## **Ottawa Light Rail Commission**

Stephen Lennerton on Thursday, May 19, 2022



77 King Street West, Suite 2020 Toronto, Ontario M5K 1A1

neesonsreporting.com | 416.413.7755

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	OTTAWA LIGHT RAIL COMMISSION
7	ATU LOCAL 279/ALSTOM - STEPHEN LENNERTON
8	MAY 19, 2022
9	
10	
11	
12	Held via Zoom Videoconferencing, with all
13	participants attending remotely, on the 19th day of
14	May, 2022, 3:00 p.m. to 6:31 p.m.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

COMMISSION COUNSEL:
Emily Young, Litigation Counsel Member
Fraser Harland, Litigation Counsel Member
PARTICIPANTS:
Stephen Lennerton, Alstom
Jaime Lefebvre, Jewitt McLuckie & Associates LLP
ALSO PRESENT:
Joanne Lawrence, Stenographer/Transcriptionist
Benjamin Bilgen, Virtual Technician

1 -- Upon commencing at 3:00 p.m. 2 EMILY YOUNG: So I'll just start today 3 by giving a brief introduction about the purpose 4 and parameters of the interview. 5 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Uh-huh. 6 EMILY YOUNG: The purpose of today's 7 interview is to obtain your evidence, under oath or 8 solemn declaration, for use at the Commission's 9 public hearings. This will be a collaborative 10 interview such that my co-counsel, Mr. Harland, may 11 intervene to ask certain questions. If time 12 permits, your counsel may also ask follow-up 13 questions at the end of the interview. 14 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Uh-huh. 15 EMILY YOUNG: The interview is being 16 transcribed, and the Commission intends to enter 17 this transcript into evidence at the Commission's 18 public hearings. Either at the hearings or by way 19 of procedural order before the hearings commence. 20 The transcript will be posted to the 21 Commission's public website along with any 22 corrections made to it after it is entered into 23 evidence. The transcript, along with any 24 corrections later made to it, will be shared with 25 the Commission's participants and their counsel on

Т

1	a confidential basis before being entered into
2	evidence. You will be given the opportunity to
3	review your transcript and correct any typos or
4	other errors before the transcript is shared with
5	the participants or entered into evidence.
6	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Okay.
7	EMILY YOUNG: Any non-typographical
8	corrections made will be appended at the end of the
9	transcript.
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Okay.
11	EMILY YOUNG: Pursuant to Section 33
12	(6) of the Public Inquiries Act 2009:
13	"A witness at an inquiry shall
14	be deemed to have objected to answer
15	any question asked him or her upon
16	the ground that his or her answer
17	may tend to incriminate the witness
18	or may tend to establish his or her
19	liability to civil proceedings at
20	the instance of the Crown or of any
21	person, and no answer given by a
22	witness at an inquiry shall be used
23	or be receivable in evidence against
24	him or her in any trial or other
25	proceedings against him or her

1	thereafter taking place, other than
2	a prosecution for perjury in giving
3	such evidence."
4	As required by Section 33(7) of that Act, you are
5	hereby advised that you have the right to object to
6	answer any question under Section 5 of the Canada
7	Evidence Act.
8	And the last thing is that if you need
9	a break at any point, just let us know and we'll
10	take one. But we usually try to take one about
11	halfway through, so for this interview, that will
12	be around 4:30.
13	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Okay.
14	EMILY YOUNG: So to start,
15	Mr. Lennerton, could you briefly describe your
16	educational and professional background for us.
17	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well,
18	education-wise, I just have high school. But
19	experience-wise and my background, I've been in a
20	lot of construction situations; I did a lot of
21	telecommunications; I have a very strong mechanical
22	background and, more specifically, in hydraulics,
23	which is what led me to work at Alstom.
24	Other than that, it's pretty much like
25	I'm a you show me it once and I get it done kind

1 of thing, so that's how I go about my jobs. 2 EMILY YOUNG: And at a fairly high 3 level for now, could you tell us how you were 4 involved in Stage 1 of the Ottawa LRT project. 5 STEPHEN LENNERTON: When you say 6 "Stage 1," are you referring to the production part 7 of it? 8 EMILY YOUNG: Referring to the 9 construction process of the Confederation Line and 10 as well as the opening and operations of that line 11 as well. As opposed to the extension. 12 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Okay. So -- okay. 13 So I started off in production approximately a year 14 to a year and a half into when the project had 15 I started out as a production technician, started. 16 which was a very general job statement. I had a 17 pretty -- I ended up being in a pretty specific 18 position, which still fell under production 19 technician. 20 I just started off working on 21 connectors and stuff until I learned the train. 22 And then once I was able to show that I had a very 23 strong mechanical background and hydraulic 24 background, I was put into working on the trains 25 once they were finished and they were being turned

6

1	on and we needed to make sure that they were
2	working and all the mechanical things that needed
3	to be done in order for it to be able to go for a
4	dynamic test was what my primary focus was.
5	EMILY YOUNG: And those roles were both
6	for Alstom?
7	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So well, so
8	that's in production, that's kind of, like, a
9	grey area. So production brought in a company
10	called Randstad, which is basically like a
11	third-party hiring company. This was basically
12	like they were there to be the ones that give care
13	to us kind of thing. Like a from a union point,
14	like, when they come in, they try to figure out who
15	gives care to the actual employee to see who's
16	responsible for them.
17	So there was a middle man between us,
18	so I actually worked for a company called Randstad,
19	but everything I wore, all my identification,
20	everything I did, all the rules I followed were for
21	Alstom. So that's pretty much how that
22	relationship worked. Like, I would go to Randstad
23	for a complaint, and they were to apply it to
24	Alstom that that actually happened. Never did I
25	actually it wasn't until I was in maintenance

1	that I was officially an Alstom employee.
2	EMILY YOUNG: And when you were working
3	for Randstad on construction of the vehicles, were
4	you receiving instructions from Alstom to do your
5	work?
6	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. Everything
7	came all the micros came from Alstom's
8	engineering team. Pretty much anything to do with
9	the train itself was from Alstom. The only time
10	where Randstad would really step in was, like, HR
11	concerns, let's say, or if there were, you know,
12	attendance issues and stuff like that.
13	EMILY YOUNG: And when, Mr. Lennerton,
14	you talked about working on the trains when they
15	were finished to prepare them for dynamic testing,
16	would that be considered the static testing phase?
17	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So yeah, they would
18	have, like, a static test where the train would be
19	turned on, we'd test all the electronics, and while
20	they were doing that, I was getting basically
21	the like, the gear boxes ready. So the bogies
22	didn't come to us complete, so my production part
23	was to install all of the gear boxes, the calipers,
24	the HPUs, all the fixings that go with it to
25	connect everything. And then I would actually make

1	them function, so I would have to flush them and
2	insert like, put the hydraulic fluid into it,
3	make sure they were all functioning. That was more
4	of my production side of it, and then the actual
5	function part of it was where I would do some
6	static testing, where it was basically visually
7	seeing that it's functioning properly and relaying
8	that information to the test team so that they
9	could confirm that they were safe to actually go
10	out on the track and not have brake issues.
11	EMILY YOUNG: Okay. And can you tell
12	us you said you started in production about a
13	year to a year and a half after the project
14	started. Would that have been 2014? Do you
15	remember the year?
16	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. It would have
17	been, like well, maybe it's a little bit longer
18	than that. I'm terrible with time. I'm pretty
19	sure it's around 2017, 2018 is when I joined.
20	EMILY YOUNG: Okay. And at what point
21	did you switch to the role where you were doing
22	involved in the static testing?
23	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So it how do I
24	explain that? I never actually changed roles.
25	Like, my job title never changed. So Randstad

1 controlled that, as in everybody was, like, equal, 2 so everybody had the same job description. It was 3 just that I was put at a different part of the 4 production process where I didn't sit at a table 5 and install wiring harnesses to the roof or 6 anything like that. The train was always 7 constructed or finished being put together when I 8 started to actually work on it.

9 So it was more or less like I went into 10 that position because it was -- at the time that I 11 was there, it was their weakest point. Like, they 12 were -- they were behind the most in that point. 13 And because I have such a strong ability to do it, 14 they placed me there, and that's where I stayed. Τ 15 was actually on a team called the retrofit team, if 16 that makes it a little bit clearer. Still under a 17 production technician job title to the -- like, for 18 instance, to the labour board or something like 19 that, but I was on a team, a retrofit team.

