamination."

Where did you form that opinion?
A. Can you point that out again?
Q. Page 3 of 23 in your prefiled testimony. It's Exhibit 1 of the NOI.

MR. WAGMAN: It's the last line.
A. Oh, the last line, okay.
Q. Under Section II, pretty much the last sentence of the page.
A. Okay. I see that.

What was the question again?
Q. How did you formulate that opinion?
A. Part of it based on personal knowledge and then also evaluation of the documents that $I$ relied on to give an overall formation of opinion.
Q. And again I'm not going to belabor the point, but you're not a doctor of medicine or a doctor of toxicology. Is it correct that you formed your opinion based upon just a review of documents?

MR. BIERNOFF: Objection.
Your Honor, this is ground that's already been covered pretty -- in pretty good detail by Mr. Dunn with
the witness, and I'd ask that Mr. Powers not repeat that line of questioning.

MS. ORTH: Yes.
Mr. Powers, we've heard this a couple of times.

MR. POWERS: I'll move along, Your Honor, or Madam Hearing Officer.

MS. ORTH: Thank you.
Q. (BY MR. POWERS) I want to talk about the regulation of pharmaceuticals that have been at issue during our conversations.

Does the State of New Mexico, Groundwater Quality Division, these type of permits, regulate -- or do we have authority to regulate the type of pharmaceuticals that are in discussion?
A. Well, you do if they contain toxic pollutants or they have the potential to cause an undue risk to property.
Q. But $I$ think our authority is limited to 20.6.2.3103 and 3109. Is that correct?
A. I'm not sure, but you're referring to two different things.

One is the -- 3103 are the standards for -for groundwater; and then the other is a little different, that's -- 3109 is the criteria for approval
of a permit.
Q. The toxic pollutants, though, that's what you're saying, though, that -- and where are the regulations found?
A. Excuse me?
Q. Where are the regulations for toxic pollutants found?
A. Toxic pollutants are found in the definitions in 20.6.2.7.WW.
Q. And how are they referenced as enforcement capabilities?
A. They are picked up through a couple of different ways. They are picked up through the 3103 standards, there is a reference in there, and there is also a reference to them as -- it's linked to another definition, it's linked to the definition of hazard to public health, which that is a criteria for approval in 3109.
Q. Okay. Does EPA regulate all those list of chemicals in groundwater discharges or surface water discharges?
A. They do not regulate groundwater issues. The groundwater is a province of the state to regulate, with some exceptions for hazardous waste facilities, there is some exceptions that way. But in general, EPA doesn't
regulate groundwater. They do -- for New Mexico, they regulate the surface water issues, because New Mexico does not have primacy for the Clean Water Act programs.
Q. So the pharmaceuticals that we're talking about and the exhibit that has the numerous drugs, does EPA regulate those in wastewater discharges or discharges such as these?
A. I don't think I've seen them regulate those. They've been concerned about them and they are looking at them, but $I$ don't know that they are currently regulating them. I'm not up to date on what the EPA is doing with that.
Q. But they are of concern, is that correct?
A. They are a concern, yes.
Q. And similarly, the State of New Mexico, at least in our department, the New Mexico Environment Department, does not regulate those chemicals as well; correct?
A. I would say that -- I wouldn't say that's necessarily true.

The Commission could adopt standards for any chemical out there. At the moment, they are -- you are correct, though, there is not a standard specific within the 3103 standard that has a designated concentration limit with effects on public health, that's correct.
Q. And that would be the province, I think you indicated, of the WQCC to enact rules and regulations; correct?
A. Right, they'd have to adopt a standard for those constituents, unless they -- unless there is some kind of byproduct from those that might show up within the toxic pollutant list. That's the other place it could occur.
Q. Would it also be true that the legislature could direct the Environment Department to regulate those as well?
A. I don't think that would come -- direct them to regulate that.

I mean, they've already got authority to regulate and propose standards to the Commission under the Water Quality Act now. So I don't know that there is anything that's necessary for the Department to study it and propose a standard.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about -- I think in some of your testimony you refer to one of the requirements that you would recommend is a double-lined lagoon. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And $I$ think you had referenced that there is one facility that may have been required to have a
double liner. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I think you indicated, correct me if I'm wrong, that happened after your tenure?
A. No, that was during my tenure. That was --
Q. And what type of facility was that?
A. That was for a dairy facility.
Q. Okay.
A. The Parasol Dairy.
Q. And you referenced in some of your other
testimony that -- and $I$ think it's related to the dairy facilities, the percentage -- I think 72 percent or 52 percent had leaks and should require some kind of lining. Is that correct?
A. I think that was for demonstrative purposes, that there is a high potential for groundwater contamination from ag facilities that go to impoundments, yes.
Q. And $I$ think you referenced that -- you sort of also by comparison talk about copper mining, is that correct, and the lining situation?
A. I talk about it from the aspect of not saying that it -- a copper mine is exactly the same as a dairy facility. It was -- I'm sorry.
Q. No, I apologize. I don't mean to interrupt.

And my understanding of copper mines, and I've dealt probably less with it than you have with those, very high concentrations, low pHs, very -- can be very acidic, the lining on those huge copper tailing facilities are critical; correct?
A. Well, right now, there is not a lining on a lot of those facilities. There is -- they don't -- a lot of these facilities preexist some of the regulations and were actually permitted based upon a demonstration that they would not cause contamination. So they weren't required to be lined at that time.
Q. So Valley Meat currently has liners -- I think both lagoons are already lined, is that correct?
A. Yes. Both are lined with synthetic liners.
Q. And you -- I think you indicated around 2003 is when they first started installing those liners?
A. I think one of the liners was -- I'm not sure exactly when it was installed, but $I$ think it was two sequences of permit renewals, 1998 and then the permit renewal from --
Q. The next year?
A. -- 2004, and that probably occurred a year after that.
Q. I think I remember that as well.
A. Right.
Q. And so they've had these liners quite some time, correct?
A. They have had the liner -- the one liner, they've had longer than the other, yes. Uh-huh.
Q. And in your review, and $I$ know we're going to get to this shortly, there is monitoring wells around this facility.
A. That's correct.
Q. And based upon the regulated constituents -- I know you've indicated that there are some other monitoring situation constituents that we have to monitor, but there is compliance constituents, is that correct, generally?
A. Yeah, I'd call them more indicator chemicals that are used for those facilities.
Q. I think you heard my earlier questions, I think, to Mr. Wyant on TKN, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, are sort of indicators, is that correct, to the constituents of real concern, such as nitrogen?
A. Right. Well, typically with those ag facilities, it's TKN, nitrate.
Q. TDS, total dissolved solids; correct?
A. No, that's the total Kjeldahl nitrogen, and then the TDS is -- yeah, the total dissolved solids. There is the chloride, and then even typically sulfate
occurs as well at least with these dairy facilities.
Q. And how -- I mean, based upon the monitoring results you've looked at, how has this facility -- have they exceeded their groundwater standards for the main constituents?
A. Well, there have been a couple of exceedances that have occurred at the facility.

The most difficult thing, in looking at the data, there is data that's gone on over time, but -- I don't know, somewhere around 60 percent of the time, the facility has not submitted required monitoring reports, or sometimes they've submitted the reports and then they've been incomplete and not contained monitoring well data. But there is -- there is some data there that that's over the period of time of that facility.
Q. And I'm going to be general here.

The NOV that was issued in, I think, 2010, what -- how long did it give them to resubmit their application? Do you remember that?
A. If you'll bear with me.

It gave them 30 days, until -- it was issued on May 7th of 2010 and gave them 30 days, until June 7th of 2010 .
Q. And I apologize, I didn't give you the document to look at.

Just for the record, as well as the Court, I'm looking at 236C-109.

Is that correct?
A. I was referring to our Exhibit 35. I believe that's the --
Q. Oh, sure. It's in several places.
A. I think that's probably the same thing.
Q. Do you know when they resubmitted their application after that?
A. I believe they submitted it right about that time. I think it was -- it was approximately --
Q. Would you disagree or agree that they submitted it within the $30-d a y$ period?
A. I believe it was submitted about that time. I just don't remember the exact day.
Q. Sure.
A. But it was in early June. I thought it might have been the 10 th or something, so --
Q. Have you had a chance to look at some of the other correspondence between the applicant and the Department?
A. Yes. I've looked at the correspondence in the administrative record.
Q. Okay. Would you agree or disagree that the majority of the time, once they were notified of a
problem, they did respond, at least in part, to what the Department requested?
A. I'd say they responded for a short period of time and then resumed noncompliance. That's what's really evident in the record. But actually some of it seems more when certain consultants were doing some of the monitoring for the facility.

I know one example was Mary Barron was doing the facility monitoring, and then it was pretty -- there was pretty crisp and regular submissions, and then that all stopped about 2006, something like that.

So it's been -- the monitoring has been very spotty at the facility. I don't think that they have taken it seriously.
Q. When you were in charge of the Department or the Bureau issuing permits similar to this -- I mean, how many permits are we talking about to slaughter facilities?
A. I'm only familiar with this one and one other that -- it wasn't one that was actually for a permit. It was one that $I$ actually sent a cow to myself, so --
Q. Okay. And did you ever issue permits to those facilities -- or that facility?
A. No. Not to my knowledge. I don't recall.
Q. And correct me if I'm wrong, you were still
with the Department when the renewal permit came out, is that correct?

I think the issuance date was -- I'm sorry.
A. Right.
Q. I'm thinking of something else.

Earlier you mentioned LES. What type of
facility is that?
A. That's a uranium enrichment facility over by -- south of Hobbs, New Mexico.
Q. Is that -- that's quite a different type of facility, is that not correct?
A. Yes. I wasn't using that to say that it's the same as a horse slaughter facility; just that there was different considerations that had to be looked at for that type of a facility that hadn't been looked at before.
Q. As a hydrologist, $I$ think your concern, and correct me if $I$ 'm wrong, is that if there is a leak of a lagoon that groundwater contamination would occur; is that correct?
A. That's -- that's the concern. I think it's a concern of the Department that's reflected in the findings of the draft permit as well.
Q. And the monitoring wells, aren't those intended to catch any leakage, or at least show that
there was possibly leakage?
A. Yes, they catch the leakage after it has occurred. Yes.
Q. And how long -- this is probably my softball question to you -- how long, as a hydrologist, would you say the groundwater would move across that facility?
A. Well, it's going to be based on the -- you know, the -- you have to sit down and run some calculations of the permeability of the material it's in, but, you know, it varies in the monitoring wells for that facility. In some places, it's a little more silty clay; some, it's more sandy; some, it's -- there is a little bit of gravel in the bottom of some of them. So you'd have to try to make some assumption of a standard permeability and then make some calculation to that.

But, typically, $I$ can -- $I$ know from the way the Bureau has done these before, you try to locate them as close as possible to the impoundments so you're going to get as early detection of the contaminant as possible.
Q. If somebody represented to me that it would take maybe a year or more for a full cycle of groundwater to move past that location, would that be an accurate statement based upon just a general hypothesis?
A. To move past the facility, maybe. But a lot of it depends on where the leak is, if it's on the same side that's near the impoundment -- or, you know, if the impoundment is next to the monitoring well, it's going to get there quicker than having to sweep the entire length of the groundwater under the impoundment.
Q. And I think you've heard our staff adopt one of your recommendations as a condition, leak testing of the -- at least the septic tanks and maybe the liners; is that correct?
A. Yes. I thought that was good.
Q. Now, also included, though, in your testimony you referenced adding another additional monitoring well.
A. Right. In the vicinity of those concrete septic tanks.
Q. In your experience or in your career as -with the Groundwater Quality Bureau, was that required of any other type of facility similar to this, the same sort of risk level?
A. I'm not exactly sure if we've had that -- if that had occurred before with those, but $I$ was looking at this from the age of the tanks and thinking that there should be something -- especially considering the shallow nature of the groundwater there, so --
Q. And $I$ think in most general permits such as this, it's very boilerplate in most instances, would you agree, with some specific conditions changing upon the location and type of facility?
A. Right. The Department tries to be consistent from facility to facility, to the maximum extent they can. There is differences from facility to facility as well, but they try to be consistent in the application of the rules.
Q. And what happens during -- if during the course of a permit, say this permit does issue or even the prior one, that the Department finds out new information or learns that a facility may be causing pollution, what's the Department's remedies at that time, based upon your experience as the Bureau chief?
A. Well, it could be, you know, three major things that could occur.

One could be they require modification of the permit to cover the new activity. You know, pursuant to the statute, it could include termination of the permit, depending on the severity of the action or as well as the compliance order.

Then it could also result in abatement, if water has been contaminated. There is another section of the rules -- the 4000 series of the Water Quality

Control Commission rules is for abatement of water pollution.

So there are several things that could occur.
Q. And are those ununique items, something that the Department rarely takes, or is it something the Department -- not only for this and other types of facilities, something we regularly do once we become aware of it?
A. Yeah, I don't know how regular it would be, but it does -- it does occur. Yes.
Q. So the Department does have options if it sees that this facility or another facility is exceeding their discharges or constituent parameters that we could take those actions; is that correct?
A. Yes, I guess. But in terms of the constituents, I look at the permit would not be doing any monitoring for other constituents that might be out there.

I think that's mostly a concern because the groundwater at the facility is -- the background concentrations are already elevated, so sometimes it's a little difficult to tell when you're actually seeing some impacts from the impoundment, because you have natural impacts that you're trying to factor into that, and then the constituents that here are being monitored
as part of anything, so it's something that could be missed.
Q. And for lay people listening, to talk about this, $I$ just want to make sure, and correct me if I'm wrong, there is a difference between monitoring what's inside the impoundments above the liners and differences between what's below and in the groundwater; is that correct?
A. Well, there is typically going to be higher concentrations in the impoundment than what's in the groundwater.
Q. So --
A. That's why the permits are required, right.
Q. Sure.

And getting back -- I'm sort of backtracking a little bit.

So once it comes out of the facility and goes into these settling tanks, which $I$ think the Department at this point would agree that, you know, maybe a leak test and monitoring might be wise, it goes to these impoundments and then it's evaporated; is that correct?
A. That's the intent of the operation, yes.
Q. And I think, as a reasonable person, what's left over, we want to manage; is that correct?
A. Say that again.
Q. Solids and biosolids that might be left.
A. Yes, there would be biosolids. They are going to accumulate in the impoundment as well as in the concrete tanks.
Q. And there is -- are there conditions in the permit that deal with that, regulation and monitoring and disposal of biosolids left over?
A. Well, there has especially been requirements in the permits that have been in there for some length of time. I don't see anything in any of the -- that talked about regular removal of biosolids from the concrete tanks, and $I$ didn't see anything in the monitoring reports that was really showing that they've been removing solids and what they've been doing with them. I don't know, maybe they hadn't removed them, but there is nothing in the monitoring reports to indicate that.
Q. And I'll just -- just bear with me for a moment if you would, sir.
A. Sure.
Q. And $I$ would -- while my staff is looking that up, I just would like to point out that the revised draft permit is included with the New Mexico Environment Department's revised testimony.

MR. BIERNOFF: Mr. Powers, would you just
restate what you said? I couldn't hear you.

MR. POWERS: I'm sorry.
The revised draft permit was included with

Ms. Kim Kirby's testimony. After consideration of all
the factors, she did revise the initial draft permit.
So I just want to make sure everybody is clear on that there are two different permits, the most current one that we're looking at for implementation -or proposing for implementation -- is the one included most recently with Ms. Kirby's NOI testimony.

MR. OLSON: Is that the one that's NMED Exhibit 9?

MR. POWERS: Exactly.
MR. OLSON: Okay.
Q. (BY MR. POWERS) And I'm looking at, as you referenced, Exhibit 9, conditions 7 and 8 and 11 .
A. Did you say 7, 8, 9 and 11?
Q. Yes.

If you need a break, just let us know.
A. $\quad I^{\prime} m$ okay.
Q. So reading those conditions, 7, 8 and 11, the Department has built in some provisions that the permittee must remove solids in a timely manner. Is that correct?
A. That's correct. That's what - -
Q. And that's fairly standard boilerplate language, is that not correct?
A. Yes, that is.
Q. Okay. We've talked about volume earlier as well, and this sort of sponsored a second thought of mine.

Freeboard -- freeboard on the lagoons, what is that?
A. That's maintaining a minimum of two feet of freeboard, which is the distance from the highest elevation allowed for water in the pond to the top of the berm. It's to prevent wave action and overtopping of the berms.
Q. And that's a general permit condition, too, as well?
A. That's always been a permit condition for many, many years, as far as $I$ can recall.
Q. And what is that provision for, generally?
A. It's for -- when you have a pond, you get essentially wind blowing across the top of the pond, it can create wave action, so that can cause overtopping of the berms and potentially cause a failure of the -- of the berms.
Q. Also excess flow, is that correct?
A. No, it's more so for -- originally, it was
kind of set out for wind action. Winds coming over a certain surface can generate waves, and if you're -you're giving a buffer zone essentially to make sure the water stays in the impoundment, it doesn't overtop the berms and cause problems with the integrity of the berms.
Q. All right. I know in your testimony - - and I made a reference to this in one of my motions -- you say that there is a high probability that these impoundments will leak. Is that correct?
A. I think --
Q. I think on page -- I think it was on page 17 of 23 of your testimony, subsection -- or section 6.A.
A. On page 17?
Q. Yes.
A. And where are you? I'm not sure exactly where you're at on that page.
Q. The last sentence, "Clearly there is a high potential for animal wastewater impoundments, similar to the impoundments at the Valley Meat Company, to cause groundwater pollution."
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you draw that conclusion, if $I$ may ask?
A. Well, it's actually also linked to the -- just
the high potential for groundwater contamination that's occurred previously at dairy facilities, as well as based upon the testimony of NMED's expert witness Adrian Brown at the Copper Rule hearings, where he testified that synthetic liners leak through seam failures, perforations, directly through the liner material, such that fluid is transported through the liners.

So liners do provide a much higher level of protection, but they can -- they'll still potentially leak over time. That's why $I$ was suggesting the -recommending the double-liner system.
Q. And one we've only done one time, is that correct?
A. For a dairy facility, one was done once. Currently, it's now the standard for impoundments at copper mines for process water.
Q. And $I$ think you cited certain testimony by Sarah -- what's her name? -- McGrath, discussing some of the dairy rules and information in your testimony. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Talking with my staff, we -- it was discussed that pretty much in 2003, they -- most dairy facilities started installing liners. Is that correct?
A. It was -- there were some before that, but
that's -- I think it was becoming a more prevalent practice of the Department in the early 2000 s, yeah.
Q. And based upon your knowledge -- and I understand you left not long thereafter, or 2010, 2011 -- how many dairy facilities that did install liners actually caused groundwater contamination? Do you have any numbers on that?
A. I think a lot of that is too early to tell. I don't have any numbers to give you on that.

But I think right now a lot of that has been more recent activity, so $I$ don't think that's really, you know, been fully assessed yet, especially from some of the older impoundments, because the requirements in the new Dairy Rule are much more stringent for engineering quality assurance/quality control for the construction of those liners -- for the exact purpose, to make sure that, you know, liners are sealed properly in their seams.

A lot of the leaks actually occur from poor construction, so there is a lot of liners -- I don't know the number, $I$ won't say a lot, but there is liners that were installed prior to the Dairy Rule that do not have that level of quality assurance/quality control to know that they were properly constructed.
Q. And I think anything over time, correct me if

I'm wrong, would leak. Anything after a certain period of time, any container, would leak, whether it's a ten-year period or a thousand-year period.
A. It's a higher probability if it's been -- not had good quality assurance/quality control in the construction.
Q. So -- and I may be backtracking, and I'm sure I'll get an objection for this.

So how does the Department tell if there is a leak occurring or not?
A. From a single liner, the only way you're going to tell if there is a leak is from the monitoring well. That is after the groundwater contamination has already occurred.

What I've been maintaining here is that there is some different considerations with these pharmaceuticals and other drugs that should off- -- so that the facility should offer a higher level of protection than the other facilities. That was the basis for my argument.
Q. And I might be hypothesizing too much here, but the pharmaceuticals, if they discharge, are going to be discharged along with the nitrogen, too; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So if you get a hot spot on nitrogen, you're
going to take abatement actions anyway; correct?
A. I guess it's a matter of whether you're really seeing the nitrate contamination, because at this facility at the moment there has been some kind of -right now, I think the data is really poor for the facility. There has been no water table elevation maps showing the magnitude direction of the hydraulic gradient prepared, so there is a lot of information missing at this point, but in a general sense, the -when you start seeing some of the nitrate contamination, you -- and, currently, it might even be more on the TDS, because as an evaporative pond, the TDS levels have gone up significantly on this pond over what it used to be.

So there are some -- there are other
indicators, I'm not saying that those should be the only ones, but that they are indicators that it is leaking.

MR. POWERS: Thank you.
May I have just a moment?
MS. ORTH: Yes.
(Confers.)
MR. POWERS: Just a few more questions and then I'll let you go, Mr. Olson. I appreciate your time, $I$ really do.
Q. (BY MR. POWERS) During your time and tenure as Groundwater chief, did you regulate any other
facilities that discharge pharmaceuticals, such as hospital facilities, retirement communities, other things that may have pharmaceuticals in their waste streams?
A. I don't recall.

I mean, I think a majority of those are in the cities, and that goes to the wastewater treatment plants, and those don't always fall under a discharge permit. Typically, they are under an NPDES permit that the EPA is issuing.
Q. Have you personally visited the site or conducted any inspections, done any independent monitoring of the groundwater specifically around this Valley Meat?
A. Around this valley?
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, I've done a lot of work in this valley, mostly in oil and gas.
Q. No, Valley Meat. I'm sorry.
A. Oh, Valley Meat.
Q. Discharge Permit 236.
A. I thought you were talking about the Pecos Valley, excuse me.
Q. I'm sorry. The Pecos is very nice.
A. For the Valley Meat facility, no, I've not
done any independent studies of groundwater quality at the facility.
Q. There is many other dairies around this
location.
Have you tested any of those wells or groundwater monitoring sites?
A. No. The staff had done that when $I$ was Bureau chief. There was, you know, monitoring activities that were occurring, but $I$ hadn't personally done the monitoring at that point, as $I$ was managing the program.
Q. I guess during your course, you've looked at maps overhead of this facility. Is that about it?
A. For this facility -- I'm familiar with the valley and in that area, but I haven't specifically been to the exact location.

I did pull it up on Google Earth as well and, you know, looked at it extensively there. But I have not been out to the facility, because I was -- mostly, I was looking to see what was nearby with the facility, what was next to it.
Q. My last question.

What's your relationship with FRER and the six residents of Roswell? As a consultant or --
A. My relationship is with -- you know, they are a participating party, kind of joined together with the

Attorney General's Office, so -- but, you know -- so I'm representing a group, but I'm being paid by the Attorney General's Office. So there is --

MR. POWERS: Okay. Thank you.
We'll pass the witness, but we'll reserve rebuttal.

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you, Mr. Powers.
I have one question or two questions, I guess, for Mr. Olson.

Did you generally review enforcement actions when you were Bureau chief?

MR. OLSON: I'm not sure what you mean by generally reviewing them.

They'd come through from recommendations from staff, but a lot of enforcement actions are informal enforcement actions. I think, as you see in the administrative record, there is a lot of things that are being told to the applicant at field inspections, as well as notices of noncompliance, that were done through the program manager themselves. There was a delegation of authority, kind of set out certain signing responsibilities in the Department when $I$ was there. I'm assuming there is still a similar one. But not all enforcement actions would go through the Bureau chief.

MS. ORTH: All right. I'm looking at page 14
of 15 of Mr. Schoeppner's testimony. He states that most compliance issues found at Valley Meat are common at other facilities with DP permits. It doesn't sound as though the compliance history is all that unusual. Do you -- do you find that the compliance history at Valley Meat was unusual when compared with the compliance history at other facilities?

MR. OLSON: Well, I guess it depends on the facility. A lot of facilities -- especially I'm thinking of a lot of the mining industry and a lot of other regulated facilities -- are quite good at complying with their monitoring requirements.

MS. ORTH: Well, let's talk about other --
MR. OLSON: I think the dairies have been an issue. The dairies have been an issue, but I think from what $I$ see here, this -- it just seems that this is an extremely poor compliance history, because they've been repeatedly told through inspections and informal correspondence, as well as the notices of noncompliance, that they need to submit these, and then they don't do it, so --

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.
MR. OLSON: Yeah.
MS. ORTH: Mr. Biernoff, did you have follow-up of Mr. Olson?

MR. BIERNOFF: I just wanted to make sure that, if he wishes to, Mr. Holland has an opportunity to ask any questions he might have.

MS. ORTH: I'm sorry. Yes, that was my earlier question.

MR. HOLLAND: Thank you very much, but I don't have any questions.

MS. ORTH: Okay.
Are there any other questions of Mr. Olson?

MR. DUNN: Just very briefly to kind of
illuminate on the line of questions that you just had, it raised a question.

MS. ORTH: Okay. That's only fair, and then I'll go back to you, Mr. Biernoff.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay.

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. DUNN:
Q. There was a discussion with the Hearing Officer of compliance history of Valley versus other things.

I'm going to present you two letters, they are addressed to me from the Department, and that is Administrative Record 236C-138 and 149 .

Would you look at those -- and, more specifically, would you look at the back of those, those
-- the lists on those?
A. You're talking about the table?
Q. The tables, yes.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And on the front of those two, it discusses - that's part of an IPRA request to the Department.

Would you read the italicized portion of that letter real quick?
A. The italicized portion says, "Are you aware of any facility besides Valley Meat Company, LLC, DP-236, that has been permitted by the groundwater" -- "the GWQB, where that facility's permit has lapsed because it did not submit or submitted a late renewal application? If so, please provide the name or permit number of that facility."

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I don't -- I'm just clarifying, what exhibits are we looking at?

MR. DUNN: AR 236C-139 and 148, I believe.
MR. BIERNOFF: Counsel, could you give us that citation one more time?

MR. DUNN: Okay. I'm looking at 236C-138,
which is the response to a request for public
information, dated 6/18/2013; and 149, which is a
response to request for pulblic information.
Those are responses to the same request from
my office to the Department.
MS. ORTH: Is there a Bates-stamped number?
MR. BIERNOFF: Which pages of those exhibits
are you looking at?
MR. DUNN: The entirety of those, which should be those responses.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay. Because you were asking the witness to read from something a few minutes ago.

MR. DUNN: There is one.
MR. WAGMAN: But that's just one of them.
MR. DUNN: There is another two. I'll get you
one. One of my copies, it seems to have gone astray.
MR. WAGMAN: No worries.
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) Okay. So you have those lists in front of you.

About how many -- just an estimation, just on a quick glance, between those two, how many entities or villages, dairies, are listed there?

MR. BIERNOFF: I don't have an objection, per se, but $I$ just want to note that this is a letter from 2013, and this postdates Mr. Olson's role as an official with the agency.

MS. ORTH: Okay. I think it's still a good question.

Please go ahead.

MR. OLSON: You want me to count all these?
Q. (BY MR. DUNN) No. There is quite a number of them. Just an estimation.
A. Uh-huh. I don't know how many there are per page. There is, you know, two pages mostly of one, and then there is a page-and-three-quarter on the other.
Q. So there is -- probably between the two, would you say over 50?
A. It appears that way.
Q. Sure.

So if there is over 50, those are institutions -- when you were the Groundwater Bureau chief, those would have been sent a notice of compliance or notice of violation for failure to renew?
A. They may have. It just depends on when they submitted it. If they waited until the agency had to discover it, then they may have gotten a notice of violation, but they may have had a phone call from the staff and maybe they submitted -- I don't know what the history of each one of these is, how that was corrected, but --
Q. But it does appear to be kind of commonplace? You have a lot of entities there. A lot of groundwater permits.
A. Yes. These are all permits that -- if --
Q. So those all represent --
A. I didn't prepare this, but I would assume, if this is responsive to this, these are facilities that their permits expired.
Q. And those are issues of compliance -- those are compliance issues for those entities listed there?
A. That would be a compliance issue, yes. MR. DUNN: Okay. That's all I have. MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you. Mr. Biernoff?

MR. BIERNOFF: In the interests of moving the proceedings along, we'll rest with Mr. Olson, although we do want to reserve the opportunity to call him as a rebuttal witness at the end of the technical case.

MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Olson.
MR. OLSON: Thank you.
MS. ORTH: I guess for everyone's information, the parties at this point -- not at this moment, but at this point in the technical case, have an opportunity to decide whether they would like to present rebuttal. They don't have to say right now, I'm just saying, because we're going to go to public comment right now. MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I apologize.

I didn't know if any of the public had any
questions for Mr. Olson.

MS. ORTH: I asked earlier if anyone had any other questions before $I$ moved to Mr. Biernoff.

MR. POWERS: Okay.

MS. ORTH: But thank you.
Let's see. What was I saying?
So, again, all of the technical parties have the opportunity to decide, you don't have to say now, whether you are going to intend to do rebuttal, and I believe Mr. Dunn already said he would.

MR. DUNN: Yes. Yes, ma'am.

MS. ORTH: And again you don't have to announce your decision just yet, because it is time for public comment.

Just a few observations about public comment. I will call your names in the order in which you signed in -- thank you -- and ask you to come to the podium and to direct your comments to me and to the court reporter, rather than to the crowd.

I will ask you to collect your thoughts, because $I$ will call on you only once. If you think of something you really wanted to say after you've already made public comment, I'll ask you to put that into writing and to give it to Sally Worthington, the Hearing Clerk. You can certainly supplement your comments in
writing.
Finally, I'll ask that you avoid offering any technical testimony. This is nontechnical public comment.

Are there -- oh, the testimony is taken under oath.

Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: Madam Chair, perhaps just a word of caution. Those of us who are attorneys here in the room understand the implications of making public statements, but if you wouldn't mind illuminating on the fact that you need to be honest and truthful in your statements to this body, they are going to be part of a public record, it is a public statement.

MS. ORTH: It is a public statement, and you will be put under oath. So I guess, in my mind, swearing you to tell the truth means you're going to tell the truth, or do your very best to tell the truth. Are there questions?

By the way, the parties -- the technical parties are not required to stay for all of the public comment. Sometimes they duck out to have conversations among themselves. However, the public comment again is on the transcript, and all of the technical parties, I know, study that comment when the transcript comes.

Mr. Biernoff?

MR. BIERNOFF: Madam Hearing Officer, just a quick question.

How long do you -- roughly, do you anticipate this public comment session going for? Just for planning purposes.

MS. ORTH: Well, I have only one, two, three, four, five commenters listed on the sign-in sheet. So I hope to take all five of them.

MR. BIERNOFF: Understood.
Thank you.

MS. ORTH: Also, you can change your mind. If you said yes but you've decided no, that's okay. And if you said no, and you've changed your mind and would like to give public comment, you need only say so.

So that being the case, let me tell you the order I have: Jo McInery, Carolyn Schnurr, Patience O'Dowd, Lisa Teal, and Smiley Wooten.

Mr. Dunn?

MR. DUNN: I'm sorry, I was standing on something else.

Commissioner Wooten is not here at this point in time, so he won't be here.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: He's here.
MR. DUNN: Never mind.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Are all five of you here?

MS. WORTHINGTON: There is one other name that's checked -- at the top of the page, it's checked yes, and she filled in on the very top line. Do you see that?

MS. ORTH: Ah. Beverly Hughes, is that it? I think that's it.

Yes? Sir?

MR. CARTER: I apparently didn't check the right box. I would also like to. Phil Carter.

MS. ORTH: Tell me your name.
MR. CARTER: My name is Phil Carter.

MS. ORTH: Phil Carter.

Thank you.

MS. CARTER: And I'm Susan Carter.

MS. ORTH: Who?

MS. CARTER: Susan Carter.

MS. ORTH: Okay. So Phil and Susan Carter.

All right. So let's swear in the first four of you, and we'll take you in order.

Ms. McInery, Ms. Schnurr, Ms. O'Dowd, and Ms.

Teal, if you would all stand and be sworn.
(Oath administered to Ms. McInery, Ms.
Schnurr, Ms. O'Dowd and Ms. Teal.)

MS. ORTH: All right.

JO MC INERY
after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MS. MC INERY: My name is Jo McInery, and I'm the president of Animal Welfare Alliance here in Roswell New Mexico.

When I first realized that the slaughterhouse was coming, it was over the internet, and there was a gentleman that worked for Mr. De Los Santos that had taken his horse across his yard, it was bridled, and it looked like it was his companion horse, and he shot it through the head.

My feeling about it is that when people like that are working for a company, whatever that company may be, this is a reflection on the people that are going to be handling all of the things that need to be done at this slaughterhouse, meaning that they must be qualified to clean and make sure that they are doing the proper things. And from what Mr. De Los Santos said, he had indicated that the only people that are going to be able to really monitor this will be himself and his employees.

Now, I -- $I$ know a lot has gone on here, and the USDA has said, you know, that they will also be
investigating and checking in and doing oversight. However, $I$ know there is only one veterinarian in New Mexico that handles all of the agricultural and dairy -dairy ranches and Mr. De Los Santos' facility.

So her chances of going and seeing him at any length of time will be pretty -- pretty hit and miss. So I'm hoping that there will be a public -- an opening for the public to be able to go into the facility, when it just has the doors open, like any business, and that there be some type of arm's-length oversight to make sure there aren't things going on that are not being done properly.

So my feeling is, is that -- now -- well, one other point $I$ did want to make is from Dr. Blach, when he had indicated about the horses that were going to come into the slaughter facility, he told -- I understood that he said that it would be the horses that were raised for food and that those horses then would not have drugs or anything else in their system, so we didn't have to worry about it.

Now, throughout this entire time, all of the newspaper articles, all of the television reports, were stating that we're picking up the animals that are abused and neglected in the county, that are out there being starved to death, they've got broken legs, and all
of this, it's a way for us to put them humanely to sleep. Okay, fine. And then all the horses that are at the racetrack, they break legs, they will come in and be humanely euthanized and whatnot.

Now, in my opinion, that means that these horses are not looked at for drugs -- for any kind of drugs, how they've been fed, how any of this can happen.

So I appreciate the fact that Mr. Blach may have some idea that this is the way it's supposed to be in raising these horses for food, but my feeling is, is that if there is any point of any minute possibility of their contamination in this -- in Chaves County, where we're raising food to go to France and go to Canada, I don't see why we should have to stand there and say, "Oh, it's okay for our water to be contaminated, because Mr. De Los Santos wants to make money necessary to keep his facility open."

We kill 5,000 animals in this county every year at our shelter. Now, we're going to start killing horses. The only thing I've got to say is, then, fine, Chaves County will be the killing capital of the United States, welcome, and come see us now and move here. I'm sorry, this is completely out of line, if what I'm hearing is correct.

Thank you.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Ms. McInery.

Ms. Schnurr.

MS. SCHNURR: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.

I actually prepared some written comments for submission. Can I do that?

MS. ORTH: Yes.

MS. SCHNURR: Who should I provide them to?

MS. ORTH: The court reporter.

MS. SCHNURR: Thank you.

CAROLYN SCHNURR
after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MS. SCHNURR: Again, Madam Hearing Officer, thank you for this opportunity to testify.

My name is Carolyn Schnurr, and $I$ am a legislative manager with the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

I am here today on behalf of the ASPCA and our over 6,000 supporters that reside in New Mexico to submit this testimony in regards to the draft groundwater permit for Valley Meat Company.

The ASPCA has long been committed to horse welfare and strongly opposes horse slaughter as a practice. As a leader in the Homes for Horses

Coalition, our direct connection with this network of horse rescues and advocates on the front lines of horse welfare issues informs our position against horse slaughter, along with the American public's strongly held position on this matter.

Now, having reviewed all the expert testimony submitted by today's witnesses, along with our long involvement on this issue, in addition to our opposition to slaughter on the basis of inherent cruelty of the practice, we urge the agency today to deny Valley Meat's application for this permit for the following reasons.

First, as it's been mentioned today, horses are different than traditional food animals. Unlike cattle, horses are not raised to become food and are therefore treated with a variety of veterinary drugs and other substances that are ban for use in animals slaughtered for food.

Some of these drugs will be present in the byproducts of Valley Meat's slaughter operations and will be discharged into the lagoons and evaporation ponds as a result.

Second, horses are different because, as we've just heard today, they are raised in a variety of settings, in which there are no or very few limits on the drugs that are given to them.

Unlike the producers of traditional food animals, such as cattle, horse owners do not regulate the drugs that they give their horses. These drugs render horse meat, and the wastewater from horse slaughter operations, dangerous to the environment and the public.

Third, Valley Meat's history of disregard for the environment, that's been discussed today, makes the potential issuance of the permit even more concerning.

When Valley Meat last had a discharge permit, as has been discussed, it repeatedly violated agency regulations and the Water Quality Act and the terms of the permit by routinely failing to submit regularly required monitoring reports or submitting reports that reflected the presence of regulated substances in excess of legal limits.

As was heard today, when the Valley Meat's permit -- last permit expired, it continued to operate and discharge.

And again also as has been noted and has been discussed publicly in the media, Valley Meat illegally dumps cow carcasses outside its facility for multiple years in violation of the state law. And all of these reasons express extreme concern for future environmental
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If the agency gives Valley Meat a permit, the wastewater flowing into Valley Meat's lagoons may contain high levels of dangerous substances. If these lagoons rip, as has been discussed today, or if the lagoons overflow, as they have before, the toxic waste water will enter the environment and possibly the water supply.

Overflowing lagoons are particularly likely, in light of the testimony -- Valley Meat's testimony today that it has the intention of slaughtering as many as three times more animals than it slaughtered when it last operated. It is incomprehensible that Valley Meat can slaughter three times more animals and produce three times the amount of wastewater without exceeding the permit's 8,000-gallon limit.

Yet, until today, Valley Meat has yet to inform the agency of its plans to expand these operations based on the prior numbers that were disclosed.

So for all of those reasons, on behalf again of our 6,000 supporters of ASPCA that reside in New Mexico, the we urge the New Mexico Environment Department to protect the environment from the toxic substances that Valley Meat soon intends to discharge.

Thank you.
MS. ORTH: All right. Thank you, Ms. Schnurr. Ms. O'Dowd.

## PATIENCE O'DOWD

after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MS. O'DOWD: Your Honor, my name is Patience
O'Dowd. That's P-a-t-i-e-n-c-e, O-'-D-o-w-d.
Okay. You scared me, because you said no
technical comment.
I'm here representing two 502(c)(3)s. One is Citizens Against Equine Slaughter, and we are a national group and we have members all over the country, board members around the country, including Dr. Lester Friedlander, a former USDA vet.

The other group I'm representing is the Wild Horse Observers Association, a long-time nonprofit in the State of New Mexico.

I want to read to you -- I want to clear up some fallacies for you that you've probably heard over and over in the news.

Is that all right?
MS. ORTH: Again, so long as it's not
technical comment.
MS. O'DOWD: Okay. What's technical comment?

MS. ORTH: Technical comment is comment that would require more than a high school degree to be qualified to give.