EMILY YOUNG: And you mentioned that you were joining it when you were -- when -- and, sorry, to help with the weakest point that was behind.

STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. I wanted to
 make a really big, positive impact. I was tired of

1	listening to it on the radio, like, failing, so I
2	wanted to do what I could to help there, and I was
3	extremely interested in these machines. They had
4	never been built anywhere else in the world, and so
5	the opportunity to pioneer the things that I got to
6	pioneer was very, very interesting to me and
7	exciting - a lot of learning, a lot of learning
8	with that whole project. So that's what really
9	intrigued me.
10	EMILY YOUNG: And do you know why that
11	part was far behind?
12	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, the
13	willingness to do it, really. The job that I was
14	doing was extremely physically demanding, so when
15	you're being paid the amount that we were paid at
16	the time, it was very difficult to get somebody who
17	was, you know, in their early 20s to actually be
18	motivated enough to push our pace so that we could
19	actually keep up with things.
20	So, for example, when I got there, to
21	put on a single unit, to put all of the things
22	that I told you on the train, it took three people
23	2 and a half weeks, roughly, to do it, which meant
24	we couldn't sell the train until it was done, so
25	that would take 2 and a half weeks per train. And

1	I was able to complete it in 5 days, so that bumped
2	us up to being able to sell a train every 5 days,
3	which is what pushed us to actually meet the
4	deadlines that we were falling back on. I actually
5	caught up with the production team over an 8-week
6	period. I was able to beat a team of approximately
7	100 people just by myself, which was also extremely
8	fun, and it made it a challenge in the shop for
9	everyone. Like, everyone wanted to beat me, so it
10	was fun.
11	EMILY YOUNG: And when did you
12	transition from that role into the role where you
13	were directly working for Alstom? And it sounds
14	like you were working for Alstom maintenance?
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes, so I joined
16	the MVT team, which was the carrot at the end of
17	the stick, so to speak, for the production in
18	production. So the entire thing of production, we
19	were told at the end of this, you would get this
20	MVT team, so approximately I think it was, like,
21	in July I can't even remember the dates off the
22	top of my head right now. I'm pretty sure I
23	submitted that information. But it was a couple of
24	months after they had or actually it would have
25	been almost a year after they had actually started

1 hiring people for it, but there was this dormant 2 time before the trains were actually handed over. 3 So the maintenance people that were hired just 4 actually basically sat there and did computer 5 things, like -- what would you call it? Like. б where they learn about, like, management behaviour 7 and, like, their behaviour and stuff like that in 8 the workplace. So I was held back -- I willingly 9 stayed back from that hiring procedure to finish 10 things that needed to be done in production before I switched over. I don't know if that directly 11 12 answers the question or not. Sorry.

EMILY YOUNG: No, it -- that helps a
 lot. It sounds like you would have, I assume,
 switched over around when service was starting.

16 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. It was much 17 closer to that because my -- my skill set was 18 required right up basically until the last day. So 19 I was approached by two people from the validation 20 team who asked me, you know, if you want to, you 21 can be hired to maintenance right now - I would 22 have been number 3 or 4 in seniority at the time -23 and then they said, or we would really love your 24 help with this brake project, which is going to 25 take approximately 2 months, and I willingly said I

1	will help you with it because that's, at that
2	point, what I was there to do. I didn't want to
3	have unfinished work. And to be honest with you,
4	if I didn't do it, we would have had even more
5	problems into maintenance, and I thought I'm not
6	going to set myself up for a headache, so I agreed
7	to it.
8	EMILY YOUNG: Right.
9	FRASER HARLAND: Just for the record,
10	to jump in, you mentioned MBT [sic]. Can you tell
11	us what
12	STEPHEN LENNERTON: MVT, yeah.
13	FRASER HARLAND: And can you tell us
14	what that stands for?
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: It's maintenance
16	vehicle technician.
17	EMILY YOUNG: Thank you. And how long
18	did you stay in that role as a maintenance vehicle
19	technician?
20	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I want to say,
21	like, close to 2 years. It's hard for me to give
22	an exact time. I don't really remember dates very
23	well. And the way that I left was not exactly,
24	like it was an like, as a it was a really
25	negative way that left. Like, I was basically

1 pushed out the door, in my own opinion, so it 2 wasn't exactly something that I try to remember all 3 the time. 4 EMILY YOUNG: That's fair enough. Do 5 you remember, like, the year? 6 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, it would have 7 been approximately a year ago from now. I've been 8 over -- a little over a year I've been away from 9 I just -- I personally have no physical there. 10 record of that date, so I don't want to necessarily 11 want to say a date because I can't give you an 12 exact one. 13 EMILY YOUNG: That's fine. That's no 14 problem. And you're a member of ATU Local 279? 15 I was at the time. STEPHEN LENNERTON: 16 I'm no longer a member of that. After -- a year 17 after you leave, you are no longer a member. 18 EMILY YOUNG: And that union -- correct 19 me if I'm wrong on anything here. That union 20 represents OC Transpo operators? 21 STEPHEN LENNERTON: On the bus side, 22 I believe -- from the information I was ves. 23 given, I'm pretty sure they represent all the city 24 bus drivers, yeah, for OC Transpo. 25 EMILY YOUNG: And do you know if they

1	represent any other OC Transpo workers?
2	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not to my
3	knowledge, no.
4	EMILY YOUNG: And obviously they
5	represent at least some Alstom workers?
б	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes, specifically
7	the MVT team. And I I'm not 100 percent sure,
8	but I think there may be other entities there that
9	they have, but I was not made aware of that. But I
10	know for sure that the specific MVT team, which I'm
11	assuming is approximately around 18 people, is who
12	they represent.
13	EMILY YOUNG: But they don't
14	represent or they didn't represent the
15	production technicians?
16	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. We didn't have
17	a union at the time. At the very end of
18	production, people in production actually contacted
19	a union and tried to make it a union, and now in
20	Toronto now, from what I understand, they are
21	unionized, as far as I've been told, due to the
22	process that's been going on.
23	EMILY YOUNG: Would that be in the
24	facility in Brampton?
25	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I believe so, yes.

1 That was where they were trying to get a lot of 2 people -- I was requested to go there and stuff 3 like that, so I think that's the one. 4 EMILY YOUNG: And when you were a part 5 of the union, what was your involvement with the 6 union like? 7 STEPHEN LENNERTON: The union was 8 I was actually -- just before I left, awesome. 9 like, the day that I went into resign, Jason 10 actually contacted me, and he was in the process of 11 setting me up to be shop steward. So they were 12 very interested in me being able to help out in 13 that aspect due to the problems that we were having 14 with management at the time. 15 EMILY YOUNG: And who is Jason? 16 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Jason would be my 17 union rep, I believe is his proper title. 18 EMILY YOUNG: Do you remember his last 19 name? 20 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not off the top of 21 my head, no, sorry. 22 EMILY YOUNG: Okay. No problem. Mavbe 23 your counsel can come back to us on that point. 24 And I'll just note, for the record, 25 that Ms. Lefebvre is nodding her head.

1	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I'm sure she knows
2	his last name. She's aware of him too from from
3	when we have spoken previously.
4	EMILY YOUNG: We can't hear you,
5	Ms. Lefebvre. I'm not sure if something is going
6	on with your mic. Okay.
7	Mr. Lennerton, do you remember when
8	Alstom workers joined the union?
9	STEPHEN LENNERTON: In production or in
10	the maintenance part?
11	EMILY YOUNG: Your MVT team.
12	STEPHEN LENNERTON: It was always in
13	that was from Day 1, so that agreement was made
14	prior to even hiring anyone. So they it was
15	always known that we were going to be a part of
16	this union. I think it has to do with the fact
17	that the trains are technically owned by OC Transpo
18	or the City in some way, so they were automatically
19	already going to take part in that.
20	EMILY YOUNG: Okay. And would the MVT
21	team have been its own separate bargaining unit?
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I don't know.
23	That's too in depth in the this. I wouldn't
24	have cared to pay attention to that. I was more
25	worried about working on the trains.