MS. O'DOWD: Okay. Well, I'm a chemical engineer, so I'll have a hard time.

MS. ORTH: Yeah.

MS. O'DOWD: Okay.

MS. ORTH: I really am asking for nontechnical comment.

MS. O'DOWD: Okay. Here we go.
By inspection of public record, I believe
this: "According to New Mexico Cattle Growers
Association 'Because of New Mexico's border with Mexico, the state is a recipient of unwanted horses from the entire nation. This compounds the number of horses in distress that New Mexico is home to.'" I quote again, "And these horses create grave concerns -- grave concern to -- for livestock owners and managers due to the potential for disease transmission."

Okay?

That's from the New Mexico Cattle Growers
Association and the New Mexico Livestock Bureau.

Now, if we -- if we haul these wastes, perhaps there is not going to be secondary containment when they are being loaded, perhaps it is going to be raining,
there is going to be runoff. This is disease. Okay?
There is also the drug residue, and $I$ won't comment on that because others have done such a good job.

But $I$ want to say that in either case, the offal and perhaps the liquid wastes will end up in a renderer.

Now, the concern -- scientists are concerned because this goes into -- rendering products go into livestock feed that goes into the human food chain. So though we think that because of mad cow, that's not happening, that is happening. I can send you the statute that allows it, and I'm sorry I didn't bring it. But maybe it doesn't go into humans, but it does go into pigs and chickens, et cetera, other livestock and poultry. So I wanted to share that with you.

I read that to you about the -- the inspection of public records request because of the disease issue, because the kill buyers are dumping horses in New Mexico, and what you may not know, also, is that the European Equine Report for 2011, where they went to the port of entry at each port of entry, Mexico and New Mexico, what they showed was that of the 58,000 horses taken for slaughter in 2011, 19,203 of them were rejected at the border.

Now, this information was used by a working group, which was requested one week after Valley Meats announced their opening of the slaughterhouse, horse slaughterhouse.

On April 18 th, Caren Cowan of the Cattle Growers Association, speaking for them and the Livestock Bureau, wrote a letter to the Governor of New Mexico and to everyone in the Livestock Board and everyone at the Department of Agriculture saying that -- these words -this is where $I$ pulled it out from, that letter -saying that there is a grave concern because there is tens of thousands of horses being dumped all over New Mexico, and $I$ will send you -- I will give you a link to this here.

And so what they did in that working group is instead of work on that issue, they used those numbers over and over and over again, Your Honor, in the paper to say that these horses are here because of poor people, the bad economy and those filthy Indians that are starving their horses, basically. It was quite racist, I've got to say.

And so I just want you to be aware that you've heard a lot of untruths in the paper and a lot of twisting of information regarding the horses that are here because of slaughter, and they have been using them
to say that we need slaughter to take care of these horses, not out and out. Okay?

So that's my piece, and thank you for
listening.
I wanted to say to you that when -- about ten years ago in North Carolina, there was a pig farm, a hog farm -- I love pigs -- that -- there was a hurricane and they had a lot -- a lagoon overflow and they contaminated the Cape Fear River.

And so recently when we've had all the rains here, $I$ was trying to see if somebody could get over here and take a look at the lagoon. But as we heard today, the levels in the lagoon rise and fall, and so if it happens to be rising right when we're making a lot of money, we might just keep going, and as that rain comes go, "Oh, dang it."

And so I do concur with double liners, and I do concur that monitoring the water is after the fact. And I don't want horse meat in the food chain.

Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Ms. O'Dowd.
Ms. Hughes.
MR. HUGHES: I wasn't sworn in, Your Honor. She's next.

MS. ORTH: Oh. Ms. Teal.
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MS. TEAL: Thank you, Madam Officer.

LISA TEAL
after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MS. TEAL: My name is Lisa Teal, and I'm a concerned citizen of Roswell.

We have -- I'd like to present signatures and comments from 3,489 citizens of the United states.

MS. ORTH: Give it to the court reporter, please.

MS. TEAL: I forgot the comments.

I would just like to say that 80 percent of all Americans oppose horse slaughter, and we kind of proved that with our signatures. That's just specifically for this. There is other petitions against horse slaughter that I'm not counting.

I'm concerned that we're in a drought. Clean water is a precious resource to every state. What's going to happen when we are using 8,000 or plus gallons a day to -- for something that 80 percent of Americans don't want?

I'm concerned that the water is going to be contaminated, and once it's contaminated, there is no turning back.

I'm asking that the petition get denied
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because of the prior violations that Valley Meat has had.

My concern is that taxpayers have to pay for all the legal battles to enforce code violations, and if Valley Meat is allowed to open, Roswell will be polluted with the stench of dead, rotting meat; noise pollution of the horses screaming as they are being killed. Horses are hard to make unconscious. Many are dismembered while still alive.

This isn't what can happen, this is what did happen in Kaufman, Texas.

They are saying they are going to promote jobs. They are low-paying and dangerous jobs. It's going to scare away the tourists and other businesses that want to come to a nice, small, rural town.

That's all I have to say.
Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Ms. Teal.
All right, the next four people, please stand to be sworn: Ms. Hughes, Mr. Carter, Mrs. Carter, and Mr. Wooten.
(Oath administered to Ms. Hughes, Mr. Carter,
Ms. Carter and Mr. Wooten.)
MS. ORTH: Thank you.
We'll start with you, Ms. Hughes.

MS. HUGHES: I'm getting recorded again. BEVERLY HUGHES
after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MS. HUGHES: Hi. I'm Beverly Hughes,
H-u-g-h-e-s. I am from Denver. I call Denver home because I retired from the Marine Corps there. I'm a snowbird. I spend a great deal of time and money in New Mexico, from Taos to Deming, on my way to Arizona every year.

I found out about the whole horse slaughter issue this summer when $I$ was in Wyoming. I'm a photographer, and $I$ went there to photograph wild horses, and while $I$ was there, $I$ found out about the holding pens for the BLM horses, and I found out that they are regularly sold to slaughter to be transported to Canada or to Mexico for slaughter.

And then, in turn, $I$ started doing research on the internet and found out about Mr. De Los Santos and my beloved Roswell and that you guys were thinking of opening a slaughter plant here, and $I$ was absolutely mortified.

After finding out about all of this, $I$ formed
a little tight group called the American Horse
Protection Alliance, and what we do is try to get all
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the different horse concerns, the horse groups, the horse Facebook pages, the $501(\mathrm{c})(3) \mathrm{s}$ and $501(\mathrm{c})(4) \mathrm{s}$, to come together on Facebook and share information about what is going on so we can all work together.

In turn, I heard about the protest here, so I've spent the last few weeks here with Ms. Teal and others trying to educate and inform the citizens of Roswell about the horse slaughter plant and the facts surrounding it.

Horses are, to me, a national icon. I mean, I was raised in the South, and $I$ was a history major for forever, and every period of our history is punctuated by the sacrifices that horses have made for us. So, to me, they are a precious commodity and not food.

But the thing that's got me the most upset is reading about the violations of Valley Meats, hearing today that they have absolutely no experience with horse slaughter whatsoever, meaning those first horses going into that slaughter ramp are going to go through unthinkable abuse at the hands of Valley Meats.

I think the thing that shocked me the most was when Mr. Dunn pointed out a list of companies that were in noncompliance and basically said that if they don't comply, then it's okay if Valley Meats doesn't comply, so it's not a big deal. I think it should be a big
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I'm submitting this to you, and I think
Mr. Holland touched on some of it already, but to me this is the touchstone for why you do not want slaughter in New Mexico, especially in Roswell.

This is just one paragraph from the letter of Mayor Paula Bacon of Kaufman, Texas, which Mr. Holland referenced. She said, "I am a fifth generation in Kaufman, Texas, a community that spent many difficult years trying to deal with a horse slaughter plant. As a resident, business owner, taxpayer, and one who has served four terms on the city council, two as mayor, I believe a horse slaughter plant is among the very least desirable things a community would want. A horse slaughter plant ranks with a lead smelter plant and sexually oriented businesses, the dead opposite of economic development. A horse slaughter plant creates expensive environment problems for taxpayers, profoundly affected our crime rate and stigmatizes the community as 'that place where they slaughter horses' -- and good development goes elsewhere."

I cannot tell you the outpour of emotion across the United States since this subject has come up. If you ever go on Facebook and just read comments, I think you will be shocked at the outcry.
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I just hope that my Roswell stays my Roswell, and $I$ can come here every year and enjoy the things that you have to offer, and $I$ hope the citizens just don't allow this to happen.

Thank you.
MS. ORTH: Thank you, Ms. Hughes.
Mr. Wooten.
KYLE D. "SMILEY" WOOTEN
after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MR. WOOTEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor and counsel.

My comments today are not as technical as some folks, but more kind of based on common horse sense.

My name is Smiley Wooten. I'm a Chaves County Commissioner, District 3, and an active business owner right here in Roswell, New Mexico.

My fellow commissioners and $I$ have expressed in our public meetings that we support the opening of Valley Meat Company. We, as county government, welcome, with open arms, any new business that wants to put people to work and pay taxes in our county.

Chaves County is ranked number one in the State of New Mexico in agriculture, and we're very proud to say so.

The Commission believes that there is community support, as well as county and nationwide agriculture support to have this business open.

Also, these lagoon permits are commonplace in our ag community, and that when done right, present no environmental threats whatsoever.

The opening of this business not only creates jobs, it's also the most human -- it is also the most human -- humane, excuse me -- it's also the most humane solution to a very big problem our nation has faced since the last horse plant was closed many years ago.

The De Los Santos family has been in the meat processing business at this same location for over 20 years and have always done a good job.

We strongly urge you to issue the permit and get this plant open for business. This family has put their heart and soul in this endeavor, and they deserve to open their doors ASAP.

Thank you very much.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Commissioner Wooten.
MR. WOOTEN: Okay.

MS. ORTH: Mr. Carter.

## PHIL CARTER

after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.
My name is Phil Carter, and I'm the equine campaign manager for Animal Protection of New Mexico and the coordinator for the Equine Protection Fund.

I'm here representing 7,000 members and supporters of my organization here.

We commend the NMED for holding today's hearing to review the renewal permit, as we're acutely aware of the precedent being set here by this permitting consideration.

Simply put, we're deeply concerned that any environmental permitting of an equine slaughterhouse is being considered for our state and the unknown ramifications that it can and will produce if the permit is granted.

Industrialized equine slaughter is an industry previously unknown to New Mexico that carries many negative associations, which is why 70 percent of New Mexicans are opposed to the practice, according to a 2013 poll. In no way should any facet of equine slaughter be taken lightly.

According to the written testimony of

Mr. Olson, who we heard from today, the groundwater depth at Valley Meat is very shallow, at only four to 11 feet underground.

According to Mr. Olson's testimony, concerns for groundwater contamination are, quote, especially heightened.

Additionally, the direction of groundwater flow at the site is at this date unknown, which we heard confirmed from the defense's section this morning.

Further, we're alarmed at the thought that a permit renewal by Valley Meat would be taken seriously by New Mexico Environment Department, considering the company's history of negligence or outright flaunting of state environmental law.

Olson, in his testimony, outlines five instances of NMED notifying Valley Meat of noncompliance, totalling at least 13 violations since 1987. Over a ten-year period ending in 2003, Valley Meat failed to submit groundwater monitoring results to NMED 53 percent of the time. That is over half the time.

Additionally, USDA has suspended inspections of Valley Meat on at least three occasions just in the last four years because of violations of federal food safety measures.

Management of the Valley Meat has historically shown little to no interest in preserving the safety of consumers and nearby residents through complying with state and federal law.

We call upon NMED to acknowledge the facts of this company's operations. Simply put, Valley Meat has repeatedly demonstrated that it holds no respect for protective regulations or for New Mexico's water quality, and in doing so, has forfeited its right to conduct this practice of horse slaughter that the vast majority of the New Mexicans find alarming.

We're asking NMED to deny the wastewater discharge permits to Valley Meat.

Thank you.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

Mrs. Carter.

## SUSAN CARTER

after having been first duly sworn under oath, provided public comment as follows:

MS. CARTER: Since everyone else has spoken for the horses, I'll speak for a few of the other creatures that live in this area.

The Pecos River and its riparian lands are home to many birds, wildlife, common mammals, including the mule deer, coyote, gray fox, bobcat, striped skunk,
porcupine, raccoon, badger, jackrabbit, cottontail, white-footed mouse, deer mouse, grasshopper mouse and woodrat.

Many migratory birds depend on this area, including ducks, geese, cranes, and other water birds; morning doves, mocking birds, white-crowned sparrows, black-throated sparrows, western meadowlarks, crissal thrashers, western kingbirds, northern flickers, common nighthawks and roadrunners; birds of prey or raptors, including the northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, the American kestrel.

The waters of the Pecos, especially the shallow edges, are home to fish, such as the red shiner, sand shiner, Arkansas River shiner, the Pecos bluntnose shiner and Pecos pupfish, the plains minnow, silvery minnow, plains killifish, mosquito fish, speckled chub, river carp, sucker and channel catfish.

Herptiles include the yellow mud turtle, the box turtle, eastern fence lizard, side-blotched lizard, whip-tailed snake, hognose snake, the coachwhip snake.

The Pecos gambusia was listed in 1975 by New Mexico as endangered. This fish is endemic to springs and spring systems.

As you all know, the Pecos River area is part of the Pecos slope, which drains to the Pecos River.
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Valley Meat is 1.2 miles from this river. To envision a lagoon practically two acres in size filled with blood, as I've seen on Google Earth, and an adjoining lagoon, supposedly monitored by a man who did not fulfill any of his requirements to the -- to our Board of Environmental here, who I'm just appalled that they are here to defend the opening of this place.

This Pecos gambusia was listed in '75, as I said, as endangered. This fish is endemic to springs and spring systems. These are the karsts that bring the tourists here. These are the karsts that contain the water that we all live on -- that we all need to live on, not just fish, not just birds, your children, your grandchildren, their children to the next generation.

To allow a lagoon filled with this tainted drugged blood of horses, and for this to be endorsed by a man who owns racehorses right next door to this place, is absolutely pathetic.

Okay. The springs and gypsum sinkholes in Bitter Lake National Wildife Refuge and Blue Springs are the only areas of regular occurrence of these endangered fish -- the only ones in the US. The natural populations live in Sinkholes \#7, 20, 27, Sago Spring and Dragonfly Spring.

There is a spring that $I$ haven't been able to
find the name of that is directly less than one mile southeast -- the way that the waters would run through this area, directly southeast of this lagoon of Valley Meat. It's an underground system that runs through the alluvial soils and will go directly into these lagoons.

For the Environmental Department to actually defend the opening of this place and disregard the clean waters of New Mexico is absolutely a failure.

The gambusia was a federal -- was federally listed as endangered. The Pecos pupfish was listed as threatened in New Mexico in 1998 and is proposed for federal listing as endangered. The pupfish is found from Roswell to Independence Creek, Texas. It is found in the Pecos River, in creeks, and in these gypsum sinkholes -- nowhere else.

They are collected from the Bitter Lake National Wildlife Refuge, which is directly above Mr. De Los Santos' facility, and they run to Malaga Bend. The largest populations are in Black Lake -- or in Bitter Lake National Wildlife, and they are in artificial impounds, gypsum sinkholes and isolated Oxbow Lakes. They also persist in Bottomless Lakes State Park, which is just a little bit south of this area, which is called an area of critical environmental concern.

The bluntnose shiner was listed by New Mexico as threatened in 1976. It's federally listed as threatened with critical habitat. This critical habitat is the area between Bitter Lake National Wildife on the north and Bottomless Lakes state Park on the south, which is only a -- $\quad$ believe it's a six-mile spread of river.

This is directly in the line of any catastrophic happening that could happen at Mr. De Los Santos' property. It could be a monsoon that dumps six to eight inches of rain at one time. It could be a critical collapse. This area is a karst area. There could be a karst forming right now as we speak under Valley Meat.

This has happened across the country numerous times, in Minnesota and different states, where there is what's called a critical collapse, where the bottom basically falls out and into the -- into the clean water goes the blood, the guts, whatever, the manure.

So for our environmental people to stand here and sit here and defend this is beyond reason to me.

The proposed restoration project is a
reasonable and prudent measure. This is referring to the area between Bitter Lake and Bottomless Lakes. It's referred to as a reasonable and proven measure to be
restored for the bluntnose shiner. This is from the Biological Opinion of the Carlsbad Water Operations EIS 2006 .

The area -- the rivers flow out into reaches. The reaches \#4 and 5, which are directly in the same critical area, between Bitter Lake and Bottomless Lakes, they -- these are areas stated to be the most beneficial habitat for the Pecos bluntnose shriner -- I'm sorry, shiner, and that would be from Bitter Lake to Hagerman.

So as you can see, this is your -- your area here, this is -- this is the only area that we're talking about, and this is the area that our Environmental Department should be defending, not trying to pollute.

The flows there are perennial, that's why it's considered good habitat, because there is continual flow from the Pecos slope across this short six-, seven-mile stretch to the river. That's why this area is
important, because of the groundwater flow.

I've seen a report where the -- where the man who was supposed to dig the lagoon for Valley Meat refused to do it because he said that it was a watershed area, that -- and that the water level was only at four feet deep at that time.

Okay. So this area is riparian habitat, needs
to be taken care of. We need to keep these shiners alive, because they are what feed the other fish. The other fish are what feed us.

So Valley Meat's past history and failure to comply with clean water concerns does not need to be given a second chance to further pollute our rivers and streams.

Please, Mr. De Los Santos, find another line of work.

MS. ORTH: Thank you, Mrs. Carter.
Is there anyone else who has changed their mind and wanted to make public comment before we return to the technical case?

I see no hands.

Thank you all very much for that.
Again, until we close the record, either later tonight or tomorrow, anyone may submit written comments to sally or to the court reporter.

So, counsel, let's talk about resuming the technical case.

We know that Mr. Dunn has rebuttal. We would probably take a dinner break before we did that.

Should we just pick up in the morning?

MR. DUNN: Your Honor, I would prefer to pick up in the morning. I'd like to discuss some of that
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rebuttal testimony and go over a few things with the witnesses tonight.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Mr. Powers?

MR. POWERS: Are we eligible to come back in after we talk with the sheriff?

MS. ORTH: After you talk with the sheriff?

MR. POWERS: Ms. Worthington talked with
security to let us know if we were going to be able to do that.

MS. ORTH: Sally?

MS. WORTHINGTON: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said.

MR. POWERS: Ms. Worthington, did the sheriff allow us to come back in after a dinner break, or are we excluded?

MS. WORTHINGTON: He allowed us to let -- have someone down there to let people in after 5:00 when the building is closed. If you want me to go ask about a dinner break, $I$ can ask about a dinner break.

MS. ORTH: Let's not yet.
I understand your point, Mr. Powers, it will be logistically difficult to go away and then come back.

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, we're fine. The
state has prepared to stay the night. It's too late to
cancel reservations, so we're willing to do whatever Mr. Wagman and Mr. Dunn are wanting to do. We're here.

MS. ORTH: And what about coming back in the morning?

MR. POWERS: Yes. That's what I mean. MS. ORTH: All right.

Mr. Wagman?
MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer, we don't anticipate much rebuttal from us at all and would very much appreciate finishing tonight so that we could travel tomorrow early.

MS. ORTH: Right.
MR. BIERNOFF: And just piggybacking on that, I think it would be helpful if we could get just a rough time estimate from other counsel of what they anticipate for rebuttal testimony for planning purposes, because as Mr. Wagman said, I think our rebuttal is going to be very limited.

It seems like public comment, unless there is a bunch of new folks that have added their names recently, is well underway, and it seems, since it's not even 6:00, like it would be very realistic to wrap up in the next few hours.