Т

1	EMILY YOUNG: And so you mentioned that
2	it was always known that the MVT team would join
3	the union, but it sounds like it wasn't always
4	known for all Alstom workers. Can you speak a
5	little bit about why other Alstom workers wanted to
6	join the union.
7	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, in production
8	it was a different union, not the local one with
9	Jason, and they wanted to join just because a lot
10	of people on the floor felt they were being very
11	mistreated by what was going on. One of the
12	biggest issues there was our pay. Randstad took
13	almost \$10 over the top of our pay, so every hour
14	you worked, you're paying somebody that's not
15	really doing much of anything for you, so they
16	would get pretty upset about it.
17	There was a lot of people that looked
18	at the now instead of the future. I was more
19	focussed on getting to maintenance, which was the
20	career thing, so I didn't really care what they

<sup>21</sup> were paying me at the time. I just knew that I
<sup>22</sup> needed to make these trains work so that I could
<sup>23</sup> have a job later.

EMILY YOUNG: Okay. And why did you
 end up resigning from the maintenance team?

1 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, that's a big 2 There was a lot of stuff. Morals was question. 3 one of them, but I was very badly deceived by 4 Alstom at the very end by the operations manager 5 and the vehicle maintenance manager. One of the б biggest deceptions was is they actually -- how do I 7 explain this guickly? There's a flush cart that we 8 use to make the brakes work, and this flush cart 9 did not come assembled for us to be able to attach 10 it to the train, so they had requested me to do it 11 because I had previously done this type of work to 12 another flush cart that was in production. Under 13 the union rules, I'm not supposed to work on 14 machinery that's used on the train. Somebody 15 that's technically qualified for that should. 16

So I had contacted Jason and asked 17 them, you know, they're asking me to do this; am I 18 allowed to do it? I'm a stickler for rules. Т 19 follow the rules. So Jason said no, that's not 20 your job. I could observe and give information to 21 somebody else to do it, but I wasn't allowed to 22 physically do the job. So when the manager 23 contacted me and asked me to go over and do it, I 24 said, well, the union is saying no, and I am 25 100 percent willing to do it, but you have to speak

1 to the union. The union has to give permission. 2 He then went and contacted the union 3 almost right away, from what I remember. And 4 later -- I think it was either the next day or the 5 day after or my next shift, sorry, and he told me б that the union had said it was okay to do it, so I 7 willingly went over to do it. It was something I 8 was very interested in and wanted to do. I went 9 over there and did the job. 10 And then later on, I found out from 11 Jason that he had not given permission to the 12 manager for me to do that and that they had lied to 13 me, and then now I had done something against my 14 union technically. Not that the union was upset 15 with me or willing to take any action against me, 16 but I was very, very upset that I had been tricked 17 into breaking the rules, especially with also 18 being -- you know, Alstom is very big on having to 19 follow the rules, and then they broke them. 20 And then to compile on that, the 21 other -- the maintenance vehicle manager had 22 contacted me for overtime, telling me that I needed 23 to come in to change calipers and to flush them. 24 This would be task-specific overtime, meaning he's 25 able to skip the people ahead of me in -- in

<sup>1</sup> seniority and ask me specifically because, at this <sup>2</sup> time, I was the only one in the building that could <sup>3</sup> do this. And I willingly said yes, I will come in <sup>4</sup> on my day off, and I will do this for you, because <sup>5</sup> I was always doing favors for them.

And when I got there, they decided this 6 7 was no longer going to be done, and that I was 8 going to go to a different task, which was to fix 9 the sanding injectors, which was not task-specific. 10 So I made a statement to the management that by the 11 rules of my union and to be fair to my union 12 members, you need to go back and call number 1 and 13 then call number 2. And then if they keep refusing 14 until you get to me, then I will either oblige or 15 continue or whatever.

16 I was responded to with I don't get to 17 make the rules, I don't get to make these 18 decisions. Voices started to be raised, a lot of 19 aggressive mannerisms towards me. I was told that 20 I didn't do enough overtime in comparison with the 21 other MVTs. I expressed that I had worked here for 22 many years and there were people that hadn't even 23 worked regular hours that even competed with my 24 overtime yet. Obviously this didn't go over well. 25 In that room, the other manager who had

1 lied to me who I just found out about lying decided 2 to come in and start yelling at me as well, which 3 is why I then informed him that I was aware that he 4 too has lied to me. And at this point, when you 5 had worked for a company that hard and had built such a loyal work relationship with them and you 6 7 were as invested as I was, like, in all aspects to 8 this project, that was crushing to me. Like, that 9 really, really, really affected me. It made it 10 basically impossible for me to basically return and 11 stand in front of these people.

<sup>12</sup> So at that point, I immediately went <sup>13</sup> out and requested 2 weeks of vacation that I had. <sup>14</sup> They granted it immediately, and when I came back, <sup>15</sup> I put my resignation in. It was so bad that I <sup>16</sup> wasn't even able to finish that day. I was so <sup>17</sup> frustrated with the place, and I felt so betrayed <sup>18</sup> that I just left. And that was it.

I did -- actually, sorry, I did have an HR meeting within that, this -- I believe it was the same day that the incident happened, but I actually spoke with Alex L'Homme and the HR lady which I can't remember her name at this time about the incident. And their mannerisms in there showed me that they didn't care about my situation

1 and that they were just there to protect their 2 They were more concerned that other manager. 3 people were going to find out that he had lied 4 instead of actually correcting the problem, which 5 showed me that, you know, the future there was not 6 really bright. So I decided to leave. 7 EMILY YOUNG: Thank you for telling us 8 about that. Other than -- you mentioned that there 9 was a -- a significant issue with pay when you were 10 back in construction, and Randstad was taking guite 11 a bit of your salary. Were there any other --12 STEPHEN LENNERTON: That was the --13 that was the agreement, though -- sorry to 14 interrupt. That was the agreement, though. So I 15 don't -- I don't want it to be depicted as they 16 were stealing or anything. They were taking what 17 was rightfully -- I signed a contract that I agreed 18 to the terms. This was why I really didn't have a 19 problem with it. If you had an issue, then you can 20 quit. You know, nobody's forcing you to work 21 there. But just to make that clear, that they 22 weren't -- they weren't taking something that 23 wasn't theirs. It was part of the agreement. 24 EMILY YOUNG: Were there any other 25 issues that the workers on the construction side

1 were concerned about, that were motivating them to 2 want to unionize? 3 The fact that their STEPHEN LENNERTON: 4 jobs were ending, that was one. Most of it was 5 just money-driven, and unfortunately, at the time, 6 the gentleman that had actually made contact, they 7 were actually being somewhat fooled by the union. 8 The union obviously wanted to get in there and 9 expand themselves. It was some sort of food union. 10 I can't remember the name of it, but they were 11 trying to get a lot more members. 12 I do a lot of research when I get 13 approached, and I looked up some of the stuff and I 14 noticed that they were small, so they wanted to 15 jump onboard with this. This was a big project. 16 So they were saying, you know, you should be making 17 \$30 an hour and all this kind of stuff, and when 18 you're only making \$18 and somebody tells you that, 19 you know, it's pretty motivating for a younger 20 fellow to, you know, go after something like that. 21 And they also -- there was a little bit of, like --22 there were some quarrels between certain people and 23 the management, and it was almost as though there 24 was a little bit of a revenge thing in there. They 25 wanted to take away the power that they had to --

1	you know, with their like, withhold them from
2	making the amount that they felt they should make.
3	EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that the
4	membership of the MVT workers in the union had any
5	impact on the project and operations?
6	STEPHEN LENNERTON: You mean, like, to
7	the quality of the machine, or?
8	EMILY YOUNG: Any impact that you can
9	think of - I mean work environment, quality.
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, so for me
11	personally, one of the things that I noticed - and
12	this was definitely something that other people
13	noticed - was being in that union group and not
14	having the supervisors and the management in the
15	union group, it posed a barrier between us. So
16	basically the supervisor's job is to launch every
17	train every day to avoid penalties, and it's pushed
18	so much on them that it's almost to the point of at
19	any cost, whereas in the union, I'm there to be
20	treated a certain way, I'm there to do my job
21	properly, and I'm there to follow these these
22	rules and instructions. So it created this
23	like, they wanted more control to force us to do
24	more things, but the union stood in the way of them
25	being able to do that. So the union was looked at

1	more as a barrier more by these managers as opposed
2	to something that they would be willing to work
3	with, if that makes if that makes more sense.
4	EMILY YOUNG: That does make sense.
5	And so the people who were in charge of getting the
6	trains out every day were managers?
7	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, supervisors
8	and stuff like that. The MVT's job is to literally
9	go and inspect the train. Unless we're doing a
10	maintenance thing to it like, say, at 150,000
11	kilometres, you do a 150K check. But, for
12	instance, if we were doing an inspection and you
13	found something wrong with the train, we were to
14	report it.
15	We had a different classification of
16	reporting it. You had a P1, P2, P3, and a P4. P1
17	stops the train from going out on the track until
18	it's fixed and the file is closed. So when you go
19	to a manager who's got 11 trains total, and he has
20	to launch 11 trains, which is the agreement at the
21	time, and you tell him one of those trains now
22	can't go out, this is you know, he knows he's
23	going to hear it from his boss. Like, you know,
24	there's penalties, and they you know, whatever
25	they go through behind the scenes to the point

where they would actually manipulate what was in
there so that the train could go out.
They would tell MVTs to, you know,
where rewrite their inspection, or they would just
go on the computer and override your authority and
bump it from a P1 to a P2 so they could launch the
train. And then once the train was out there, it
would have a fault, and then they would say, oh,
look, it happened on the track, and this would
avoid those penalties of not launching the train.
EMILY YOUNG: So there was a lot of
pressure to launch all the trains in the morning?
STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. And in that
instance, when you're making those reports for
instance, I'll use sanders as a problem. If you
found more than two sanders that were not working
in your daily inspection, those trains could not go
out until those were fixed.
So there were numerous times where you
would I would bring a report back and say I
found six of them, and they would literally crumple
up the piece of paper and tell me to write it again
and only write down two sanders. And I would tell
them, you know, that's not happening; like, I don't
break rules like that. That's a safety feature on

refused.

1 the train for braking. You could overshoot your 2 landing. So I was not willing to do that, which is 3 what created more turmoil between us and the 4 management. 5 EMILY YOUNG: And how would management б generally respond to you if you refused to change 7 your report, let's say --8 STEPHEN LENNERTON: They would -- they 9 would definitely get upset with me and express to 10 me that I'm being ridiculous and why don't I just 11 listen to them. Like, they're my boss; you're 12 supposed to listen to me. And in my opinion, like, 13 I have this vast experience with these trains, and 14 this person has just shown up, and they're telling 15 me to break rules that have been embedded in my 16 brain for the last couple of years that I had been 17 working in production. 18 So there would be, you know, I'm your 19 boss; I'm telling you what to do; do it. And I 20 would say, you're telling me to do something that's 21 wrong; I refuse to do it. But the thing is because 22 they were wrong, they would never take it any 23 further. And I don't know how they would get 24 around it after that, but I personally always

I know that there are some MVTs that

Т

1	complied out of fear for their job and stuff.
2	There were a lot of times where people were told
3	they were going to be fired if they didn't comply.
4	So there was some of the people who had come
5	here from, let's say, another country who were
6	unaware of how our rules worked, that would alarm
7	them because maybe in their country that could be
8	done to them, but here they didn't understand that
9	it couldn't. So it would make them make decisions
10	under the wrong type of pressure.
11	EMILY YOUNG: And did you ever see
12	trains that you had classified as having a Pl
13	issue, you would have said this shouldn't go out
14	based on the rules, going out after you had made
15	that report?
16	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Absolutely, yep.
17	That was actually not that was actually more
18	common than it should be. I actually
19	EMILY YOUNG: And do you know what
20	happened?
21	STEPHEN LENNERTON: As for a specific
22	instance, there was a supervisor named
23	Fakah (phonetic), who actually had worked in
24	production prior. I had found a brake failure
25	issue. It wasn't technically a brake failure. It

1	was a leak in the hydraulic line, which if you lose
2	too much hydraulic fluid, this train stops. So I
3	had reported this, and I had made a P1 for it, and
4	he went into the system and changed it to a P2 and
5	launched the train. And then later on, that
6	like, shortly after it was launched, it had a brake
7	failure and came back.
8	EMILY YOUNG: And if a a supervisor
9	or manager had gone in to change your
10	classification, was there anything that you could
11	do about that?
12	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No.
13	EMILY YOUNG: And
14	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, actually,
15	sorry, I could make another report. Like, I could
16	go into the system and make another P1 order, but
17	he could then just do the same thing again. I
18	mean, as far as I know, they could erase it as
19	well. They could completely remove it from the
20	system, as far as I know. I didn't know too much
21	about their end, but it seemed as though they could
22	because stuff was very well hidden.
23	EMILY YOUNG: And was this type of
24	approach present from the start of service, or is
25	it something that developed later?

1 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, yes, more at 2 the beginning than it was later on. So, like, for 3 instance, I used the sanders as an example because 4 they were a very big problem on the train. At the 5 very beginning, almost all the sanders wouldn't 6 work, especially when wintertime came. They're not 7 really -- they don't really function very well in 8 the winter. So when wintertime came, there was a 9 lot of trains who -- that shouldn't be going out 10 because of these sanders, and there was a lot of changes that were made in order to launch the 11 12 There were some nights, to be completely trains. 13 honest with you, that -- there was probably maybe 14 three, four units that should have actually been 15 allowed to go out in the entire fleet, and we still 16 launched the entire fleet. 17 EMILY YOUNG: And how many trains were 18 in the entire fleet at that point? 19 STEPHEN LENNERTON: That were -- well,

<sup>13</sup> STEPHEN LENNERTON: That were -- wert, <sup>20</sup> so we built -- oh, my goodness. I don't remember <sup>21</sup> these numbers now. What train did I stop building? <sup>22</sup> I think we stopped building at Train 36. I'm <sup>23</sup> pretty sure there's 17 -- no, there's 15 to 17 <sup>24</sup> total units.

Sorry, in production, I built them as

1	single units, so once they coupled them together,
2	that scrambled me for numbers, but I believe it's
3	between 15 to 17 working units. The agreement was
4	that we would launch 15. When we were unable to
5	obtain that number, I believe the agreement was
6	changed to 11, and that's what we went off of.
7	EMILY YOUNG: So, Mr. Lennerton, are
8	you aware of the original plan for where the train
9	would be constructed?
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, I knew the
11	first train was constructed somewhere in the
12	States, and then it was transported up here, and
13	that was supposed to be, like, a guideline for us
14	to build the trains after that. That was the
15	original train set 1. That train did not go into
16	service, as far as I can remember.
17	But that was the only other location
18	that I knew of that the trains would be built. And
19	then, obviously, we built them in the facility we
20	were in.
21	EMILY YOUNG: And then we touched on
22	this a bit more. It sounds like there was a a
23	change to move assembly of the trains to Brampton
24	for the Stage 2 trains.
25	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes.

1 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know why that 2 decision was made? 3 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I believe because 4 the facility that we have now would not be able to 5 facilitate all the way up to 72 single units, 6 because I -- I know the whole number was 72 7 single-unit trains were going to be built for the 8 entire project. I believe the rest of them 9 actually go into the Phase 2 part is when they're 10 supposed to be released. So there would be no way 11 for us to facilitate maintenance plus construction 12 of the trains, so that's why they needed to move. 13 I believe that date was actually bumped 14 up, and they moved a little bit sooner than they 15 had planned. And I -- I can't attest to 16 necessarily what that exact reason was, but there 17 was a lot of things said about the fact that the 18 union was trying to come in and take over that they 19 were -- it was kind of an attempt to stop that. 20 EMILY YOUNG: And do you think that 21 that decision, that move of production to Brampton, 22 was helpful? 23 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes and no. It 24 was -- it was because right now you'd be a lot 25 worse off in the -- with the facility you have now

1 because it would be overloaded, but in that 2 process, the people who had been building the 3 trains for the time duration already were the most 4 experienced people in the entire world on these 5 trains, and they got rid of most of them, so the 6 majority of the people in that new facility are 7 literally starting from scratch again. So in a 8 way, that would create a learning curve that would 9 have a negative impact on the project. But at the 10 same time, there were a handful of people that went 11 from production and moved to Brampton to take on 12 positions to help out with this. Like, they -- it 13 was almost like they got to be promoted type of 14 thing.