MS. ORTH: All right. So let me ask.
Mr. Dunn, how much rebuttal do you anticipate?

MR. DUNN: I'd actually need the time -probably a break now to confer with my clients and with our experts before we do that.

MS. ORTH: Okay. Shall we take a break, then, and come back on the record in about ten minutes?

MR. DUNN: I'd voice my request that we resume in the morning.

MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I'd have to talk with my staff or talk with counsel. I mean, we might be - we're willing to do it tomorrow.

MS. ORTH: Okay. Mr. Dunn, you might -- well, we'll see. Let's regroup in ten minutes.
(Recess held.)

MS. ORTH: Let's come back from the break, please.

All right. So we are back after the break.

We'll call on Mr. Powers first.

Mr. Powers, you apparently just had a
conversation with the sheriff.

MR. POWERS: Yes, Madam Hearing Officer. I talked to the security down below. If we leave the building, we will not get back in tonight. They will close the door.

So with that said, $I$ would prefer to pick it up in the morning.

MS. ORTH: All right.

Mr. Dunn?

MR. DUNN: I anticipate we're going to potentially have at least another couple hours for rebuttal testimony between the witnesses we have and the Department, but additionally Dr. Blach does need to go, he has other engagements he needs to be at tonight.

I'd ask the indulgence to bring him back in the morning instead of tonight.

MS. ORTH: Okay. He needs to go, but can come back in the morning.

MR. DUNN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. ORTH: Okay.
Mr. Biernoff?

MR. BIERNOFF: Your Honor, I'm concerned that counsel on the other side of the aisle here are perhaps looking for a strategic advantage to gain from adjourning and reconvening in the morning rather than any legitimate need to present testimony.

I guess, first of all, I'm concerned by Mr. Dunn's estimate that he's looking at several hours of rebuttal testimony, that's many times the amount of initial testimony that he elicited, and I'm not really sure where that's going, but $I$ just want to flag that as a concern.

I would say that even if there is two hours of rebuttal testimony from Mr. Dunn, that puts us at 8:00 or 9:00, and that's certainly a very plausible hour to be concluding. Just as Dr. Blach has other engagements, many of the rest of us also have other engagements. If Dr. Blach needs to be excused for a finite period of time, perhaps that can be done and his testimony can be rearranged to fit his schedule tonight.

I don't think we've heard anything that justifies terminating the proceedings now at 6:00 and adjourning this to another day.

So I'd ask that you stick to the schedule that was originally contemplated.

MS. ORTH: Okay. But I -- my understanding of the schedule that was originally contemplated was two days; that is to say, today and tomorrow as necessary.

MR. BIERNOFF: And I'm suggesting, respectfully, that it doesn't sound like it's really necessary for us to continue until tomorrow; that if there is even a few more hours of testimony, we should be able to accomplish that this evening.

And like I said, I'm concerned that there may be other -- other reasons behind it, and we won't explore that, because it's just --

MS. ORTH: Right. The motivation really is --
is almost never of interest or relevance to me.

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay.

MS. ORTH: But I'm concerned that we -- one, I don't understand the strategic advantage merely by taking the second day of a two-day hearing we had scheduled.

Plus, I'm concerned about proceeding through the evening without giving people a chance to even step out of the building for a little bit of time before we hit rebuttal, because ordinarily we wouldn't just march all the way through the dinner hour without -- whether you're hungry or not --

MR. BIERNOFF: Okay.
MS. ORTH: -- allowing people to just to step away from the hearing, but we don't have that.

MR. BIERNOFF: Well, certainly, we don't want anyone to starve.

I had understood that we would have access to this facility as needed, and so I was a little surprised by Mr. Powers' announcement that he had just now conferred with building staff and that we were not going to be able to go in and out.

If that is indeed the case, then, of course, it's Your Honor's decision, but $I$ do want to point out that several of us -- not me, because I'm -- I'm here in
the state, but many of the other people at this table do have travel and do need to be elsewhere tomorrow, and that out of fairness to them, $I$ think we should make an effort to see how far we can get, and if we're able to conclude at a reasonable hour, then $I$ think we should do that, or at least aim for that, and if we're still not able to, then I absolutely understand if the way we have to do it is to adjourn and start again in the morning. But I'd just request that we make that effort.

MS. ORTH: All right.
Mr. Dunn?
MR. DUNN: First thing, you've hit on an
important point, which is that not only myself but probably most everybody in this room has to consume food at some point. I personally am one that definitely needs to.

I tend to get a little bit cranky when I don't eat, as I am becoming right now hearing this implication that I'm somehow misleading you or that there is some sort of strategic advantage.

One, if there is a strategic advantage being sought here, it seems to be on the part of the Attorney General's Office to limit testimony and to diminish the capacity of my witnesses to actually present the testimony.

There is no other strategic advantage, I do take affront to that, but that could just be my low blood sugar talking.

So I'd again ask if we could, you know, resume again in the morning and allow my witnesses to go home and handle their business.

MS. ORTH: Right. All right.

Mr. Wagman?
MR. WAGMAN: Madam Hearing Officer, I just would request, it seems that's where we're going, and if it's possible to commence an hour earlier so those of us who are flying out of state might be able to make flights that we made arrangements for thinking things were going to end today. So if we could start at 8:00 or earlier.

MS. ORTH: At 8:00 instead of 9:00? I don't think we can start earlier than 8:00. Is that true?

MS. WORTHINGTON: I think they open the building at 8:00.

STATE POLICE OFFICER: The building is open at 8:00. Maybe $I$ can talk with the captain to see if they can get people here a little bit earlier. I know they have me in at 8:00, and I'd have to find out from the others, but $I$ could ask them, if you'd like.

MS. ORTH: Yeah, I wouldn't ask to get here
earlier than 8:00, actually. I think 8:00 is a decent compromise.

Mr. Powers?
MR. POWERS: Your Honor, I know you expressed this earlier, and all of that aside, these proceedings are allowed to get the maximum extent of public comment.

I'm uncertain if I really understood the hearing order that we would go into the next day or there would be two days of hearing. I understand from your earlier comment that we would definitely start today and if necessary go tomorrow.

MS. ORTH: Right.
MR. POWERS: I'm unsure if the public understands that clearly. I thought we were certainly going to have open public comment tomorrow. So --

MS. ORTH: I will have public comment tomorrow. I will invite public comment tomorrow.

MR. POWERS: All right.
MS. ORTH: I believe it's my responsibility, under either one set of regs or the other, to invite public comment each and every day of a multi-day hearing.

MR. POWERS: Right. Okay.
MS. ORTH: So, absolutely.

MR. POWERS: I just wanted to make sure.

MS. ORTH: But as to the presentation of the technical case, I believe so long as the technical parties are informed as to when we're doing it and where we're doing it, the fact that we change it is not an issue.

MR. POWERS: Okay.

MR. DUNN: And if the public were to observe that -- or want to observe that technical testimony, they wouldn't have notice of that change.

MS. ORTH: That's true.

MR. DUNN: And then, second, there was -- the reasoning behind starting earlier was so that an out-of-state attorney could take off and get out of here.

Part of what they had talked about in their motion for not having local counsel present was that that wouldn't in any way impair these proceedings. This seems to be some sort of change to these proceedings based upon the fact that it's an out-of-state, nonlicensed New Mexico attorney.

MS. ORTH: All right. So $I$ know that's an issue you care about, Mr. Dunn. However, I think it's a reasonable -- a reasonable compromise. I don't find it offensive that an attorney would ask for some
consideration for travel.

And on your first point, as I understand the case law, if someone is following along with us and would know when we're meeting tomorrow, that's as far as we need to go.

That is to say, we don't -- it's not a violation of due process that not everyone will have been informed ahead of time that we would start at 8:00 instead of 9:00, because if you're here tonight, you know that that's when we're starting.

So let's do that. Again, I think it's a reasonable compromise, and the building is open at 8:00. So let's start as soon after 8:00 as we can, knowing that we'll all sort of be coming in the building at that point. So let's try to start at 8:00.

MR. POWERS: And barring instruction from Kenny Cohort, who is allowing us to use this courthouse, as well as the state police, $I$ know their representative is here, maybe after we adjourn, we can all just coordinate just briefly if that's going to be okay with the state police as well as with the court.

MS. ORTH: Okay. Thank you.
MR. POWERS: Okay.
MS. ORTH: All right. We'll adjourn for the night.

MR. BIERNOFF: Thank you.
MR. WAGMAN: Thank you, Madam Hearing Officer.
(Proceedings recessed at 6:10 PM.)


STATE OF NEW MEXICO ) ) SS.

COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)
I, Kathy Townsend, the officer before whom the foregoing hearing was taken, do hereby certify that the witnesses whose testimony appears in the foregoing transcript were duly sworn by me; that $I$ personally recorded the testimony by machine shorthand; that said transcript is a true record of the testimony given by said witnesses; that $I$ am neither attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the parties to the action in which this matter is taken, and that $I$ am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in the action.
$\overline{\mathrm{N}} \overline{\mathrm{O}} \overline{\mathrm{A}} \overline{\mathrm{A}} \overline{\mathrm{R}} \overline{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\mathrm{B}} \overline{\mathrm{L}} \overline{\mathrm{I}} \overline{\mathrm{C}}$
CCR License Number: 23
Expires: 12/31/13

My Commission Expires: 9/12/2017

KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS
110 Twelfth Street, Northwest, Albuquerque, New Mexico


KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS




KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS


| ```behavior [3] - 45:16, 45:18, 284:24 behaviorally [1] - 45:11 behind [10] - 38:5, 43:19, 43:25, 45:2, 51:7, 191:13, 192:1, 198:1, 364:23, 369:13 belabor [3]-123:18, 131:9, 294:19 Belgium [2] - 117:8, 193:17 belief [3] - 61:5, 135:23, 261:23 believes [1] - 350:1 belong [1] - 26:11 beloved [1] - 346:20 below [7] - 19:15, 32:1, 32:23, 69:7, 241:5, 310:7, 362:21 below-grade [1] - 241:5 Beltex [8] - 96:20, 96:24, 112:9, 112:15, 116:25, 117:1, 118:20, 118:24 bench [1] - 76:3 benchmark [2] - 120:15, 121:3 Bend [1] - 356:19 beneficial [1] - 358:7 benefit [1] - 120:10 berm [2]-67:17, 313:12 berms [5] - 313:13, 313:22, 313:23, 314:5, 314:6 BERNALILLO [1] - 372:3 beside [1] - 292:21 Best [1] - 9:7 best [5] - 110:11, 149:4, 238:17, 293:16, 329:18 bet [1] - 233:17 beta [1]-48:12 beta-lactams [1] - 48:12 better [9] - 52:25, 61:21, 74:10, 83:18, 136:6, 196:4, 201:5, 275:23, 276:14 between [39] - 19:23, 40:23, 41:11, 43:1, 43:8, 44:11, 46:8, 47:3, 47:6, 58:6, 59:12, 67:17, 68:8, 73:19, 81:13, 97:15, 102:12, 104:16, 154:16, 155:4,``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 328:3, 330:1, 363:14 } \\ & \text { big [8] - 109:16, } \\ & \text { 109:20, 154:15, } \\ & \text { 194:3, 194:4, 347:25, } \\ & 350: 10 \\ & \text { biggest }[5]-48: 3, \\ & 48: 4,263: 6,263: 8 \\ & \text { bill }[1]-66: 2 \\ & \text { Bill }[1]-181: 7 \\ & \text { bills }[1]-252: 1 \\ & \text { biochemical }[2]- \\ & \text { 150:7, 195:11 } \\ & \text { biofuel [4] - 208:16, } \\ & \text { 208:17, 208:22, 209:4 } \\ & \text { biography }[2]- \\ & \text { 222:8, 268:12 } \\ & \text { Biological }[1]-358: 2 \\ & \text { biological }[1]-150: 7 \\ & \text { biosolids }[4]-311: 1, \\ & 311: 2,311: 7,311: 11 \\ & \text { birds }[6]-353: 24, \\ & 354: 4,354: 5,354: 6, \\ & 354: 9,355: 13 \\ & \text { biscuits }[2]-44: 3, \\ & 44: 4 \\ & \text { bison }[1]-39: 3 \\ & \text { bit }[45]-13: 6,25: 2, \\ & 25: 6,25: 9,26: 5,28: 1, \\ & 29: 22,30: 17,34: 13, \\ & 34: 15,36: 17,40: 6, \\ & 43: 5,46: 7,51: 19, \\ & 51: 23,54: 20,56: 18, \\ & 56: 20,60: 10,85: 11, \\ & 93: 2,106: 13,106: 14, \\ & 137: 25,160: 11, \\ & 169: 5,170: 4,187: 6, \\ & 191: 25,206: 25, \\ & 222: 23,224: 13, \\ & 231: 8,237: 11,256: 2, \\ & 262: 1,271: 19,290: 6, \\ & 306: 13,310: 16, \\ & 356: 23,365: 9, \\ & 366: 17,367: 22 \\ & \text { Bitter }[7]-355: 20, \\ & 356: 16,356: 20, \\ & 357: 4,357: 24,358: 6, \\ & 358: 9 \\ & \text { BLACH }[70]-4: 3, \\ & 4: 13,23: 6,23: 19, \\ & 26: 7,27: 2,27: 8, \\ & 27: 11,27: 13,40: 11, \\ & 40: 14,40: 16,40: 18, \\ & 40: 20,41: 6,43: 9, \\ & 44: 18,44: 22,44: 24, \\ & 45: 14,45: 18,45: 22, \\ & 46: 6,46: 13,47: 12, \\ & 49: 18,49: 21,49: 23, \\ & 49: 25,50: 11,50: 20, \\ & 51: 12,52: 2,53: 24, \\ & 55: 5,55: 9,62: 22, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 84:10, 84:13, 84:16, 84:18, 84:20, 84:22, 85:1, 85:4, 85:9, 85:18, 87:14, 87:24, 88:4, 88:15, 89:7, 89:15, 89:19, 89:23, 90:1, 90:4, 90:7, 90:10, 90:13, 90:17, 136:1, 152:13, 169:17, 170:2, 170:16, 170:20, 170:24, 171:2, 171:6 <br> Blach [36] - 6:10, 23:2, 23:19, 24:3, 26:4, 39:25, 62:17, 72:24, 74:21, 84:2, 87:6, 110:11, 110:14, 110:16, 110:22, 136:3, 136:5, 136:8, 142:17, 143:4, 148:18, 149:10, 152:11, 165:25, 166:4, 166:21, 169:5, 172:1, 247:20, 273:7, 284:23, 333:14, 334:8, 363:6, 364:4, 364:6 <br> blach [1] - 136:4 <br> Blach's [1] - 148:19 <br> Black [1] - 356:19 <br> black [1] - 354:7 <br> black-throated [1] 354:7 <br> Blair [1] - 15:25 <br> BLAIR [1] - 2:12 <br> blasted [1] - 208:19 <br> bleed [2] - 98:14 <br> bleeding [2] - 98:7, <br> 98:12 <br> BLM [1] - 346:15 <br> blood [42] - 40:25, <br> 41:6, 41:9, 41:12, <br> 41:17, 41:18, 41:20, <br> 51:10, 51:25, 53:22, <br> 53:24, 54:25, 55:1, <br> 55:8, 55:11, 62:18, <br> 98:16, 98:18, 98:21, <br> 106:14, 106:18, <br> 107:22, 115:25, <br> 136:17, 159:9, <br> 182:17, 182:22, <br> 195:25, 196:1, 198:6, <br> 198:10, 199:17, <br> 199:21, 199:23, <br> 206:17, 206:18, <br> 206:19, 355:2, <br> 355:16, 357:19, 367:3 <br> blotched [1] - 354:19 <br> blowing [1] - 313:20 <br> Blue [2]-251:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 355: 20 \\ & \text { Blue-Kote }[1]- \\ & 251: 18 \\ & \text { bluntnose }[4]- \\ & 354: 14,357: 1,358: 1, \\ & 358: 8 \\ & \text { board }[1]-339: 13 \\ & \text { Board }[4]-195: 16, \\ & \text { 196:23, } 342: 8,355: 5 \\ & \text { boards }[1]-203: 2 \\ & \text { bobby }[1]-65: 16 \\ & \text { bobcat }[1]-353: 25 \\ & \text { body }[12]-41: 9, \\ & 106: 17,140: 2,154: 9, \\ & 154: 12,159: 3,159: 8, \\ & 159: 15,162: 4, \\ & 260: 14,329: 13 \\ & \text { boilerplate }[2]- \\ & 308: 2,313: 1 \\ & \text { Bond }[1]-10: 13 \\ & \text { boning }[1]-97: 17 \\ & \text { books }[1]-190: 13 \\ & \text { border }[3]-198: 24, \\ & 340: 13,341: 25 \\ & \text { borders }[1]-198: 21 \\ & \text { borrow }[1]-64: 17 \\ & \text { bottom }[6]-127: 24, \\ & 196: 7,212: 12,278: 6, \\ & 306: 13,357: 17 \\ & \text { Bottomless }[4]- \\ & 356: 22,357: 5, \\ & 357: 24,358: 6 \\ & \text { bought }[1]-199: 11 \\ & \text { Boulevard }[1]-2: 13 \\ & \text { bound }[3]-54: 22, \\ & 231: 23,260: 6 \\ & \text { Bouvery }[9]-112: 5, \\ & 112: 10,112: 20, \\ & 112: 25,114: 1, \\ & 114: 18,116: 25, \\ & 117: 16,117: 25 \\ & \text { bovine }[2]-154: 9, \\ & 154: 13 \\ & \text { Box }[1]-3: 11 \\ & \text { box }[2]-331: 11, \\ & 354: 19 \\ & \text { boxes }[2]-87: 10, \\ & 87: 19 \\ & \text { branch }[1]-197: 21 \\ & \text { branches }[7]-21: 5, \\ & 21: 9,21: 14,21: 15, \\ & 21: 17,197: 20 \\ & \text { break }[26]-13: 13, \\ & 13: 14,13: 22,13: 24, \\ & 53: 25,56: 25,93: 6, \\ & 93: 10,101: 5,130: 2, \\ & 160: 24,170: 5,172: 4, \\ & 255: 10,255: 11, \\ & 255: 18,312: 19, \\ & 334: 3,359: 22, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS


KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS


KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS


KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS


KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS

| 312:24, 312:25, | 205:14, 206:20, | 46:21, 47:17, 48:1, | 20, 178:12, | 214:4, 288:10, 299:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 313:2, 313:24, | 273:17, 275:16 | 50:3, 99:1, 99:2, | 6, 186 | 316:14, 316:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 314: 10,315: 13, \\ & 315: 20,315: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 308: 11,320: 11 \\ & 365: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 21,102: 22, \\ & \text { 104:12, 105:23 } \end{aligned}$ | 210:19, 246:20, | dairy [75]-23:21, |
| 315:24, 316:25, | [14]-12:22, | 106:9, 106:13 | $255: 1,255: 8$ | $37: 15,39: 16,40: 20$ |
| 317:23, 317:24, | 9:8, 25:20, 25:22 | 106:14, 107:4, 107:5, | CROSS [12]-64:22, | 40:21, 40:24, 41:13, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 318:1, } 334: 24 \\ \text { corrected }[1] \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148: 24,177: 4, \\ & 187: 24,208: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:6, 107:9, 109:13, } \\ & \text { 109:17, 109:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 87:5, 94:19, 119:11 | $41: 22,42: 9,42: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 326: 20 \\ & \text { correctly }[6]-30: 25, \\ & 125: 14,126: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 219:18, 227:12 | , | 18 | 5:24, 46:4, 46 |
|  | 227:13, 249:19 | 123:11, 123:1 | 255:23, 285:7, 323:16 | 47:17, 47:25, 48:3 |
|  |  | 128:21, 128:23 | cross-exam [1] | 48:5, 49:4, 49:16 |
| 127:4, 133:11, 223:14 correspondence [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { court [13]-25:9, } \\ & 93: 19,105: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:15, 135:10, } \\ & \text { 138:19, 141:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 178:12 <br> cross-examination | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 20,49: 21,49: 23 \\ & 50: 2,50: 16,52: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| - 303:20, 303:22,322:19 | 127:20, 187:7,196:25, 197:1, | 150:8, 151:19 | [11]-64:13, 93: | 54:8, 55:14, 65:16 |
|  |  | 152:16, 153:10 | 93:13, 111:24, 130:2 | 73:19, 73:20, 73:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 322: 19 \\ & \text { costs [2] - 191:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 254:20, 328:18, } \\ & 335: 9,344: 9,359: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 153:17, 153:22 | :16, 210:19, | 80:21, 87:23, 107: |
| ```191:8 cottontail [1] - 354:1``` |  | 153:25, 162:5, 162:6, | 246:20, 254:13, | 107:6, 109:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { cottontail [1] - 354:1 } \\ & \text { council [1] - 348:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 370:21 } \\ & \text { courtesy [2]-15:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:25, 198:22, } \\ & 215: 18,219: 8,223: 4, \\ & 226: 7,233: 25,234: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 255:1, 255:8 } \\ & \text { cross-examine }[1] \text { - } \\ & 248: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:20, 122:14, } \\ & \text { 122:16, 122:21, } \\ & \text { 149:10, 153:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 58:20, 170:6, 212:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 188:24 } \\ & \text { courthouse }[3]- \\ & 22: 2,22: 14,370: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 265:5, 265:8, 277:9 |  | 153:24, 224:7, 256:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 223: 7,232: 3,240: 16, \\ & 240: 21,242: 20, \end{aligned}$ |  | 278:16, 278:19 | - 186 | 259:20, 260:9, |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 22:2, 22:14, } 370: 17 \\ \text { Courthouse }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | 278:21, 278:24 | wd [1] - 328:1 | 260:11, 263:9 |
| 242:24, 247:25,249:13, 277:25, | 1:15 | 280:6, 280:7, 281 | []-196:1 | 272:10, 272:13 |
|  |  | Cows [2] - 101:15 | 196:15, 196:2 | 272:22, 274:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 249: 13,277: 25, \\ & 349: 12,359: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:10 } \\ & \text { courts }[1]-194: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 230:4 | 197:7, 203:9, 203:16, | 280:6, 280:7, 293:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 349: 12,359: 19, \\ & 361: 15,362: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { courts }[1]-194: 11 \\ & \text { cover }[7]-85: 11, \end{aligned}$ | coyote [1] - 353:25 <br> cracks [1] - 241:7 | 207:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 299:7, 299:11, } \\ & \text { 299:23, 302:1, 315:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 363: 16,369: 17, \\ & 372: 10,372: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:23, 177:23, } \\ & \text { 191:5, 237:17, 308:19 } \end{aligned}$ | nes [1] - 354: | 5:18 | 315:14, 315:19, |
|  |  | cranky [1] - 366:17 | uelty [1] - 336:9 | 315:23, 316:5, 333:3, |
|  | 191:5, 237:17, 308:19 cover-ups [1] - 191:5 covered [2]-246:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { create }[3]-208: 19 \\ 313: 21,340: 17 \end{gathered}$ | current [11]-34:24, <br> 60:3, 61:10, 61:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 333: 4 \\ & \text { Dallas [10] - 72:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 324:19 counsel's [1] - 33:5 count [3]-230:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 294:25 } \\ & \text { covering [1] - 174:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { creates [2]-348:17, } \\ & 350: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 71:19, 77:2, 173:22, 176:25, 221:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:11, 196:11, } \\ & \text { 196:15, 196:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $231: 3,326: 1$ | 42:4, 42:9, 42:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { creatures [1] } \\ & 353: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 248:14, 312:8 } \\ & \text { custom }[4]-81: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:6, 203:9, 203:15, } \\ & 207: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 143: 13,230: 19, \\ & 344: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $42: 20,42: 21, ~ 43: 1$, $43: 2,43: 11,43: 14$ | credibility [2] - 19:1, | 132:2, 132:3, 132:5 | damage [5] - 62:20, |
|  | 43:2, 43:11, 43:14, 44:5, 44:10, 44:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 248:18 } \\ & \text { credible [2] - 254:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { customers [1] - } \\ & \text { 106:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:3, 69:8, 90:20, } \\ & \text { 262:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:10, 281:20 } \\ & \text { country [5]-20:19, } \\ & \text { 164:3, 339:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $44: 18,45: 8,45: 24,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 254:6 } \\ & \text { Creek }[1]-35 \end{aligned}$ | cut [1] - 116:9 <br> cutting [2] - 97 | dang [1] - 343:16 dangerous [7] - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 11,48: 14,48: 15, \\ & 48: 16,48: 19,48: 21, \end{aligned}$ | eeks [1] - 356:1 | $270$ | 84:25, 141:3, 141:6 |
| 164:3, 339:13, 339:14, 357:15 |  | me [1] - 348:19 | cle [1] - 306:22 | 205:3, 337:5, 338:4, |
| 339:14, 357:15 COUNTY [1] - 372:3 | 49:4, 49:9, 49:11 | minal [3]-28:7 | Cynthia [1] - 8:9 | 345:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { County [8] - 1:15, } \\ & \text { 22:1, 22:2, 65:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 49:16, 49:19, 49:20 <br> 49:21, 49:23, 50:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:10, 28:12 } \\ & \text { crisp [1] - 304:10 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 7:22, 248:12 |
| $334: 12,334: 21$, $349: 15,349: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 11,95: 14,96: 1, \\ & 96: 25,97: 1,98: 1, \end{aligned}$ | crissal [1] - 354:7 |  | data [14]-190:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { county }[6]-65: 11, \\ & 333: 24,334: 18, \end{aligned}$ | 98:2, 109:16, 132:19, | $125: 7,295: 25,296: 17$ | daily [8]-118:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 190: 19,235: 21 \\ & 282: 21,282: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 141:16, 142:1, 155:4, 160:5, 165:14, | critical [8] - 279:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:5, 146:2, 180:8, } \\ & \text { 181:11, 181:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 282:24, 282:25, } \\ & \text { 283:2, 283:3, 302:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| couple [10]-17:4, <br> 65:24, 70:10 154:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:22, 196:15, } \\ & \text { 203:7, 277:4, 277:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $357: 12,357: 17,358: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 225:6, 279:9 } \\ & \text { dairies [14] - 27:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 302:14, 318:5 } \\ & \text { Data }[2]-7: 5,7: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:24, 70:10, 154:15, } \\ & 212: 6,221: 15,295: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 277:11, 277:14, | Cross [12] - 4:5, 4:6, | $27: 23,37: 9,37: 13,$ | date [9]-128:7, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 296:12, 302:6, 363:4 } \\ \text { course }[20]-28: 7, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 278:25, 279:3, 284:4, } \\ & \text { 284:6, 304:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $4: 12,4: 14$ | 68:4, 153:23, 259:22, | 143:12, 171:2 |
|  | 284:6, 304:21, | 4:18, 4:21, 4:24, 5:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 260: 13,261: 3 \\ & 266: 16,320: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:15, 212:9, } \\ & \text { 297:11, 305:3, 352:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $46: 23,49: 15,50: 6,$ | 337:23, 341:11 <br> Cowan [1] - 342:5 | 5:5, 5:6 | 322:14, 322:15, | $\text { dated }[4]-100: 15,$ |
| 97:5, 135:15, 169:19, | $\begin{gathered} \text { cows [62] - 43:4, } \\ 43: 18,43: 22,45: 12, \end{gathered}$ | $65: 5,93: 4,93: 13$ | 325:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 127: 22,230: 23, \\ & 324: 23 \end{aligned}$ |

KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS



KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS

160:22, 166:23,
182:13, 191:8, 20
257:5, 257:9, 257
258:5, 258:14, 26
261:9, 280:14,
290:12, 306:17,
$315: 12,315: 14$,
$319: 12,319: 17$,
$320: 1,320: 7,320$
$321: 19,332: 18$,
$333: 12,341: 3,35$
$350: 14,364: 7$
door $[3]-97: 22$,
$355: 17,362: 23$
doors [3]-65:25,
333:9, 350:18
dosage [9]-47:14,
47:22, 50:13, 50:14, 138:8, 139:24, 140:7, 162:3
dose [3]-55:9,
55:10, 139:23
double [8] - 239:3,
258:6, 259:5, 259:23,
298:21, 299:1,
315:11, 343:17
double-lined [5] -
239:3, 258:6, 259:5,
259:23, 298:21
double-liner [1] -
315:11
doves [1] - 354:6
down [34]-29:18,
36:1, 43:19, 43:21,
44:9, 53:25, 89:5,
91:1, 91:2, 91:12,
92:11, 92:17, 98:13, 114:25, 115:1, 169:10, 170:6, 193:7, 193:17, 193:19, 193:25, 194:8, 194:9, 194:21, 195:15, 197:19, 198:10, 208:13, 222:23,
234:20, 236:3, 306:8,
360:18, 362:21
downgrade [2] -
70:5, 70:6
downgradient [8] -
31:9, 32:6, 69:16, 126:11, 126:18,
241:15, 241:18,
270:22
downside [1] - 70:9 downstream [1] -
69:16
DP [2] - 11:7, 322:3
DP-236[7]-1:6,
6:11, 6:13, 33:16,
34:16, 214:25, 324:10

DR [61]-23:19, 26:7,
27:2, 27:8, 27:11,
27:13, 40:11, 40:14, 40:16, 40:18, 40:20, 41:6, 43:9, 44:18,
44:22, 44:24, 45:14, 45:18, 45:22, 46:6, $46: 13,47: 12,49: 18$, 49:21, 49:23, 49:25, 50:11, 50:20, 51:12, 52:2, 53:24, 55:5, 55:9, 62:22, 84:10, 84:13, 84:16, 84:18, 84:20, 84:22, 85:1, 85:4, 85:9, 85:18, 88:4, 88:15, 89:7, 89:19, 89:23, 90:1, 90:4, 90:13, 90:17, 152:13, 169:17, 170:2, 170:16, 170:20, 170:24, 171:2, 171:6
$\operatorname{Dr}[32]-23: 2,24: 3$, 26:4, 39:25, 62:17, 72:24, 74:21, 84:2, 87:6, 110:14, 110:16, 110:22, 136:3, 136:8, 142:17, 143:4, 148:18, 148:19, 149:10, 152:11, 165:25, 166:21, 169:5, 207:2, 247:20, 273:7, 284:23, 333:14, 339:14, 363:6, 364:4, 364:6
draft [22]-29:17,
35:21, 60:3, 60:5, 60:8, 60:17, 61:17, 61:23, 62:14, 80:13, 175:6, 175:8, 175:11, 177:9, 178:7, 224:25, 225:2, 305:23,
311:23, 312:3, 312:5, 335:21
Draft [3]-6:11, 6:12, 7:2
Dragonfly [1] -
355:24
drain [1]-67:8
drainage [1] - 198:11
drains [4]-98:16,
98:21, 98:24, 354:25
draw [3]-253:3,
253:10, 314:23
Drawer [1]-2:19
drawn [1]-244:11
drill ${ }_{[1]}-192: 12$
Driller's ${ }_{[1]}$ - 7:13
driller's [1] - 7:15
Drive [2]-2:4, 2:9
drop [1] - 41:18
drought [1] - 344:17
drug [33]-49:8,
50:22, 50:25, 51:12, 51:14, 52:3, 52:24, 55:6, 84:16, 88:19, 89:13, 136:13, 140:1, 140:4, 140:12, 140:18, 140:20, 141:5, 142:1, 143:13, 143:24, 144:2, 144:3, 150:9, 153:7, 156:16, 164:15, 165:9, 169:10, 201:4,
239:20, 274:25, 341:2
drug-free [1] - 141:5
drugged [2] - 144:5,
355:16
drugs [115]-43:3,
46:2, 46:20, 46:21,
47:2, 51:20, 52:1,
52:16, 52:17, 52:21,
52:22, 53:10, 53:12,
54:12, 54:14, 84:24,
85:6, 85:9, 85:14,
85:21, 87:7, 88:25,
89:7, 89:11, 89:12,
89:16, 123:11,
132:14, 140:5,
140:15, 140:22,
141:2, 141:3, 141:6, 143:1, 144:7, 144:10, 144:13, 145:10, 145:13, 146:15, 146:24, 150:8, 150:25, 151:19, 151:20, 152:16, 152:19, 153:11, 153:25, 157:2, 157:22, 158:2, 158:8, 158:12, 158:19, 159:8, 159:19, 159:24, 161:7, 161:25, 162:2, 162:9, 162:24, 163:9, 163:22, 164:24, 165:3, 165:8, 169:22, 170:12, 170:14, 170:15, 170:17, 171:1, 171:4, 193:8, 200:10, 200:18, 206:19, 217:11, 218:9, 219:24, 220:19, 220:24, 221:2, 224:16, 249:15, 249:22, 250:1, 250:14, 250:15, 250:19, 250:25, 251:22, 267:8, 267:17,

268:23, 270:7, 275:6, 275:7, 275:15, 294:3, 297:5, 317:17, 333:19, 334:6, 334:7, 336:15, 336:18, 336:25, 337:3
dry [1] - 47:19
duck [1]-329:22
ducks [1]-354:5
due [8]-34:20,
93:24, 182:17,
217:10, 238:24,
289:7, 340:18, 370:7
duly [14]-23:7,
173:2, 176:2, 187:2, 211:11, 332:3,
335:12, 339:5, 344:3, 346:3, 349:9, 351:2, 353:18, 372:7
dumped [1] - 342:12
dumping [1] - 341:19
dumps [2] - 337:23,
357:10
DUNN [234] - 2:12,
15:23, 18:2, 18:6, 18:10, 21:3, 21:21, 22:12, 22:19, 22:25, 23:3, 23:10, 23:23, 25:2, 25:20, 25:23, 26:3, 26:24, 27:5, 27:9, 27:12, 27:14, 27:25, 28:13, 28:18, 28:22, 29:3, 29:6, 29:9, 29:12, 30:13, 30:17, 31:2, 31:18, 32:8, 32:14, 33:1, 33:10, 33:13, 33:21, 33:25, 34:11, 35:7, 35:15, 35:19, 35:24, 36:3, 36:16, 36:25, 37:7, 37:20, 37:23, 38:6, 38:12, 38:17, 38:22, 39:9, 39:11,
39:24, 40:12, 40:15,
40:17, 40:19, 40:22,
43:3, 44:14, 44:19,
44:23, 45:10, 45:15,
45:19, 46:1, 46:7,
47:5, 49:16, 49:19,
49:22, 49:24, 50:10,
50:16, 51:3, 51:19,
53:21, 54:19, 55:6,
55:12, 55:24, 56:4,
56:7, 56:11, 56:15,
57:22, 58:4, 58:12,
58:24, 59:8, 59:21,
59:25, 60:9, 60:24,
61:3, 61:9, 61:16,
61:22, 62:2, 62:17,
62:23, 63:6, 91:23,

93:22, 93:24, 99:11,
100:3, 100:6, 100:22,
101:1, 101:9, 107:10, 107:12, 110:4,
111:12, 113:5, 113:8,
114:2, 130:9, 151:2,
151:4, 151:6, 152:1,
152:3, 158:6, 160:8,
160:10, 161:9, 167:4,
167:6, 167:7, 167:15,
167:17, 167:21,
168:5, 168:10,
168:21, 168:25,
169:5, 169:18, 170:7, 170:9, 170:17, 170:21, 170:25, 171:3, 171:7, 171:18, 171:22, 178:3, 178:13, 185:7, 185:12, 185:25, 186:2, 188:14, 188:25, 201:17, 202:6, 208:10, 208:14, 208:15, 209:16, 218:21, 227:8, 227:10, 227:23, 228:4, 229:3, 229:21, 229:23, 230:5, 230:9, 231:8, 231:11, 231:17, 232:8, 232:11, 232:17, 241:24, 242:1, 242:20, 242:23, 243:2, 244:21, 248:7, 248:14, 252:19, 252:21, 253:13, 253:23, 253:25, 255:2, 255:12, 255:22, 255:24, 265:23, 266:17, 268:13, 268:19, 278:10, 278:13, 282:5, 284:5, 284:22, 285:3, 323:10, 323:17, 324:18, 324:21, 325:5, 325:9, 325:11, 325:14, 326:2, 327:8, 328:11, 329:8, 330:20, 330:25, 359:24, 362:1, 362:6, 363:3, 363:12, 366:12, 369:8, 369:12
Dunn [75] - 4:4, 4:15, 4:24, 5:4, 5:6, 15:22, 15:25, 18:1, 22:18, 25:1, 63:8, 63:19, 64:17, 70:13, 73:18, 78:3, 91:22, 93:23, 99:10, 100:5, 100:21,