15 Do you think that the MSF EMILY YOUNG: 16 facility in Ottawa was suitable for train assembly?

STEPHEN LENNERTON: 18 Not even close. The second facility that was 19 built, when you put a train inside of it, you can't 20 even open the side skirts on the train to work on 21 the train. So they have pillars that were built, 22 and they're approximately, like, 3 inches off the 23 side of the train. So when you pull the train in, 24 I'd say about 50 percent of the side skirts that 25 you would open to actually access the mechanics on

Not even close.
1 the train are unaccessible, to -- for one. 2 The other facility is not too bad. Ιt 3 has four bays, so you could have four single units 4 or two coupled units in it, so that was a little 5 bit better. But in my personal opinion, with the 6 amount of trains we have, only being able to facilitate two coupled units in a building, with 7 8 the amount of failures that are happening, it's 9 just not going to keep up. There's just not enough 10 people and not enough room to work on all of them. 11 Can you help us FRASER HARLAND: 12 understand what you mean by "a second facility"? 13 So we know there's the MSF. Was there an 14 additional facility built beside that? 15 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. So MSF 1 is 16 where production took place, and then MSF 2 is the 17 building that was built -- if you're looking at 18 where the shed is where they actually park the 19 trains, it's just a little bit behind that, almost 20 connected to that building. That facility was --21 oh, I can't even -- I don't remember when they 22 started building that or if the building was 23 already there and they put things inside of it, but 24 that was to be the MSF 2. That was originally 25 supposed to be where all the MVTs worked the whole

1	time. That was supposed to be specifically for the
2	MVT team, from what I was told. And then obviously
3	only being able to facilitate one train in there to
4	work on in a bay and then having the wheel lathe
5	like, they can't again, can't really keep up
6	with the amount of things they needed to do. So we
7	were moved back to MSF 1 after production had
8	completely left and then that is where we remain,
9	for the most part.
10	So MSF 2 is mostly used for lathing the
11	wheels. If they need to remove bogies, they have a
12	jack system there that they can do it in. And then
13	there's obviously the bay where they can pull the
14	train in and work on it where it has an overhead
15	catenary system to be able to power the train.
16	EMILY YOUNG: So MSF 1 is where the
17	construction would have been taking place for phase
18	1, or assembly?
19	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. Yes.
20	EMILY YOUNG: Okay. And did you think
21	that MSF 1 was a suitable place for that work to be
22	happening?
23	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, it definitely
24	wasn't designed for that, but I have to tip my hat
25	to the management team in production: They

1	definitely made that facility work as best they
2	could for that situation. It was tight, but it
3	we got the job done in that facility. I wouldn't
4	say that it hindered us to the point of failure.
5	It was not ideal, but it wasn't the most worst
6	thing ever.
7	EMILY YOUNG: And how could you tell
8	that it hadn't been designed for that purpose?
9	STEPHEN LENNERTON: It's not
10	necessarily that I was like, I could well,
11	room, so to speak, but also just that was what we
12	were being told by management. You know, why
13	you'd say, Why are we having this issue? Well, the
14	building wasn't built for this, so we're trying to
15	do this. Also the fact that they had to come in
16	and, you know, put things like, bolt things to
17	the ground to make it so that we could use that
18	area as a station and stuff like that showed that
19	the facility wasn't there, ready to flip chassises
20	over and that kind of thing.
21	EMILY YOUNG: Are you aware of any
22	issues that Alstom encountered in gaining access to
23	the MSF when it wanted access?
24	STEPHEN LENNERTON: To which MSF? MSF
25	1?

Τ

1	EMILY YOUNG: MSF 1, yes.
2	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not not to my
3	knowledge. I had full access of the entire
4	building. Alstom went anywhere they wanted in
5	there. The only time there was any restriction to
6	access is if there was a safety issue.
7	So for instance, if the OCS went down,
8	they may barricade, for safety purposes, a certain
9	area so that they could fix the problem safely,
10	with the people who were qualified to do it. But
11	by way of saying, like, Alstom, you can't use this
12	facility, I never really experienced that.
13	EMILY YOUNG: Was there any delay in
14	Alstom being able to use the MSF?
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not to my
16	knowledge, no.
17	EMILY YOUNG: Okay.
18	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not to my
19	knowledge, no. Maybe in the beginning, but I don't
20	have any knowledge of that. I didn't come in until
21	later, when we had full access.
22	EMILY YOUNG: So our understanding is
23	that the train, the Citadis Spirit, relied on
24	modular technology, which meant that in the MSF, it
25	was only final assembly being done there; is that

1 right? 2 The entire STEPHEN LENNERTON: 3 construction of the train was done there. So it 4 would literally come in with a chassis, and you 5 would start putting all your hydraulic parts on in the first station. So they'd flip the chassis б 7 upside down, put all your piping in, put all your 8 brackets on to hold all your wiring harnesses and, 9 you know, the HPU trays and that kind of stuff. 10 And then they would float that to the 11 next station, and they would put more wiring 12 harnesses on. And then it would go to ASO 2, which 13 is where we would put, you know, the walls on, 14 actually attached the nose -- or not the -- yeah, 15 attached the nose of the car to LMC 1 or LMC 2. 16 And then that would be -- and then it would go to 17 the next stage and have the interiors put in. 18 And then it would go to a -- another

<sup>19</sup> static testing place where they would run power <sup>20</sup> through the wiring harnesses to make sure that the <sup>21</sup> wiring harnesses were sound and not shorting out or <sup>22</sup> anything like that. And then it would go to ASO 5, <sup>23</sup> which is where they would actually put the car onto <sup>24</sup> the bogie and then we would couple the cars <sup>25</sup> together. And then it would go to another static

1 test, which was more of a -- it was a static test 2 because the train wasn't moving, but it was a live 3 test because, at this point, the train would be 4 turned on. 5 Just to clarify that a FRASER HARLAND: 6 little bit more. I mean, I understand that things 7 like the walls and the roof, these were welded and 8 assembled elsewhere and came to the shop to then be 9 sort of bolted --10 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Put together, yeah. 11 FRASER HARLAND: Is that a fair 12 description of how --13 Yeah. Like, the STEPHEN LENNERTON: 14 chassis would be all welded and everything in a 15 solid unit. The walls would be put together and 16 the components and then the -- those small 17 components that were welded would, then, be bolted 18 together by the technicians, and that's how it 19 would be constructed. So yes, I would say that's a 20 fair assessment, yeah. 21 FRASER HARLAND: Is it fair to say 22 there was a -- and this isn't to diminish the hard 23 work that you did in any way, but there was perhaps 24 a slightly less specialized knowledge required 25 or -- and specialized tooling required because you

1 wouldn't have had, you know, welding, painting, 2 various things like that? It was much more sort of 3 bolting pieces together? Just to help us 4 understand that. 5 STEPHEN LENNERTON: So the painting б level was just on a repair thing. So if something 7 got scratched, they had a painter that could fix a 8 But by way of, like, painting the red and scratch. 9 the white onto them, no, as far as I know, there 10 weren't there. We didn't have any spray booths or 11 anything like that. By way of specialty tools, we 12 did have speciality tools. Obviously not to do 13 welding - we weren't actually allowed to have open 14 fire in the building, so the welding was done at a 15 different facility. 16 And yes, you are correct. A lot of the

17 things were bolting pieces together. On the actual 18 production floor itself before it actually made it 19 to the static test stage, there was a lot of 20 putting zip ties on and just kind of bolting things 21 together, bolting pipes together, and getting the 22 windows in and stuff like that. And then once you 23 got to the static test, where the test team and I 24 would take over, that's when you got into more 25 specialized things concerning hydraulics or

42

1 concerning the electronics of the train. 2 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know where the 3 various parts of the train that were being 4 assembled in the MSF were coming from? Like, where 5 were they built? 6 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I don't know every 7 single one, but I know, for instance, like, 8 Faiveley and Wabtec, who -- so Faiveley, at the 9 time, owned the calipers, and -- sorry, created the 10 calipers. And Wabtec manufactured the HPUs. And T 11 know those came from, like -- for instance, the 12 HPUs came from, like, South Carolina. I know a lot 13 of engineering was done there. Just -- my memory 14 might not pose too well. I believe the windows 15 came from either Turkey or Israel, and I -- the 16 only reason I remember that is because a gentleman 17 came to help us with it, and he was a very 18 interesting person.