| 233:21, 292:17 | 206:15, 224:6, | 234:20, 241:6, | failing ${ }_{[1]}-337: 14$ | Fate ${ }_{[1]}$ - 8:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 141:12 | 239:10, 239:12 | $258: 6,260: 11,265: 2,$ | 326:14, 356:8, 359:4 | FDA [5] - 49:12, |
| explains [1] - 154:25 | 256:10, 258:15, | 265:11, 265:12, | failures [1]-315:5 | 160:14, 205:15, |
| explanation [1] | 259:6, 259:20, 260:9, | 266:20, 271:16 | fair [8]-110:13, | 205:17, 205:20 |
| 196:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 260:12, 260:25, } \\ & \text { 261:1, 263:9, 263:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 282:15, 290:21, } \\ & \text { 290:23, 292:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 147:11, 149:17, | Fe [3]-2:5, 2:10, |
| $219: 10,364: 24$ | $4: 4,270: 23,$ | :21, 293:11, | 182:4, 203:23, 209:8, |  |
| exponential [1] | 270:25, 281:9 | 293:12, 298:25, | fairly [6]-36:18, | Fear [1] - 343:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:3 } \\ & \text { exposed }[2]-263: 7 \\ & \text { exposure }[1]-220: 6 \\ & \text { express }[2]-22: 6 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | 290:14, 290:25 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 299:6, 299:7, 299:24, } \\ 301: 7,302: 3,302: 7, \end{array}$ | 36:20, 80:14, 143:8, | feasible [2]-201:3, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 293:9, 293:14, } \\ & \text { 296:24, 299:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 301:7, 302:3, 302:7, } \\ & \text { 302:11, 302:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 222:9, 313:1 } \\ & \text { fairness }[1]-366: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:9 } \\ & \text { February }[5]-13: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 299:17, 300:5, 300:7, | 304:7, 304:9, 304:13, | fall [6]-205:11, | 31:12, 125:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 337:25 } \\ & \text { expressed [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 300: 8,301: 15, \\ & 301: 21,302: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 304:23, 305:7, 305:8, } \\ & 305: 11,305: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 264:18, 264:19, <br> 265:6, 319:8, 343:13 | 234:11, $234: 18$ fed [3]-45:25, |
|  | $304: 18,304: 23,$ | $305: 15,306: 6$ | 265:6, 319:8, 343:13 <br> fallacies [1] - 339:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { fed }[3]-45: 25, \\ 164: 5,334: 7 \end{gathered}$ |
| 349:18, 368:4 expression [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 309: 7,315: 2,315: 23, \\ & 316: 5,317: 19,319: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 306:11, 307:1, } \\ & 307: 19,308: 4,308: 6, \end{aligned}$ | fallen [1]-191:20 | federal [11]-55:20, |
| 14:5, 22:8 | $319: 2,322: 3,322: 7,$ | 308:7, 308:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { falls [2] - } 55: 19, \\ & 357: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 105:8, 105:18, |
| 14:5, 22:8 <br> expressly [1] - 14:17 <br> extended [1]-241:6 | $\begin{gathered} 322: 9,322: 11,327: 3 \\ \text { facility }[181]-22: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 309: 12,309: 20, \\ & 310: 17,315: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { familiar [37]-26:24, } \\ & 27: 6,27: 9,37: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:5, 194:10, } \\ & 352: 24,353: 4,356: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| extension [1] - 30:17 <br> extensive $[7]-85: 6$, | 26:1, 28:4, 30:5, 31:9, | 317:18, 318:4, 318:6, | 37:10, 37:12, 40:9, | 356:12 |
|  | 35:1, 36:7, 36:8, <br> 37:19, 39:21, 46:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 319: 25,320: 2, \\ & 320: 12,320: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 40:11, 46:2, 127:10, | Federal [2]-25:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 85: 9,168: 11,222: 4 \\ & 223: 23,235: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 19,39: 21,46: 12, \\ & 55: 16,55: 21,55: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 320: 12,320: 13, \\ & 320: 18,320: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 156:14, 169:25, | 145:10 |
|  | 56:21, 57:9, 57:14, | 322:9, 324:10, | 205:21, 208:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { federally [2] - 356:9, } \\ & 357: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 285:12 | 58:9, 59:11, 59:12, | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 324:15, 333:4, 333:8, } \\ 333: 16,334: 17, \end{array}$ | 209:5, 220:23, 250:1, | feed [6]-37:13, |
| 320:17extent $[7]-92: 6$179, | 59:22, 60:15, 61:9, 62:10, 62:11, 65:1, | 337:23, 356:18, | 250:20, 250:22, | 42:20, 163:25, |
|  |  | 365:19 | 251:6, 251:23, | 341:10, 359:2, 359:3 |
| 179:7, 210:18, 210:20, 254:17, | $65: 12,65: 18,66: 25,$ | facility's [1] - 324:12 | 252:13, 262:24, | feedlot [1] - 39:16 |
| 308:6, 368:6 | 67:1, 67:8, 68:19, | facility-wise ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 263:2, 264:6, 264:10, } \\ & \text { 264:11, 264:12, } \end{aligned}$ | feedlots [3] - 37:9, 163:12, 163:16 |
|  | 70:18, 70:19, 70:21, | 59:11 | $267: 3,273: 20$ | feelings [3]-14:3, |
| 281:23 | 70:24, 71:20, 73:19 | fact [28]-88:13 | 274:16, 278:13 | 14:4, 286:19 |
|  | 73:20, 73:21, 74:13, | 88:22, 107:20, | 304:19, 320:13 | fees [1]-287:2 |
| 280:18 | $74: 24,75: 5,75: 13$, $79: 6,79: 12,79: 14$, | 111:19, 111:20, | familiarity [1] - | feet $[5]-71: 7,76: 15$, |
|  |  | 111:22, 135:1 | 250:13 | 313:9, 352:3, 358:24 |
| 281:7 | 81.9, 82.10, 82.22 | 193:14, 195:25 | family [2] - 350:12 | Felicia [1] - 11:2 |
|  | 81:9, 82:10, 82:22 <br> 97:12, 98:1, 98:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:14, 195:25, } \\ & \text { 200:12, 202:8, 206:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 350:16 | FELICIA [2] - 1:14, |
| 322:17 |  |  | far [20] - 33:24, 38:3, | 2:3 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:6, 104:1, 104:4, } \\ & \text { 104:12, 104:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 239:25, 251:22, | 39:13, 46:13, 57:12, | fellow [1] - 349:18 |
| eyes [1] - 15:4 | 105:2, 105:7, 106:24, |  | 110:22, 110:25, | felony [2]-28:25, |
|  |  |  | (1, 148:20, | 29:3 |
| F | 112:11, 112:20, | 329:11, 334:8, | $1,180: 1$ | fenbendazole [1] - |
|  | 113:12, 114:8 | 343:18, 369:5, 369:20 | 6:1 | 25 |
| $\text { face [1] }-217: 17$ | 116:21, 117:1, 117:6, | ct [1] - 8:22 | 276:1, 282:9, 313:17, |  |
| Facebook [3] - |  | factor [3]-48:4 | 366:4, 370:4 | 210:14 |
| 347:2, 347:3, 348:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 124: 19,124: 20, \\ & 126 \cdot 13128: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 135:15, 309:24 | $\text { farm }[4]-38: 25 \text {, }$ | fertilizer [2]-206:18, |
| faced [1] - 350:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 126: 13,128: 8, \\ & 128: 13,138: 6, \end{aligned}$ | factories [2] | 122:21, 343:6, 343:7 | 206:20 |
| facet $[1]-351: 23$ <br> facilities [70]-27:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 13,138: 6, \\ & 167: 24,174: 5, \end{aligned}$ | factors [1]- | farmed $[1]$ - 39:4 | fever ${ }_{[1]}-150: 17$ |
|  | 181:21, 181:23, |  | arms [6]-188:10 | few [28]-28:2, |
| 37:9, 57:23, 58:19, | 182:2, 183:22, 184:3, |  | 198:13, 198:17, | 33:19, 43:22, 80:17, |
| 62:4, 62:7, 66:18, | 192:3, 192:4, 192:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { facts }[8]-111: 15, \\ & 111: 19,113: 8,219: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 199:21, 199:25, 200:5 | 80:19, 109:4, 123:23, |
| $75: 4,80: 14,81: 2$ | 193:19, 205:11, | $282: 20,347: 8,353: 5$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { farms [4] - 26:17, } \\ 45: 4,122: 14,122 \end{array}$ | 131:10, 137:25, |
| 106:24, 107:2, 183:4, | 206:6, 206:10, | factual $[4]$ - 24:5, | Farnam [1] - 251:8 | 139:8, 178:18, |
|  | 206:12, 210:20, | $25: 5,25: 24,204: 3$ | fashion [1]-14:8 | 185:18, 186:13, <br> 187:7, 198:19, 205.2, |
| 183:23, 184:8, 184:12, 184:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 215:11, 217:24, } \\ & \text { 202.20 } 20: 21 \end{aligned}$ | failed [2] - 216:9, | fast [3]-120:24, | 214:5, 250:24, 255:7, |
| 184:17, 204:13, | 223:25, 224:2, | 352:19 | 208:13, 227:19 | 318:21, 325:8, |

KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS

| 328:15, 336:24, | 126:6, 134:17, | Flynn [2]-13:19, | foreseeable [1] - | free [16]-13:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 347:6, 353:21, 360:1, | 134:24, 142:9, | 20:15 | 192:6 | 48:25, 50:9, 140:18, |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 361: 23,364: 20 \\ \text { field [5] - 24:9, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:10, 173:2, 176:2, } \\ & \text { 180:21, 180:25, } \end{aligned}$ | Flynn's [1] - 20:17 <br> focus [3]-29:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forever [3]-51:11, } \\ & \text { 169:15, 347:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:19, 140:22, } \\ & 141: 2,141: 5,15 \mathrm{~S} \end{aligned}$ |
| 168:6, 234:16, | 181:6, 185:17, | 94:2, 162:18 | forfeited [1] - 353:9 | 159:16, 161:19, |
| 269:24, 321:18 | 186:16, 187:2 | focused [1] - 156:20 | forget ${ }_{[1]}$ - 72:24 | 161:21, 162:15, |
| fields [2]-24:10, | 187:12, 187:15 | ded [2] - 115:22 | rgive [1] - 292:4 | 162:21, 163:2, 195:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 248:21 } \\ & \text { fifth }[2]-101: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:11, 194:16, } \\ & \text { 194:18, 211:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 115:24 | forgo ${ }_{[1]}$-63:24 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { freeboard }[3]- \\ 313: 7.313: 10 \end{array}$ |
| $348: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 215: 2,245: 10,246: 3, \\ & 256: 2,291: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 361:20 | 344:11 | freely [1] - 189:21 <br> frequent ${ }^{11]}$ - 184: |
| 143:5, 226:21, 272:3 | 300:16, 331:20, | 167:3, 184:24, 185:1, | form [5]-20:24, | [2]-7:11, |
| figuring ${ }_{[1]}$ - 41:16 | 332:3, 332:8, 335:12, | 250:5, 253:14, | 44:15, 61:20, 271:6, | 320:22 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { file }[3]-13: 23, \\ 188: 25,278: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 336: 12,339: 5,344: 3, \\ & 346: 3,347: 18,349: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 260:15, 322:25 } \\ \text { follow-up [6] - } \end{array}$ | 294:5 | Friday [5] - 17:2, |
| File [1] - 7:17 | 351:2, 353:18, | 184:24, 185:1, 250:5, | 268:7, 268:19, 269:4 | $21: 5$ |
| filed [7]-35:8, | 362:17, 363:20, | 253:14, 322:25 | format [1] - 219:6 | Friedlander [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 177:23, 187:24, } \\ & \text { 212:4, 213:7, 245:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 366:12, 370:2 } \\ & \text { fish [8] - } 354: 13, \end{aligned}$ | followed [1] - 139:25 following [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { formation [2] - } \\ \text { 244:23, 294:18 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 339:15 } \\ & \text { front }[9]-25: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| 285:17 | $354: 16,354: 22$, $355 \cdot 9,355: 13$ | $336: 11,370: 3$ | formed [4]-269:17, | 101:20, 191:2, |
| filing ${ }_{[1]}-174: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 355: 9,355: 13, \\ & 355: 22,359: 2,359: 3 \end{aligned}$ | follows [13]-23:8, | 277:25, 294:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:21, 214:8, } \\ & 253: 11,324: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| $355: 2,355: 15$ | fit [3]-65:5, 77:16, | 173:3, 176:3, 187:3 211:12, 332:4, | 346:23 <br> former [5]-18:20 | $325: 15,336: 2$ |
| filthy [4]-43:19, | 364:8 $\left.{ }^{\text {Fitch }} 11\right]-8.11$ | 335:13, 339:6, 344:4, | 18:21, 96:20, 247:6, | Front [4]-3:2, 11:20, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 43:24, 45:24, 342:19 } \\ \text { final }[1]-116: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fitch }[1]-8: 11 \\ & \text { fits }[1]-78: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 346: 4,349: 10,351: 3, \\ & 353: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 339:15 } \\ & \text { forming [3]-203 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:5, 211:21 } \\ & \text { FS-027-02 }[1]-8: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| Final $[1]-6: 22$ | five $[11]-53: 13$, $53 \cdot 18,78 \cdot 25,79 \cdot 7$ | food [50]-140:5, | 276:25, 357:13 | FSIS [4]-7:20, 9:20, |
| finally [4] - 17:16, $200 \cdot 3,200 \cdot 23,329.2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:18, 78:25, 79:7, } \\ & \text { 106:16, 214:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:6, 140:17, } \\ & 144: 14.144: 2 \end{aligned}$ | forms [3]-14:5, 268.25, 272.19 | 9:21, 9:22 <br> FSIS/USDA ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| financially [1] - | 229:6, 330:8, 330:9, | 145:3, 145:12, | formulate [1] - | $218: 17$ |
| 372:14 | $\begin{gathered} 331: 2,352: 15 \\ \text { fix }_{[1]}-195: 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:16, 146:9, } \\ & \text { 146:16, 146:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 294:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fuel }[1]-223: 25 \\ & \text { fulfill }[3]-30: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 305:23 | flag [1] - 363:24 | 147:1, 147:4, 148:1 | forth [16] - $22 \cdot 21$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { fulfill }[3]-30: \\ 123: 21,355: 4 \end{array}$ |
| fine [22]-22:23, | flaunting [1] - 352:13 | 148:5, 148:8, 148:14, | 27:22, 29:16, 32:11, | full [8]-23:11, 44:9, |
| $64: 15,92: 12,95: 9,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { flesh [3] - 51:9, } \\ \text { 136:16, 224:17 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:7, 149:15, 154:3, } \\ & \text { 154:7, 156:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $34: 9,54: 4,60: 17,$ | $91: 2,108: 19,109: 20,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:12, 170:9, } \\ & \text { 178:13, 179:10, } \end{aligned}$ | flickers [1] - 354:8 | $160: 12,160: 15$ | 86:6, 97:17, 98:8, | fuller [1] - 245:13 |
| 186:6, 194:18, 195:2, | flights [1] - 367:13 | 169:16, 171:5, | 120:21, 120:24, | fullness [1]-124:17 |
| 208:10, 231:21, | flip [1] - 101:20 | 206:16, 218:10, | 125:15 | fully [2]-209:13, |
| 238:8, 242:24, 243:2, | floor [6]-67:7, | 218:16, 218:17, | forward [1] - 64:16 | 316:12 |
| 244:21, 278:10, | 115:2, 115:4, 115:11, | 219:25, 221:3, 273:2, | foundation [2] | functioning [3] |
| 293:5, 334:2, 334:20, | 116:4, 166:13 | 273:6, 273:12, | 248:23, 253:4 | 32:12, 34:10, 126:7 |
| 360:24 | Floor [1] - 3:6 | 273:22, 274:5, | $\text { founding }[1]-190: 1$ | Fund [1]-351:7 |
| fined [2] - 194:24, | floors [1] - 115:5 | 333:18, 334:10, | four [24]-13:18, | fungicides [1] - 46:3 |
| 195:13 | Flow [1] - 7:6 | 334:13, 336:13 | $31: 12,31: 20,32: 1 \text {, }$ | furnace [2]-191:20, |
| fines [1] - 195:14 | flow [13] - 37:5, 75:7, | 336:14, 336:17 | 42:5, 48:9, 53:12, | 208:19 |
| finish [6] - 12:8, | 77:18, 77:23, 78:4, | 337:1, 341:10, | 53:17, 78:14, 101:12, | FURTHER [1] - |
| 12:11, 12:17, 141:13, | 121:1, 124:8, 124:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 343: 19,347: 14, \\ & 352: 24,366: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 121:3, 121:6, 126:4, | 323:16 |
| 208:8, 283:24 <br> finished [1] - 255:8 <br> finishing [2] - 67:18, | $\begin{gathered} 313: 24,352: 8,358: 4, \\ \text { 358:16, 358:19 } \\ \text { flowing [2] - 36:10, } \end{gathered}$ | 352:24, 366:14 food-producing [3] 140:5, 140:6, 140:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:18, 139:2, } \\ & \text { 176:19, 231:1, 330:8, } \\ & 331: 20,345: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { future }[4]-56: 1 \text {, } \\ & \text { 192:7, 192:22, 337:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 361:10 } \\ & \text { finite }[1]-364: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 338: 3 \\ & \text { flows [2] - 59:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { footed }[1]-354: 2 \\ & \text { FOR }[2]-1: 5,2: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 348: 12,352: 2, \\ & 352: 24,358: 23 \end{aligned}$ | G |
| first [60]-11:15, | $358: 15$ | forbidden [2] - <br> 87:21, 87:22 | fourth [1] - 35:25 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:23, 15:9, 23:7, } \\ & \text { 28:6, 32:23, 36:10, } \end{aligned}$ | fluid [1] - 315:7 <br> fluids [3]-159:4, | force [1] - 197:19 | fox [1] - 353:25 frame [3]-31:21, | gain [1] - 363:17 |
| 51:6, 64:10, 67:15, | 159:15, 162:4 | foregoing [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rame } 3 \text { - } 11: 2 \\ & 215: 16,215: 21 \end{aligned}$ | gallons [49]-36: |
| 68:23, 70:15, 96:8, | fly [3] - 251:10, | 372:5, 372:6 | France [1] - 334:13 | 48:19, 56:12, 56:17, |
| $97: 25,98: 9,103: 10,$ | $251: 11,251: 13$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { foreign [2] - 54:4, } \\ \text { 162:12 } \end{gathered}$ | Francis [2] - 2:4, 2:9 | 57:13, 57:16, 57:18, 58:6, 58:10, 58:13, |
| 106:21, 107:17, | flying [1] - 367:12 | 162:12 | Francisco [1] - 3:6 |  |
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| 58:17, 58:23, 72:22, | 235:25, 236:8, | 213:17, 213:20, | 259:18, 259:19, | 357:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 72:25, 73:4, 91:2, | 236:14, 236:20, | 247:24, 349:20 | $260: 22,261: 2,$ | guys [2]-54:21, |
| 91:6, 91:16, 102:3, | 237:4, 280:14, 281:5, | Government [1] - | 265:18, 266:19, | 346:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:13, 124:5, } \\ & \text { 124:12, 124:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 348:8, 355:14 <br> gentian [1] - 251:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:14 } \\ & \text { governments } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 271:14, 274:24, } \\ & \text { 291:10, 291:17, } \end{aligned}$ | GWB [3] - 1:3, 11:8 <br> GWQB [1] - 324:12 |
| 128:3, 129:6, 134:5, | gentleman [4] | 21:5 | 291:18, 291:22 | - 355:19, |
| 167:10, 180:9, | 112:9, 112:15, | Governor [1] - 342:7 | 295:24, 296:20 | 356:14, 356:21 |
| 181:12, 181:13 | 118:24, 332:10 | 'ed [1] - 78:1 | 296:22, 296:23, |  |
| 225:6, 225:18, | gentlemen [1] - | grab [1] - 45:7 | 297:1, 299:16, 302:4, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 225:19, 227:14, } \\ & 228: 6,234: 25,235: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 64:19 geochemistry [2] - | grade [1]-241:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 305: 19,306: 6, \\ & 306: 23,307: 6, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 235:6, 236:1, 236:4, | 291:17, 291:18 | 318:8 | $307: 25,309: 20$, $310: 7,310: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H-u-g-h-e-s [1] - } \\ & 346: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 236:22, 237:9, } \\ & \text { 237:10, 237:12, } \end{aligned}$ | geologist [7] - 126:1, 131:17, 168:13, | gram [1] - 54:10 | 310:7, 310:11, | 346:6 <br> habitat [5] - 357:3, |
| 279:4, 279:12, | 168:16, 169:2, |  | 317:13, 319:13, | 358:8, 358:16, 358:25 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 281:22, 344:19 } \\ \text { gambusia }[3]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 269:16, } 276: 4 \\ & \text { geology [2] - 157:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { grant }[2]-95: 21, \\ & 95: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 320: 1,320: 6,324: 11 \\ & 326: 23,335: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hagerman }[1] \text { - } \\ & 358: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 354: 21,355: 8,356: 9 \\ \text { gas }[1]-319: 18 \end{gathered}$ | 214:16 | granted [2]-238:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 352: 1,352: 5,352: 7, \\ & 352: 19,358: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { half [14]-65:10, } \\ \text { 89:8, 89:9, 89:12, } \end{gathered}$ |
| ed ${ }_{[1]}$ - 138:6 | $287: 22,287: 23$ | graphic [5] - 15: | Groundwater [26] - | 90:2, 118:20, 118:22, |
| geese [1] - 354:5 | 288 | 15:2, 188:11, 199:15, | 7:4, 7:6, 11:6, 11:8, | 139:16, 140:1, |
| General [10]-2:7, | oscientist [2] | 200:4 | 13:21, 25:12, 85:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 169: 24,170: 13, \\ & 352: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2:8, 2:18, 15:20, <br> 18:11, 18:12, 20:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 173:11, 173:22 } \\ & \text { given }[45]-12: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { grasshopper [1] - } \\ & 354: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 100:19, 103:3, | half-life [7] - 89:8, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 64:1, 211:21, 287:5 } \\ \text { general [21]-14:2, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 11,49: 8,52: 22, \\ & 52: 23,88: 19,91: 18 \end{aligned}$ | grave [3]-340:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 173:11, 175:2, } \\ & \text { 176:12, 176:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 9,89: 12,90: 2, \\ & 140: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23:16, 27:5, 40:13, | 120:17, 142:1, | ravel [1] | 176:15, 176:17, | half-lives [3] |
| 51:21, 65:2, 65:6, | 143:24, 144:2, 144:3, | $\text { ay }[1]-353: 25$ | 213:21, 256:8, 277:3, | 139:16, 169:2 |
| 67:1, 69:20, 77:3, | 144:10, 146:15, | Great ${ }_{[1]}-192: 1$ | 279:2, 288:1, 295:12, | 170:13 |
| 92:3, 120:22, 121:7, | 153:25, 156:16, | reat [12]-26:10 | 307:18, 318:25, | halfway [2] - 89:5, |
| 174:7, 292:10, | 157:22, 158:19, | $42: 25,74: 3,91: 1$ | 326:12 | 277:11 <br> hammer [1]-292:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 296:25, 302:16, } \\ & 306: 24,308: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:4, 161:8, 164:6, } \\ & \text { 165:2, 169:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 102:10, 115:17, | 321:2, 339:13, | hand [2] - 13:5, |
| 313:14, 318:9 | 170:22, 194:18, | 151:16, 153:16, | 339:16, 342:2 | 100:8 |
| General's [9]-11:19, | 207:6, 218:10, | 346:8 | $342: 15,346: 24$ | handed [1] - 101:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:15, 17:10, 19:21, } \\ & \text { 286:6, 287:3, 321:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 219: 25,220: 13, \\ & 20: 19237 \cdot \end{aligned}$ | greater [6] - 107:21, | groups [1] - 347:1 <br> Grover [1]-8:5 | handle [7]-32:24, 107:6, 107:9, 124:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 286:6, 287:3, 321:1, } \\ & 321: 3,366: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 220: 19,237: 8, \\ & 249: 14,254: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 129:6, 129:7, 226:6, | Grover [1] - 8:5 Growers [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:6, 107:9, 124:21, } \\ & \text { 124:24, 202:8, 367:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| generally [12] - | 257:4, 267:18, | Gross [1] - 211:23 | $340: 12,340: 21,342: 6$ | handled [2]-46:10, |
| 89:16, 168:12, | $267: 19,273: 2,273: 5$ | GROUND [1] - 1:6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { guess [29]-15:16, } \\ 70: 24,75: 10,80: 7, \end{gathered}$ | 182:19 handles [2]-288:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:18, 176:19, } \\ & \text { 222:5, 236:3, 247:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 273:12, 275:18, } \\ & 275: 19,336: 25, \end{aligned}$ | ground [5] - 102:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:24, 75:10, 80:7, } \\ & \text { 86:15, 106:20, 122:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { handles [2]-288:2, } \\ & 333: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 279:2, 301:13 | $359: 6,372: 9$ | 108:21, 196:6, | $123: 22,125: 2,244: 9,$ | handling [2]-74:3, |
| 313:18, 321:10, | Given [2]-7:23, | grounds [2]-111:4, | $244: 15,251: 12$ | 332:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 321: 13 \\ & \text { generate }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 248: 13 \\ & \text { glad }_{[5]}-191: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 209:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 251:17, 253:3, } \\ & \text { 264:21, 281:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hands [4] - 20:17, } \\ & \text { 116:19, 347:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 110:25, 233:23, | 204:10, 223:5, |  | 282:19, 285:11, | 359:14 |
| 283:10, 314:2 | 228:24, 249:4 | 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, | 286:13, 288:13, | hang [1] - 98:13 |
| generated [17] - <br> 14:3, 30:8, 32:25, | glance [1] - 325:17 | 62:12, 62:16, 63:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 289:19, 309:15, } \\ & 318: 2,320: 11,321: 8, \end{aligned}$ | Hanning [1] - 100:17 <br> happy [4]-127:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:3, 30:8, 32:25, } \\ & 36: 7,89: 21,135: 12, \end{aligned}$ | glasses [1] - 79:2 <br> gloves [1] - 45:9 | 68:9, 69:17, 70:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 318:2, 320:11, 321:8, } \\ & \text { 322:8, 327:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { happy }[4]-127: 12, \\ \text { 168:8, 208:10, 229:13 } \end{gathered}$ |
| 224:3, 224:6, 224:21, | glycol [1]-251:9 | 77:14, 77:18, 78:3 | 329:16, 363:20 | hard [4]-66:4, |
| 235:10, 235:22, | goat [1] - 51:16 | $83: 11,106: 20,$ | guessing [2] - 181:1, | 227:19, 340:5, 345:8 |
| 235:23, 235:25, | goats [5] - 39:2, | 107:16, 219:9, 220:6, | 288:11 | hard-and-fast [1] - |
| 236:6, 236:24, | 46:14, 55:18, 55:21, | $224: 11,238: 2,238: 3$ | guidance [1] - | 227:19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 236:25, 277:16 } \\ \text { generating [5] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:17 } \\ & \text { Google }[2]-320: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $238: 24,239: 2,239: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 229:18 } \\ & \text { guideline }[1]-76: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { harder }[2] \text { - 107:9, } \\ & \text { 107:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 226:12, 227:7, 237:9, | Google [2] - 320:16, 355:3 | 239:7, 239:8, 239:10, | guidelines [1] - | Hardin [1] - 3:4 |
| 237:10, 283:14 | government [7] - | 241:13, 256:13, | 127:7 | harm [2]-34:2, 57:2 |
| generation [9] - | 21:9, 21:10, 21:16, | 258:1, 259:16 | guts [2] - 71:7, | Harold [2] - 2:4, 2:9 |
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| 192:18, 194:8, | 117:21, 122:24, | 292:1, 294:2, 333:15, | 284:14 | 312:8, 312:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200:12, 200:25, | 123:6, 123:10, | 333:17, 333:18, | hydrologic [1] - | implicated [1] - |
| 204:16, 206:3, | 132:13, 134:18, | 334:2, 334:6, 334:10, | 78:23 | 240:4 |
| 206:12, 207:3, | 135:1, 136:14, | 334:20, 336:12, | hydrologist [10] - | implication [2] - |
| 217:24, 220:16, | 137:14, 137:17, | 336:14, 336:22, | 119:22, 125:24, | 216:11, 366:18 |
| 224:17, 236:21, | 139:4, 139:7, 139:12, | 337:3, 340:14, | 131:14, 168:16, | implications [2] - |
| 236:24, 248:15, | 144:14, 144:21, | 340:15, 340:17, | 169:1, 244:2, 276:5, | 219:9, 329:10 |
| 270:24, 271:16, | 144:23, 145:11, | 341:19, 341:23, | 284:14, 305:17, 306:5 | important [8] - 49:1, |
| 272:6, 272:20, | 145:24, 146:2, 146:7, | 342:12, 342:18, | hydrology [2] - | 50:12, 110:21, 180:7, |
| 273:21, 281:8, | 146:14, 146:19, | 342:20, 342:24, | 157:12, 214:17 | 189:13, 228:13, |
| 281:23, 283:21, | 146:20, 146:24, | 343:2, 345:7, 345:8, | hypersensitive [2] - | 358:19, 366:13 |
| 284:4, 284:6, 286:9, | 147:1, 147:2, 147:3, | 346:14, 346:15, | 90:12, 90:15 | imposed [1] - 139:3 |
| 286:13, 286:16, | 147:11, 147:22, | 347:10, 347:13, | hypothesis [1] - | impoundment [21] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 290:10, 290:20, } \\ & \text { 291:21, 305:13 } \end{aligned}$ | 147:24, 148:1, 148:5, $148: 8,148: 10,149: 6$ | 347:18, 353:21, | 306:25 | 69:16, 215:8, 215:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 291: 21,305: 13, \\ & 332: 11,332: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 149:15, 149:18, | 355:1 | hypothesizing [1] - | 215:12, 220:7, 234:3, |
| 335:23, 335:24, | 149:24, 150:2, 150:5, | hospital [1] - 319:2 | hypothetical [2] - | 241:17, 256:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 336: 2,336: 3,337: 2 \\ & 337: 4,342: 3,343: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:7, 151:19, } \\ & \text { 152:16, 152:20, } \end{aligned}$ | hot [1] - 317:25 | 54:19, 163:19 | $260: 20,270: 9,274: 2,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 344: 13,344: 16, \\ & 346: 11,347: 1,347: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:21, 153:10, } \\ & 154: 3,154: 6,15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 160: 21,364: 3, \\ & 365: 11,366: 5 \end{aligned}$ | I | 307:6, 309:23, |
| $347: 8,347: 17$ | 156:14, 156:17, | hours [7] - 13:13, | icon [1] - 347:10 | impoundments [27] |
| $348: 14,348: 17$ | 157:3, 157:7, 158:19, 161:14, 162:1, 162:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 22,361: 23,363: 4 \\ & 363: 21.364: 1.364: 20 \end{aligned}$ | idea [8] - 61:4, 65:6, | - 36:11, 68:7, 68:18, <br> $68 \cdot 25,79 \cdot 6,79 \cdot 9$ |
| $349: 14,350: 11$ | 162:16, 162:20, | 363:21, 364:1, 36 huge [8] - 42:4, | 96:6, 96:7, 96:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 25,79: 6,79: 9 \\ & 220: 4,220: 17,239: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| 353:10 | 163:4, 163:5, 163:7, | 42:19, 43:9, 109:19, | $96: 13,133: 14,334: 9$ | 239:6, 257:8, 257:22, |
| Horse [2]-339:17, | 163:8, 163:24, 164:1, | $300: 4$ | identical [1] - 157:7 | 258:1, 259:3, 259:12, |
| 346:24 <br> horse's [2] - 51 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:2, 164:4, 164:17, } \\ & \text { 170:22, 170:25, } \end{aligned}$ | Hughes [7] - 331:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { identifiable [1] - } \\ & \text { 230:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 261:14, 261:24, 280:1, 299:18, |
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|  | 189:22, 369:2 <br> presented [8] - | $314: 9,317: 4$ | $41: 14,43: 18,57: 14$ | progression [1] - |
| ```351:12 preceding [1] - 203:4 precious [2] -``` | presented [8] - | probation [2] - 29:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:18, 140:20, } \\ & \text { 140:21, 141:1, } 160 \end{aligned}$ | $271: 18$ |
|  | 209:24, 210:13, | probativ | 165:22, 191:16, | 88:19, 144:14, 145:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 344: 18,347: 14 \\ & \text { precise [1] - 77:18 } \\ & \text { predecessors [1] - } \end{aligned}$201:6 | ```245:13, 253:16, 262:5 presenting [2] - 211:18, 211:20 presents [1] - 18:17``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:21, } 242: 13 \\ & \text { problem }[23]-45: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 262:10, 292:7 } \\ & \text { processes [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145: 11,145: 14 \\ & 145: 15,147: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $48: 4,57: 6,74: 20$ | 150:7, 205:13, 292:23 | 147:20, 164:24, |
| ```201:6 preexist [1] - 300:8 prefer [3] - 14:18,``` | presents [1]-18:17 <br> preserve [1] - 192:5 <br> preserving [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:20, 130:15, } \\ & \text { 194:3, 195:20, } \\ & \text { 196:21, 197:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 6,36: 20,36: 23 \\ & 37: 8,39: 15,39: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 218:9, } 219: 24 \\ & \text { prohibitive }[5]- \\ & 52: 21,87: 14,165: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 359:24, 362:24 } \\ & \text { prefiled [5] - 187:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 353:2 } \\ & \text { preside [2] - 256:5, } \\ & 256: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:20, 204:7, } \\ & \text { 206:14, 218:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 13,41: 10,44: 13 \\ & 44: 14,46: 12,49: 6 \\ & 50: 6.54: 7.54: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:8, 169:6 } \\ & \text { project [2] - 208:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $246: 13,285: 13$ |  | $220: 1,220: 3,220: 5,$ | 50:6, 54:7, 54:15, | $357: 22$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 285:17, 294:7 } \\ & \text { prehearing [1] } \end{aligned}$ | President [2]-3:10, | 232:17, 247:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 21,58: 9,67: 7, \\ & 73: 11,74: 7,79: 8, \end{aligned}$ | projection [1] - |
|  | 66:2 | 259:17, 262:18, | $97: 17,97: 19,150:$ | 278:23 |
| ```210:1 prejudicial [2] -``` | president [2] | $304: 1,350: 10$ | 156:9, 194:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { projects [2] - 27:22, } \\ & \text { 190:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $201: 21,242: 13$ | pressure [2] | 108:8, 113:1, 124:1 | 195:10, 204:13 | promote [1] - 345:12 |
|  | 198:15, 198:20 | 193:1, 195:12 | 204:17, 205:10, | Proof [1]-6:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 85:12 } \\ & \text { preparat } \end{aligned}$ | pressures [1] - 191:4 | 196:18, 200:20, | 215:20, 234:14, $265: 2,265: 11$ | proof [2]-11:15, |
|  | pretty [18] - 18:25, | 202:19, 203:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 265:2, 265:11, } \\ & \text { 265:12. 279:18. } \end{aligned}$ | 19:9 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 131:12, 235:7 } \\ \text { prepare }[7] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $76: 5,86: 16,103: 23$ | 203:19, 204:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 265:12, 279:18, } \\ & \text { 280:3, 281:9, 290:6, } \end{aligned}$ | proper [3] - 148:22, |
|  | 134:19, 150:9, 193:2, | 210:15, 239:14, | 290:9, 290:23, 291:4, | $164: 14,332: 20$ |
| 137:12, 174:6, 177:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 208:13, 277:10, } \\ & \text { 277:25, 294:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $314: 5,348: 18$ | 350:13 | properly [8] - 32:12, |
| $253: 12,253: 14,327: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 277: 25,294: 11 \\ & 294: 25,304: 9 \end{aligned}$ | procedure [2] - <br> 120:12, 161:14 | produce [3] - 110:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 126: 8,129: 5,164: 5, \\ & 251: 12,316: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| prepared [10] - 48:7, <br> 64:16, 132.21 | $304: 10,315: 23,333: 6$ | 120:12, 161:14 procedures $[2$ | $338: 14,351: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 251: 12,316: 17 \\ & 316: 24,333: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 133:16, 133:22, | prevalence [2] - | $20: 19,127: 6$ |  | property [8] - |
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| ```298:15, 318:25, 337:2 regulated \([7]-83: 11\), 85:15, 85:21, 183:2, 301:9, 322:11, 337:16 regulates [1] - 99:7 regulating [3] - 289:20, 292:20, 297:11 regulation [4] - 104:14, 159:15, 295:10, 311:6 Regulations [2] - 145:11, 213:25 regulations [33] - 11:11, 105:6, 105:9, 117:6, 131:8, 138:6, 138:11, 138:12, 138:14, 139:3, 139:5, 140:11, 142:12, 145:1, 146:23, 147:1, 149:11, 149:14, 149:19, 159:3, 160:12, 166:17, 181:16, 184:13, 218:16, 221:14, 289:22, 296:4, 296:6, 298:2, 300:8, 337:13, 353:8 regulator [3] - 222:4, 222:11, 247:6 regulatory [3] - 81:15, 149:11, 247:23 rehash [2]-20:5, 246:5 reimbursed [1] - 122:11 rejected \({ }_{[1]}-341: 25\) relate [2]-148:5, 148:8 related [5] - 136:9, 187:16, 213:14, 299:11, 372:11 relates [1]-280:10 relationship [3] - 199:3, 320:22, 320:24 relative [1] - 372:13 release [2]-239:6, 240:7 released [3] - 220:7, 239:1, 240:11 releases [1]-239:4 relevance [4] - 107:12, 107:13, 189:3, 365:1 relevancy [3] - 201:19, 209:23, 242:6 relevant [8] - 107:14, 110:17, 111:17, 111:20, 111:21, 210:13, 242:14, 244:1``` | ```reliable [1] - 113:22 reliance [2]-113:17, 245:21 relied [6] - 113:22, 153:2, 153:5, 244:12, 254:11, 294:17 relies [2]-88:17, 181:16 relievers [1] - 46:17 rely [5] - 136:22, 156:6, 156:8, 253:18, 260:7 relying [4] - 151:8, 151:11, 202:24, 276:24 remain [5] - 51:14, 51:15, 51:17, 140:2, 164:20 remains [2]-50:18, 51:9 remedial [1] - 190:25 remediation [2] - 190:16, 191:7 remedies [1] - 308:14 remember [14] - 31:22, 75:9, 128:9, 128:12, 223:12, 227:21, 248:24, 287:9, 287:13, 288:5, 289:6, 300:24, 302:19, 303:15 REMEMBERED [1] - 1:13 remembering [1] - 21:12 remind [3]-127:11, 187:22, 188:6 Removal [2]-8:19, 212:21 removal [2] - 242:8, 311:11 remove [1] - 312:23 removed [3] - 14:11, 118:6, 311:15 removing [1] - 311:14 render [4]-98:9, 161:21, 165:1, 337:4 rendered [1] - 165:4 renderer [3]-200:7, 200:8, 341:7 renderers [1] - 200:9 rendering [16] - 71:17, 72:13, 72:14, 72:17, 72:18, 164:21, 193:5, 193:6, 200:14, 206:6, 206:10, 206:11, 206:15, 207:13, 207:19, 341:9``` |  | 129:13, 129:17, <br> 202:25, 225:11, <br> 225:12, 302:11, <br> 302:12, 311:13, <br> 311:16, 333:22, <br> 337:15 <br> represent $[4]$ - <br> 17:24, 19:25, 100:15, 327:1 <br> representation $[4]$ 16:23, 17:7, 174:10, 175:17 <br> representative [2] 69:1, 370:18 represented [3] 84:25, 265:3, 306:21 representing [7] 18:20, 232:4, 281:16, 321:2, 339:11, 339:16, 351:8 <br> represents [1] 19:23 <br> request [13]-99:25, 104:14, 128:13, <br> 223:7, 256:22, 324:6, <br> 324:22, 324:24, <br> 324:25, 341:18, <br> 362:6, 366:9, 367:10 <br> requested [6] - 15:5, <br> 29:25, 33:18, 245:20, <br> 304:2, 342:2 <br> require [8] - 14:16, 44:16, 76:19, 139:10, 168:19, 299:13, <br> 308:18, 340:2 <br> required [21]-31:7, <br> 33:19, 33:20, 33:23, <br> 60:19, 71:14, 104:1, <br> 104:7, 127:7, 129:2, <br> 169:23, 215:7, <br> 215:10, 216:18, <br> 298:25, 300:11, <br> 302:11, 307:18, <br> 310:13, 329:21, <br> 337:15 <br> requirement [5] - <br> 30:19, 68:25, 78:7, <br> 126:5, 184:6 <br> requirements [13] - <br> 33:15, 77:7, 77:9, <br> 81:16, 123:22, 139:6, <br> 162:24, 260:10, <br> 298:20, 311:8, <br> 316:13, 322:12, 355:5 <br> requires [4] - 76:6, <br> 81:23, 116:3, 139:9 <br> requiring [1] - 40:3 <br> Requiring ${ }_{[1]}$ - 10:12 <br> requisite [1] - 168:6 <br> Rescue [4]-3:2, | ```11:20, 16:6, 211:21 rescues [1] - 336:2 research [6] - 106:23, 182:2, 189:18, 244:11, 253:14, 346:18 researched [1] - 182:18 reservation [1] - 164:4 reservations [1] - 361:1 reserve [7] - 24:20, 24:22, 171:19, 178:5, 185:8, 321:5, 327:13 reside [2] - 335:20, 338:22 resident [1] - 348:11 residents [4]-201:7, 211:22, 320:23, 353:3 Residents [1] - 3:2 residue [7] - 48:20, 52:10, 55:1, 141:22, 161:21, 163:3, 341:2 residues [8] - 49:14, 52:10, 136:13, 159:4, 159:11, 159:16, 162:13, 201:4 resistant [2] - 262:22, 263:19 resource [2] - 200:21, 344:18 Resources [1] - 190:9 resources [2] - 184:1, 291:13 respect [8] - 123:5, 123:20, 138:18, 166:1, 166:4, 182:5, 182:14, 353:7 respected [1] - 151:9 respectfully [1] - 364:18 respirations [1] - 154:24 respond [3] - 208:6, 216:2, 304:1 responded [2] - 152:17, 304:3 Response [1] - 10:10 response [8] - 150:10, 169:3, 243:19, 245:25, 246:4, 248:9, 324:22, 324:24 responses [3] - 247:1, 324:25, 325:6 responsibilities [1] - 321:22 responsibility [1] -``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KATHY TOWNSEND COURT REPORTERS |  |  |  |  |
| 110 Twelf | Street, No (505) 243 | west, Albu $18 \text { - Fax }$ | rque, New M $243-3606$ | $\text { ico } 87102$ |