And then other than that, Sorel is
where our bogies came in from, which is a place in
Montreal, where they were getting their ports from
I'm not sure. I know a lot of pieces came from
France and Europe places. A lot of people came
from parts of Europe. Whenever, you know, a
specific engineer was requested to come in to give

1	specific insight on something, a lot of it was from
2	Europe. There's a there's only a few parts of
3	the train that are, like, we would call them
4	American parts, so the pantograph and then the HPUs
5	and the calipers are the ones I remember for sure.
6	FRASER HARLAND: In your experience on
7	the project, did you notice any of these particular
8	parts causing challenges for construction or
9	failing during construction?
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, yeah. Oh,
11	yeah. So specifically to the calipers, the
12	Revision 1 caliper that we have so right now,
13	you have a Revision 2 caliper. The first ones had
14	a 50 to 70 percent failure ratio. So I'd install
15	14 of them, and at minimum, I'd change 5, sometimes
16	even cycling through them, like, one after another.
17	In some cases, I could literally physically look at
18	the caliper and know that it was not going to work,
19	due to, like, defects in the manufacturing.
20	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know
21	FRASER HARLAND: Did sorry, Emily.
22	Did they move to what you called Rev 2 as a result
23	of those issues? Is that
24	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes, that was so
25	the calipers specifically, it was very early on,

1 we knew we were getting a second set of calipers 2 because it had been determined very early on that 3 these were not going to be sufficient - not due to 4 the manufacturing; it was actually due to the cycle 5 So those calipers are expected to do -- I number. б can't remember the exact number, but for the sake 7 of the conversation, they needed to be able to do 8 roughly 3.5 million cycles before needing 9 maintenance done to them, and the ones we had 10 originally would only do roughly 2 million before 11 they needed it, so it wasn't going to meet the 12 requirements of the kilometres versus the 13 maintenance needed. It wouldn't -- the lifetime 14 wouldn't last long enough. So that was one of the 15 major things they changed, but the failure rate 16 pushed that to happen faster.

FRASER HARLAND: And so were those used temporarily and then they would have been swapped out during --

STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, yeah. So at one point, eventually -- once we had proven that we had -- that they were a failure, Wabtec was then required to come in with a team of people and change them all because I was not going to do that myself. They actually brought in, like, a bunch of

1 people to do that because it was very overwhelming 2 to change the entire fleet as fast as they wanted 3 And because it was the fault of Wabtec it to be. 4 that we had proven the failures to be done, they 5 were under contract made to do it. 6 FRASER HARLAND: Were there any other 7 parts that stand out to you in terms of challenges 8 or failures, other than the calipers? 9 STEPHEN LENNERTON: The HPU, that went 10 through a numerous amount of retrofits in order to 11 be compatible with them. Some of those updates, I 12 will admit, changed due to the change of the 13 caliper, so that was proper, I would say. I know 14 the CVS causes a lot of problems computer-wise. 15 I'm not -- I'm very sound on the mechanics. I'm 16 not so sound on the electronics. So just by 17 talking to colleagues, I knew the CVS was an issue, 18 which is one of the computer components on the top. 19 There was -- the same idea with the air 20 compressor happened, so there was issues with the 21 air compressor, and that was changed to another 22 revision, so we had changed out the majority of 23 those. 24

I'm trying to think what else. I mean,
mostly some of the electronics. But really those

46

1 would have been the ones that stood out the most. 2 Like, I was changing calipers left, right, and 3 centre, like it was a never-ending thing. 4 EMILY YOUNG: Do you recall whether 5 Wabtec would have been a new supplier for Alstom? 6 STEPHEN LENNERTON: As far as I knew, 7 Wabtec was there the entire time. The only thing 8 that happened that I know with Wabtec is -- so for 9 instance, Wabtec and Faiveley were almost the same 10 company, and so Faiveley owned the calipers and 11 Wabtec owned the HPUs, and at some point, between 12 the two of them, Wabtec bought Faiveley, and 13 everything became Wabtec. 14 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know whether 15 Alstom had worked with Wabtec on any projects other 16 than the Ottawa project? 17 STEPHEN LENNERTON: So there are trains 18 in Toronto, I believe, that are running which have 19 HPUs and calipers that are also provided from 20 Wabtec. 21 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know if there are 22 any other of the suppliers that Alstom was using 23 that were new suppliers for them? 24 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not that I can say 25 100 percent for sure.

1 Do you remember whether EMILY YOUNG: 2 there were any supply chain issues that Alstom had? 3 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, lots. Lots. 4 EMILY YOUNG: Can you speak a bit about 5 those? 6 Well, at one point, STEPHEN LENNERTON: 7 the States closed the border -- or -- I can't 8 remember the incident that happened, but they 9 closed the border, and that set us back quite a 10 bit. Some of the supply chain issues were that 11 because parts were -- so they -- how do I say this 12 quickly? They do -- they have, like, a 13 skeleton-type production thing. So there's only 14 one part for each thing. So when they have a part 15 that breaks, they have to go to the next set of 16 parts for the next train and take from there, and 17 then they order down the line and bump everything 18 So because there were so many failure rates, up. 19 the manufacturers weren't really even able to keep 20 up. 21 So for instance, like, with Sorel, we 22 needed bogies so badly and so fast that they 23 couldn't send them to us with gearboxes on them

and, you know, a gearbox shaft and have it
connected to the motor and the calipers and

Т

1	everything else that goes with them. So it wasn't
2	necessarily the fault of Alstom that we weren't
3	getting them, but definitely some of the failure
4	rates contributed to why we didn't have part.
5	We actually we actually changed
6	to train set 8 was my parts train. I had full
7	permission to take anything that I needed from that
8	train, which is still sitting in the shed with a
9	lot of stuff missing.
10	EMILY YOUNG: And and I would guess
11	that the result of those failures and having to
12	sort of cannibalize other trains is probably delay?
13	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. It would
14	cause it would cause some of the delays, for
15	sure. That was a lot of the stuff that they talked
16	about in the radio and stuff like that, like,
17	people outside that would make comments that they
18	knew nothing of about.
19	EMILY YOUNG: Did you feel that you had
20	appropriate tooling available in the MSF to do the
21	assembly work?
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: In production, yes,
23	I had every tool I wanted. If I I could walk up
24	to Thomas, who was the director at the time, and
25	I'd say I need this, and within 4 hours I'd have

<sup>1</sup> it. Like, they jumped when I needed tools. I know <sup>2</sup> that the -- in production, there were some times <sup>3</sup> where tools were lost by employees very quickly, <sup>4</sup> and the company was a lot less -- or a lot more <sup>5</sup> reluctant to provide them again right away due to <sup>6</sup> the -- to expenditures. But for me personally, I <sup>7</sup> had it.

8 Now, in maintenance, that's a totally 9 different story. I didn't have anything I needed. 10 I had begged for tools for the entire time that I 11 had been there, and I was never given them. So for 12 instance, like, when we started in maintenance, 13 they bought a Snap-on toolbox, and the -- Hussein, 14 the maintenance vehicle manager, he bought one set 15 of wrenches, gear wrench or a Snap-on, and it went 16 from 6-mil to 19-mil, and that basically covered 17 maybe, you know, 40 percent of the sizes on the 18 train. And obviously you had to explain to them 19 that nuts have, like, a bolt and a nut setup have a 20 nut side and then the bolt side, so you'd actually 21 need two wrenches in order to turn it. So they 22 were very, very lacking on the tools needed to work 23 on it.

There was also this stigma that we were not going to touch the trains as MVTs until the

1 warranty was all done, but obviously that's not the 2 case. 3 FRASER HARLAND: May be a silly 4 question, but, I mean, where did the tools from the 5 construction phase go? Why weren't you able to --6 STEPHEN LENNERTON: To Brampton. 7 FRASER HARLAND: Oh, okay. They --8 STEPHEN LENNERTON: So even though 9 production and maintenance was Alstom, they weren't 10 helping each other. So for instance, all the 11 information I had to build the train, all the 12 micros I memorized in production, they never 13 transferred those to them. It was almost like they 14 wanted to recreate these instructions. Because now 15 that they -- they had thought, well, those are 16 production instructions, and we're not producing 17 the train anymore - we're doing maintenance. So we 18 need to make our own instructions -- right -- but 19 essentially when you're doing maintenance to the 20 train, you're basically replacing parts. Like, 21 we're not reengineering the part, and we're 22 certainly not remanufacturing the part when we're 23 in their facility, so they would have used all of 24 those, but they decided not to. I personally 25 believe it's due to some of the eqos of the

1	management team, but some would say that it was
2	contractual and all that kind of stuff.
3	EMILY YOUNG: So Alstom maintenance
4	would create their own manual when
5	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes.
6	EMILY YOUNG: you could have used
7	documents from construction to make that a lot
8	easier? Is that what you're saying?
9	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. I mean, at
10	the beginning, obviously you're going to have a
11	massive learning curve. So out of, like, the
12	roughly 150 people that built the train, there was
13	6 or 7 or something like that that they actually
14	kept. So the management that came in regarded all
15	the people who built the trains as not how do I
16	say this politely? They weren't educated enough,
17	in their mind, to be able to do maintenance, which
18	baffled my brain. So they regarded them as being,
19	like, a hindrance to what was going on, so they
20	didn't want to hire them. They wanted to hire
21	anybody who had a if you had a mechanical
22	engineering degree or an electrical engineering
23	degree, like, you're in right away. You know what
24	I mean? Even though it's not a requirement to work
25	there, they still wanted that to happen.