| 176:9, 177:20, 179:1, | 38:20, 288:4, 308:24, | 147:11, 147:13, | 358:17 | 189:14, 200:10, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 183:21, 185:4 | 352:9 | 147:16, 147:18, | several [13] - 26:16, | 03:10, 237:14, |
| schoeppner [1] - | secure [1]-22: | 147:23, 162:19 | 70:13, 102:9, 128:9 | 252:11, 278:11, |
| 172:18 | security [2]-360:9, | 294:12, 314:18 | $138: 17,214: 10$ | $98: 6,305: 25$ |
| SCHOEPPNER [3] | 362:2 | [2] - | $\text { 245:20, } 251$ | showed [7] - 32:11 |
| 4:19, 176:1, 183:19 | see [62]-20:22, | 154:13, 197:1 | 285:11, 303:6, 309:3, | 38:13, 128:11, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 37 \end{aligned}$ | separated | $363$ | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 15,203: 22 \\ & 229: 11,341: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| school [3] - 169:19, | 57:2, 57:5, 57:6, | 179:9 | sewer [2]-197:19, | showing [9]- |
| 291:2, 340:2 | 57 | 18] - | 197:2 | 193:11, 228:2 |
| Schumann | 73:13, 76:16, 77:16 | 36:19, 37:2, 37:25 | ually [1] - 348:16 | 231:22, 244:19, |
| 287:19, 287:22, | 79:7, 79:11, 92:9, | 67:9, 70:22, 74:14, | shaking [1] - 79:11 | 271:11, 272:16, |
| 287:23, 288:6, | 101:9, 101:16 | 79:16, 79:22, 79:24 | shall [8] - 130:4 | 272:19, 311:13, 318:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 288:20, 289:6 } \\ & \text { science [4]-214:16, } \\ & 214: 17,243: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101: 18,109: 21 \\ & 111: 17,134: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 80:1, 80:5, 168:1, $241: 5,307: 9,307: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:13, } 175: 21, \\ & \text { 186:12, 242:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shown [3]-15:1, } \\ & 269: 22,353: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 148:20, 168:12, | sequences [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:12, 242:18, } \\ & 249: 7,255: 11,3 \end{aligned}$ | shows [3] - 210: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 284:25 } \\ & \text { scientific [3] - 220:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 184:8, 186:4, 186:5, } \\ & \text { 191:25, 192:23, } \\ & \text { 193:18, 193:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 300:19 } \\ & \text { serial }[1]-223: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { shallow [9]-238:1, } \\ \text { 238:24, 239:5, 239:8, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 225:25, 278:21 } \\ & \text { shriner [1] - } 358: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 195:22, 196:8, 197:2, | 197:9, 201:18, | $307: 25,352: 2,354: 13$ | shut [2] - 194:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 253: 19 \\ & \text { scientist }[4]-222: 5 \\ & 244: 2,247: 6,269: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $223: 14,224: 6$, $229: 21,238: 13$, | 223:10, 243:22, <br> $308 \cdot 25$ | shape [2] - 41:10, | 194:9 |
|  | $2$ | $308$ | $41$ | sic [1]-62:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 244:2, 247:6, 269:10 } \\ & \text { scientists [1] - } 341: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 282:14, 283:8, | serious [1] - 101:7 seriously [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { share }[3]-15: 15, \\ & 341: 16,347: 3 \end{aligned}$ | sic) [1] - 119:5 <br> sickness [1]-46.23 |
| scope [1] - 207:11 | $294: 13,311: 10$ | $304: 14,352: 11$ | sharing [2] - 26: | $\text { side }[8]-31: 16,80: 2,$ |
| screaming [1] - | 311:12, 320:19 | served [5] - 213:20, | 40:22 | 126:13, 126:14, |
| 345:7 | 321:16, 322:16, | 214:2, 214:19, | Shawsville [1] - 3:11 | 198:9, 307:3, 354:19, |
| screen [1] - 186:4 se [2]-291:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 328: 6,331: 5,334: 14 \\ & 334: 22.343: 11 . \end{aligned}$ | $214: 21,348: 12$ | sheep [7] - 39:2, | $363: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { se [2]-291 } \\ & 325: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $358: 10,359: 14,$ | serves [1] - 253:1 <br> service [1] - 213: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:17, 215:5, 236:C } \\ & \text { 236:11. 281:4, } 281 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { side-blotched [1] - } \\ & 354: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 362:12, 366:4, 367:21 } \\ \text { seeing [8] - 267:15, } \end{gathered}$ | Service [1] - 27:18 | sheet [1] - 330:8 | $\text { sides }[3]-14: 4,$ |
| 316:17seamseam | $269: 2,286: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Services [2] - 23:18, } \\ & \text { 130:22 } \end{aligned}$ | Sheet [1]-8:22 | 16:24, 291:6 |
|  | 286:21, 309:22, | services [3] - 121:20, | $\text { 13:6, } 197: 9$ | $288: 24,289: 8,330: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 316:18 } \\ & \text { seats }[1]-211: 5 \\ & \text { second }[16]-69: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 318: 3,318: 10,333: 5 \\ \text { seem [1] }-239: 21 \\ \text { sees }[1]-309: 11 \\ \text { seldom }[3]-44: 2, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:11, } 133: 10 \\ & \text { session }[1]-330: 5 \\ & \text { set }[14]-21: 16,86: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { shelter }[1]-334: 19 \\ \text { sheriff }[4]-360: 6, \\ 360: 7,360: 14,362: 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sign-in }[3]-12: 6, \\ & 13: 6,330: 8 \\ & \text { signature }[2]- \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 74:19, 88:24, 94:16, } \\ & \text { 107:19, 187:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $44: 6,69: 8$ | 161:14, 178:15, | Sheriff's [1]-22:2 | 101:22, 127:24 |
|  | Selected [1] - 8:16 | 185:18, 185:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shift [2] - 115:3, } \\ & 116: 20 \end{aligned}$ | signatures [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 195:1, 203:21, 230:2, } \\ & \text { 234:15, 256:21, } \end{aligned}$ | self [1] - 247:8 | $314: 1,321: 2$ | shiner [7] - 354:13 | signed [10] - 12:4 |
|  | sell [1] - 166:8 | 351:12, 368:21 | 354:14, 354:15, | 12:5, 66:2, 127:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 365: 5,369: 12 \\ & \text { secondary }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | selling [1] - 137:16 semiannually [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sets }[1]-11: 11 \\ & \text { setting }[1]-239: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 357: 1,358: 1,358: 9 \\ \text { shiners }[1]-359: 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:7, 230:23, } \\ & \text { 287:19, 288:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 340:24 | 120:19 | settings [4]-259:16, | ship [1] - 139:6 | $289: 4,328: 16$ |
| SECRETARY [1] - | send [4]-188:23, | 259:18, 259:19, | shipped [1]-76:4 | significance [1] - |
| $1: 2$ <br> Secretary [13] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200:7, 341:12, 342:13 } \\ & \text { Send [1] - 7:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $336: 24$ | Shirley [1] - 8:7 | 216:8 |
|  | sense [3]-277:8 | settle [2]-67:13, | shocked [2]- | significant [9] - $154: 9,154: 12,21$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 18,20: 15,20: 17, \\ & 82: 5,222: 2,253: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 318:9, 349:14 | 67:24 <br> settling [5] - 36:10 | 347:21, 348:25 <br> short [5] - 86:1 | 238:13, 239:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:5, 222:2, 253:5, } \\ & \text { 254:20, 258:14, } \end{aligned}$ | sensibilities [1] | 37:2, 68:19, 174:23 | 166:4, 257:21, 304:3, | 239:18, 279:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 259: 2,259: 6,259: 24 \\ & 260: 1,260: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 3 \\ & \text { sen! } \end{aligned}$ | 310:18 | 358:17 | $280: 4,284: 10$ <br> significantly [5] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 260:1, 260:2 } \\ & \text { Section [11] - 36:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 187:25 | 41:11, 41:16, 41:17, | shorthand [1] | 174:13, 174:16, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Section [11] - 36:13, } \\ 38: 20,77: 5,100: 17, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sent }[1]-248: 13 \\ & \text { sent }[7]-17: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $65: 10,68: 3,106: 17$ | 372:8 | $177: 6,236: 11,318: 13$ |
| 176:22, 230:24, | $30: 10,54: 2,88: 3$ | 358:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shortly [3]-199:10, } \\ & \text { 234:24. 301:6 } \end{aligned}$ | silty [1] - 306:11 |
| 287:24, 294:11, | 217:11, 304:21, | seven-and-a-half [1] | $\text { shot }[1]-332: 1$ | silvery [1] - 354:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 314: 13 \\ & \text { section [5] - 35:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $326: 13$ | $-65: 10$ | show [12] - 18:23, | similar [22] - 18:19, |
|  |  | seven-mile [1] - | $39: 20,55: 4,99: 24,$ |  |
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| 336:10, 336:12, | 6:12, | 50:15, 150:23, 193: | g | 223:16, 223:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 336:23, 337:8, | 94:2, 212:12, 276:17 | 195:19, 196:20 | 38:12, 46:1, 344:2 | 8:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 337: 18,338: 5, \\ & 338: 11,338: 17, \end{aligned}$ | ower [1] - 3:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 269: 8,286: 21 \\ & 290: 17,319: 7 \end{aligned}$ | turns [1] - 199:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 251: 9,251: 11 \\ & 256: 13,263: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 43:13, 347 | 196:25, 345 | tremendo | 354 | 63:19, 269:2 |
| 349:13, 352 |  | 44 |  | 2, 288:2 |
| 364:16, 367:14 | 37 | ial [1] - 245:12 | twice [2]-44:23 | 290:25, 309:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 368:12 } \\ & \text { today's }[3]-174: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $93: 18,186: 18,204: 2,$ | Tribunal [1]-177 tried [3] - 197:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:14 } \\ & \text { twisting [1] - 342:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { typical }[6]-36: 18, \\ 37: 6,37: 15,60: 21, \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 336: 7,351: 10 \\ & \text { together }[7]-66: 12, \\ & \text { 125:17, 127:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 219:20, } 222: 15 \\ & \text { toxic [16] - } 36: 14, \\ & 90: 6,90: 7,183: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:16, 207:20 } \\ & \text { tries }[1]-308: 5 \\ & \text { trim }[2]-116: 5, \\ & 116: 9 \\ & \text { trimming }[3]-116: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { two [69] - 11:10, } \\ \text { 13:13, 13:21, 31:11, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 195:9, 224:5 } \\ & \text { typically [13]-37:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 6,90: 7,183: 2, \\ & \text { 183:5, 183:8, 183:14, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 32:15, 34:7, 36:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:25, 184:14, } \\ & \text { 250:15, 251:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $347: 3,347: 4$ <br> tomorrow [13]-11:4, | 183:5, 183:8, 183:14, <br> 183:16, 224:20, <br> 295:16, 296:2, 296:6, |  | $43: 7,43: 8,46: 8 \text {, }$ | 257:15, 259:14, |
| tomorrow [13] - 11:4, 14:21, 359:17, <br> 361:11, 362:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 295:16, 296:2, 296:6, } \\ & \text { 296:8, 298:7, 338:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $116: 7,116: 8$ | 67:9, 67:14, 67:18, | 301:25, 306:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 361: 11,362: 10 \\ & 364: 16,364: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 296:8, 298:7, 338:6, } \\ & 338: 24 \\ & \text { toxicity [1] - 218:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trouble }[3]-33: 4 \\ & 146: 6,198: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 19,68: 20,75: 2 \\ & 78: 12,78: 20,79: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 310: 9,319: 9 \\ & \text { typo }[1]-147: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 366: 2,368: 12, \\ & 368: 16,368: 18,370: 4 \end{aligned}$ | toxicity ${ }_{[1]}-218: 24$ toxicologist [2] - |  | 22, 101:12, |  |
|  | toxicologist [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:6, 198:25 } \\ & \text { truck }[8]-198: 6, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| ton [2] - 41:16, 236:2 <br> tonight [11] - 12:9, <br> 12:17, 14:20, 359:17, | $157: 16,219: 5,294: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:8, 198:9, 199: } \\ & \text { 199:17, 199:23, } \end{aligned}$ 199:24. 200:15 | $126: 4,126: 1$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12: 17,14: 20,359: 17, \\ & 360: 2,361: 10, \\ & 362: 22,363: 7,363: 9 \end{aligned}$ | trace [1] - 55:7 <br> tracked [1]-207 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:24, } 200: 15 \\ & \text { trucking }[1]-48: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 181:12, 193:3, 199:6, | $48: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 362: 22,363: 7,363: 9 \\ & 364: 8,370: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{tracked}[1]-207 \\ & \operatorname{tract}_{[1]}-45: 6 \end{aligned}$ traditional [2] - | true [20] - 21:13, | 234:10, 241:3, 241:4, | imately [3] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 364: 8,370: 9 \\ & \text { tons [2]-192:14, } \\ & 235: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  | 132:4, 149:21, | 245:5, 245:10, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 222:2, 257:4, 259:24 } \\ \text { ultraviolet }[1]-263: 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| 235:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{traffic}[1]-29: 9^{\text {Trahan }[1]-211: 24} \\ & \text { trained }[2]-220: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 151:13, 163:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 245: 21,266: 15 \\ & \text { 292:14, 295:21 } \end{aligned}$ | unanimously [1] - |
| 112:12, 116:13,128:10, 162:9, |  | 200:19, 231:6, | 300:18, 312:7, 313:9, | 196:24 |
|  | 249:25 | 244:14, 254:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 321: 8,323: 21,324: 5, \\ & 325: 11,325: 17, \end{aligned}$ | unaware [3] - 90:7, $146: 25,183: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:22, 196:14, } \\ & \text { 200:15, 208:18, } \\ & \text { 223:23, 224:1, } 279: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trainers }[1]-53: 20 \\ & \text { training }[7]-53: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 292:5, 297:20, 298:9, $367: 17,369: 11,372: 9$ | $326: 5,326: 7,33$ | uncertain [1] - 368:8 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 2,121: 22,122: 6, \\ & \text { 169:19, 190:11, } \end{aligned}$ | truth [7]-252:10, <br> $253 \cdot 6,281 \cdot 20,288 \cdot 8$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 339: 11,348: 12, \\ 355: 2,364: 1,364: 15, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \text { uncertainty [1] - } \\ & \text { 238:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 18:14, 119:16, |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 329:17, 329:18 } \\ \text { truthful }[1]-329: 12 \end{array}$ | $365: 5,368: 10$ | unchanged [1] |
| 120:13, 131:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 268:20 } \\ & \text { TRANSCRIPT }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  | two-day [1] - 365:5 | 180:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 313: 20,331: 4,331: 5 \\ & \text { topic }[1]-14: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 1:12 transcript [9] - | try [12] - 94:15, | type [42] - 28:23 | unconscious [2] |
|  | $12: 21,12: 24,13:$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:25, } 161: \\ & \text { 192:13, 212: } \end{aligned}$ | $54: 16,67: 9,69: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:9, } 345: 8 \\ & \text { under [60] - 19:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| topog [1] - 119:20 |  | $233: 15,292$ | 71:21, 72:4, 75:12, |  |
| topogging [1] | 329:24, 329:25 | 306:14, 306:1 | 81:2, 115:8, 117:2 | 23:7, 57:17, 60:15 |
| 119:21 <br> topography [1] | 372:7, 372:9 <br> transmission | $\begin{gathered} 308: 8,346: 25,370: 15 \\ \text { Try }[1]-230: 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 22,180: 17, \\ & 180: 22,181: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:10, 79:15, 81:1 } \\ & \text { 83:11, 101:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:16 } \\ & \text { total }[11]-83: 5 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { trying [22] }-41: 2, \\ 60: 13,65: 25,100: 12, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 222: 24,222: 25 \\ & 224: 7,235: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:22, 131:7, 145:5, } \\ & \text { 159:3, 159:14, 173:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 83:23, 129:2, 167:10,263:16, 279:4, | $141: 18,272: 4$ <br> transportation [2] - | 107:18, 123:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 239: 20,239: 21, \\ & \text { 241:18, 262:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:2, 183:2, 187:2, } \\ & \text { 191:18, 198:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 142:25, 143:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 241:18, 262:11, } \\ & \text { 262:17, 262:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 199:2, 205:24, |
| 301:22, 301:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:13, 139:4 } \\ & \text { transported [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $160$ | 263:9, 263:14, 271:3, | 211:11, 213:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 301:24 } \\ & \text { totalling }[1]-352: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 315: 7,346: 16 \\ & \text { travel [3]-361:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 227:24, 232:15, } \\ & \text { 267:22, 272:2, 292:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 277:14, 290:3, } \\ & \text { 295:13, 295:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 216:19, 221:7, } \\ & \text { 222:18, 225:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 295:13, 295:14, } \\ & \text { 299:6, 305:6, 305:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 222:18, 225:8, } \\ & \text { 226:22, 253:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| touched [1] - 348:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 366: 2,370: 1 \\ & \text { treat }[1]-193: 12 \\ & \text { treated }[2]-294: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 309: 24,343: 11, \\ & 347: 7,348: 10,358: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 305:15, 307:19, | 253:25, 257:1, 257:9, 257:10. 258:5, 258:7. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 348: 4 \\ & \text { tough }[1]-277: 11 \\ & \text { tourists }[2]-345: 14, \end{aligned}$ |  | turn [6] - 39:24, 41:4, |  | 258:8, 261:1, 264:14 |
|  | 336:15 $\text { treating }[2]-26: 21 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:3, 261:21, 346:18, } \\ & 347: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $37: 20,37: 21,46:$ | 267:4, 287:16, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:14 } \\ & \text { treatment }[12]- \\ & 39: 21,44: 15,47: 15, \end{aligned}$ | turned [5] - 192:5 | 80:21, 131:10, | 4, 294:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 355:11 } \\ & \text { toward [1] - 188:6 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 193:7, 197:2, 198:9, | 168:11, 170:13, | 298:15, 307:6, 319:8, |
|  |  | 208:22 | 218:9, 219:24, | 332:3, 335:12, 339:5, |
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