1 So this learning curve that would have 2 happened at the beginning of maintenance could have 3 been lessened by using some of those instructions 4 until they had created the ones that they wanted. 5 I'm not saying that wanting to create the new б instructions was a bad thing, because it did have 7 to be transformed into a maintenance-type 8 instruction, but we could have -- for instance, 9 like, all the mechanics on there -- like, if a 10 caliper fails, I'm not opening up the caliper and 11 rebuilding it there on the train. I'm taking the 12 caliper off and putting a new one on. That's as 13 far as you go with it. You know what I mean? Τf 14 they sent it to the manufacturer and have it 15 rebuilt or something, that's on them. So just even 16 for a caliper, for instance, even just having the 17 instructions from production to remove and put a 18 caliper on would have been huge for them to be able 19 to do, but this information was far and few 20 between.

I actually obtained a USB card at one point that had the micros for all the bogies on them that I used in production, and I installed it with a friend of mine on the computer that the maintenance team used, and that was an avenue for

1 information that they would come to. This would 2 provide things like torque values, part numbers. 3 So for instance, if you need to get a specific 4 bolt, it would give you the number for that bolt 5 that you could go to the parts section and get the 6 specific bolt. 7 EMILY YOUNG: And if you hadn't done 8 that, would you not have had that information 9 available to you? It sounds like information you 10 need to do your maintenance job. 11 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. Tt's 12 extremely crucial. So it's not that it wouldn't 13 have been available at all. It's that they would 14 have had to go to the supervisor, and the 15 supervisor would have to request it from 16 engineering and then engineering would have to 17 transfer it down to them. So having it readily available at the click of a mouse -- like, one of 18 19 the issues we had with management is that they 20 spent all this money giving them all these 21 electronics and computers and things to do their 22 job, but they couldn't provide us with the torque 23 value for a bolt. You know what I mean? 24 So we were a little bit frustrated with

<sup>25</sup> our access to it, so we kind of did our own thing

1 to try to get ahold of this information. A bunch 2 of us that were still there from production got 3 together and said, hey, we need to pull this 4 information out that we would from before and get 5 it to these guys because, like, they're going to do 6 things wrong that's going to have stuff fall off 7 the train - which has happened - and, you know, we 8 need to help out as much as we can. 9 EMILY YOUNG: Was that ever improved 10 over the time that you worked in maintenance? Did 11 it start to get easier? 12 STEPHEN LENNERTON: The time that --13 In my opinion, it actually got worse. So for no. 14 instance, with the sanding injectors, they've --15 they've been doing a lot of work on the sanders. 16 Obviously there's been a lot of trouble with them. 17 And then when we got to the point where we were 18 basically being taught how to clean them, the 19 instructions came from a co-op student who had 20 written it, who was becoming an engineer. So they 21 had an entire engineering team, and then they 22 brought in a co-op student who is now telling me 23 how to fix the train. So he's never seen this 24 before, he's not even a complete engineer, and he's 25 sending me information that has the wrong name of

1	parts; he's referring to things that don't do
2	certain things and telling us to do things to them
3	that you can't even really do. And there were
4	multiple occasions where even, like, Hussein would
5	tell me go and remove said part from the train, and
6	I would have to look at him and inform him that
7	that part doesn't actually exist, so I can't go and
8	take it off the train, and they would be upset with
9	me for arguing with him about it.
10	EMILY YOUNG: What would have been, in
11	your view, the proper process to provide
12	instructions on how to fix some of the issues with
13	the sanders? Rather than having the co-op student,
14	what should they have done?
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, it needed
16	to be revamped by engineering. They needed to
17	the biggest problem is when they bought the trains,
18	they forgot we have winter every year. It's as
19	though we don't they bought these things and
20	launched them as though winter's not going to come
21	anymore because we bought these trains or
22	something. So the problem with the sanders, in my
23	opinion, is not necessarily the engineering of the
24	device. If you were to drive this thing around on
25	a beautiful California day, the sanders are going

1	to work fine all day. But the second you add our
2	level of humidity and, you know, this cold and the
3	change of temperatures and all that kind of stuff,
4	this is where it starts to clog up.
5	So in my personal opinion, those
6	sanders need to be completely revamped in order to
7	do be able to actually do what they want them to
8	do. They did attempt to change the sand that was
9	in there to a different type of sand, but this also
10	failed as well, so
11	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know whether the
12	sanders were identified as an issue before service
13	started, or was it only discovered after service
14	started?
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So because in
16	the production, we had it kind of easy in the sense
17	that if there was a massive snowstorm outside, we
18	didn't go out with the train due to safety, right,
19	because we were still in the testing stage. So
20	we some of us there knew, like, as employees
21	like, I like, I myself knew that this thing was
22	going to cause a huge problem. Like, I could even
23	tell just if if the sand got a little bit wet,
24	it had a problem. So I knew that this was going to
25	be a little bit of a headache. But by way of them

1	actually knowing at a testing engineering level,
2	they wouldn't have been able to know for the simple
3	reason that they never really actually tested that
4	much before going. Like, it was a function test.
5	Did it deploy the X amount of sand that we need it
6	to deploy upon request? Yes, so it passes.
7	EMILY YOUNG: Did they run it in
8	winter?
9	STEPHEN LENNERTON: In some cases, they
10	were run in winter. But, I mean, when you take the
11	train from the facility and it's warm run and you
12	take it outside and you run it up and down the
13	track two or three times and come back, you know,
14	it's not sitting out in the shed overnight in minus
15	30 and then coming out in the morning when it goes
16	up to plus 2, and then running it during the day,
17	and as the day goes on, it drops back to minus 20.
18	Like, these variables that change, you know,
19	obviously create condensation inside the sanding
20	well and obviously creates more issues as it goes.
21	EMILY YOUNG: So would they have needed
22	to, more realistically, mimic operations to kind of
23	figure that issue out?
24	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, it could
25	have been a suggestion, but at the time, the

1 testing we were doing was all underneath the 2 requirements that they had agreed upon. So, I 3 mean, maybe it should have happened, but to see 4 Alstom step up and say, we need to do more testing 5 because, you know, we're worried about this and 6 then it would cost them more money, at a -- as a 7 business look, that's not going to be something 8 that -- they're not going to go out and willingly 9 spend more money to do more things -- you know what 10 I mean? -- when they don't have to, right, because 11 the City at that time was content with the 12 agreements that they had had.

EMILY YOUNG: So in your view, should there have been a more stringent winter testing requirements in the agreement?

16 I would STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. 17 have -- I would have 100 percent suggested that. 18 Absolutely. I mean, in my personal opinion, the 19 train was doomed from the beginning. This is not a 20 train that's sold in countries that have winter. 21 It rides too low. It needs to be stored in minus 5 22 to plus 15 temperatures. It's in an open shed --23 you know what I mean? -- so whatever outside is is 24 what it's stored at. I mean, the only thing that 25 they could really do for the storage right now is

25

trains.

1 they can keep it on, which is their only real 2 Like, they can keep the heat on and chance. 3 everything in them. 4 But when it comes to being in the 5 facility -- like, for instance, like the shed that б they built, they didn't close all the walls because 7 it costs more money in Canada because then it 8 becomes a building, so then there's more 9 inspections; there's more rules or stuff like that 10 surrounding it. So they left the top portion of it 11 So for instance, you're in the shed and open. 12 you're doing an inspection, and there's a huge 13 windrow up against the side of a train because snow 14 has been blowing in through this opening. So it's 15 not really being stored the way that the 16 requirements were, I guess. 17 I don't know who built the facilities 18 and all that - like, who made the decisions on 19 these requirements for the facilities - so I can't 20 really point the finger to that, but I can 21 definitely tell you that it's not -- like, in my 22 personal opinion, these problems are not about to 23 go away at any point unless we seriously change the

EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

1	these these issues, that the train was not
2	really fit for the Ottawa climate, was known at the
3	beginning.
4	STEPHEN LENNERTON: They were known for
5	certain people, for sure. For sure. There were
6	people who had come from all over the world
7	building trains for them. Like, people came
8	they had been in China for 2 years; they had these
9	amazing jobs where they travelled all over the
10	world building all these types of trains in all
11	these different types of scenarios. And a lot of
12	the stuff that was talked about is, like, you know,
13	we have you have open vents on the top for
14	certain fans, like, for the the coil conductor,
15	I believe I can't remember the name of the part.
16	There's a conductor on top that kept exploding, and
17	it was open to the elements, so when you're driving
18	down the track, like, stuff's going in there you
19	know what I mean? like, elements are going in
20	there, and I don't think that that was necessarily
21	what it was made to do, to have, like, freezing
22	rain go in there or anything like that.
23	So it's it definitely was not suited
24	for those temperatures, for sure. And the people
25	who had worked on it, you know, would say, like,

Т

1	you know, when the winter comes, like, this isn't
2	going to work. You know what I mean? So and
3	now we're seeing that. I think we can all agree,
4	like, winter is the worst season for those trains.
5	EMILY YOUNG: And were those types of
б	concerns, about how the trains would work and
7	perform in winter, were they sort of escalated up?
8	STEPHEN LENNERTON: They were escalated
9	amongst us in the sense that, you know, we were
10	trying to put things together properly so they
11	could work as best as they could. Our only as
12	technicians, our only defence to what was going on
13	was building the train exactly to the micro. So
14	we everything I did was exactly the way the
15	design said to do it. I never strayed from that.
16	But by way of Alstom communicating to the City, I
17	mean, the way I guess Alstom looked at it, from my
18	standpoint, was that we were giving them what they
19	requested. So they had purchased a certain train,
20	and this is the design to build it, and that's what
21	we're building. You know what I mean?
22	I'd give an analogy of it's almost
23	like, you know, the City went to a car dealership,
24	and there was the choice between a Mazda 6 and a

1 then the City went in and said, Well, I want the 2 Ferrari because it's cheaper, and Alstom said, 3 Well, this Ferrari is what's going to win you the 4 race. And they said, Well, it's okay, we want the 5 Mazda instead. And then once they bought the 6 Mazda, the Mazda was built, they turned around and said, This isn't a Ferrari, and Alstom said, Well, 7 8 you've bought a Mazda; you didn't buy the Ferrari. 9 And then the City basically went, Well, you need to 10 turn this into a Ferrari. And that's obviously not 11 possible.

12 That's -- that's how I see the -- some 13 of the conversations that were had and the -- in 14 some cases where City members came in, they were --15 you know, Well, I didn't know this; you know, they 16 would do this kind of stuff. But I think that was 17 more of like a -- they were trying to pass blame on 18 each other a lot. A lot of the project was, like, 19 No, you did; no, you did - not, like, Let's work 20 together. Because there's businesses, right? So 21 the business is trying to make a profit, and the 22 City is trying to save money, and -- and all this 23 kind of stuff, so it's -- I guess that would be the 24 best way to describe that.

EMILY YOUNG: So it sounds like you

1 think the City picked the wrong kind of train. 2 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Absolutely. And I 3 think there's fault on Alstom for not telling them 4 you shouldn't buy this, or not even presenting it 5 to them as -- like, Alstom should not have 6 presented a train to the City that would not be 7 adequate for their working conditions. And the 8 City should not have bought a train without doing 9 enough research to find out if it was going to 10 work. 11 I mean, there's many examples all 12 across the world where Alstom has built trains that 13 run in the winter that are very successful. Like. 14 Alstom is actually a very successful train building 15 They've built a lot of amazing machinery. company. 16 It's just that here, the conflict of -- like, in my 17 own opinion, like, we're penny-pinchers here. So 18 because of -- like, I believe, like, the majority 19 of the decision was based solely off the cost of 20 it, right? EMILY YOUNG: Can you elaborate on that

EMILY YOUNG: Can you elaborate on that a little bit more. Do you mean just the cost in the initial selection of the vehicle, or would you say that there were cost-cutting measures throughout the construction process that you saw?

1	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I would say, from
2	what I researched, that the the want like,
3	the main concern from the City was making sure that
4	the train they bought was as cheap as possible is
5	what I would say. I wouldn't say that there was
6	any like, there were cost-cutting measures in,
7	like, the way we did things, to be able to reduce
8	the cost of doing it for the company, which is just
9	sensible business.
10	But by way of saying, Oh, you know, we
11	could put this part on, but Alstom's going to
12	secretly downgrade the part, that kind of stuff
13	didn't happen. Like, we built the trains as per
14	the design. I mean, I wouldn't say that they're
15	completed, but, you know, we the things that are
16	on there are built to the design.
17	EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that the
18	Citadis Spirit is a proven vehicle? Or was a
19	proven vehicle when the City purchased it?
20	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, it's the
21	first time they've ever built it. So that was,
22	like, the big thing, right? Like, they these
23	trains it was a brand-new design. It was
24	basically, like, a mixture of some other ideas.
25	And so I guess Alstom was wanting to present this

1	in this you know, they're new to this country.
2	They're trying to get into the country to work in
3	our economy, and then they're also trying to
4	introduce new technology and new things. But, I
5	mean, realistically, it's a railcar that a train
6	should be driven down the middle of a street on a
7	warm, sunny day, not on, like, a VIA Rail track.
8	EMILY YOUNG: Do you recall whether
9	Alstom experienced any power issues in the MSF?
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, yeah. We had
11	breakers break like, we had fuses go all the
12	time with the OCS. There were a couple of power
13	outages that happened. We always used to joke
14	around - when the lights went off, we used to say,
15	Oh, they didn't pay the power bill again.
16	Obviously it was a joke. But yeah, there were
17	times where the power would go out a bit. And then
18	you would have a backup thing, but it would limit
19	us in doing, you know, like, testing with the power
20	on, obviously. So there were some issues with
21	that.
22	EMILY YOUNG: Were there issues with
23	stinger power?

STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. So the
stingers we actually pretty much -- so it's

23

24

25

headache.

1 interesting that you ask that. Are you aware of 2 the difference between the OCS and the stinger? Or 3 are you referring to the OCS when you say that? 4 So really quickly, the OCS is the line 5 that runs above the train that the pantograph б attaches to -- right -- that's what goes down all 7 of our tracks. In the shop, there's a thing called 8 the stinger, which is a power source that could be 9 plugged into the train so that they can do about 80 10 to 90 percent of the things that the train will do 11 without having to use the overhead catenary system. 12 It's actually a safer way to power the train and be 13 able to be on the roof. Because with the OCS on, 14 you can't go on the roof of the train because you 15 have to be at least, like, 9 metres away from the 16 OCS so you don't die. And with the stinger, we 17 were able to -- they were -- the electrician guys 18 were able to test the top of the train. 19 But those -- I know for the longest 20 time, only one of those worked. And they were 21 always up and down, up and down - like, they would

fix one and then it would break again. And it got

to the point where they just said, Screw it, we're

not going to use those. It was just too much of a

67

1 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know what -- do 2 you know what the causes of those power issues 3 were? 4 No, I wasn't STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. 5 given that information. They had, like, techs that 6 came in that did that that are, like, power line 7 technicians for the train. They'd work on the OCS 8 and stuff. 9 So I was always removed from that for 10 safety reasons. Like, I'm not an electrical quy, 11 so I don't --- you know, so I'm not going to be in 12 there if I don't need to sort of thing. So no, I 13 wasn't -- I do not know the details of what would 14 have caused that. 15 FRASER HARLAND: And with the fuses, 16 did you have any sense of what was causing those to 17 blow? 18 STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. We -- we --19 like, we had speculation that some of the guys had 20 told me. But it didn't really concern me too much, 21 so I didn't really pay too much attention to it. 22 EMILY YOUNG: What impact did those 23 power issues have on your work, assembling the 24 vehicles? 25 When the building STEPHEN LENNERTON:

1	power went out, I couldn't see, so that would be
2	one. But by way of mine was mostly mechanical. So
3	if the train couldn't be turned on, I couldn't
4	actually test the brakes and stuff. But by way of
5	being able to install parts on the train and stuff,
6	I could still work that way. There was still stuff
7	I would do. It would stop a few things here and
8	there, but it didn't really impact me specifically.
9	It was more of an impact to the testing team, who
10	needed the power to be on to do their job.
11	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know whether an
12	electrical fire ever occurred in the MSF?
13	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not a fire. There
14	was an electrical fire that happened on the rail,
15	but not in the facility, to my knowledge. I know
16	one person got electrocuted by a capacitor. But
17	nothing that like nothing that I know to oh,
18	there was a oh, yes, there was. There was a
19	wiring harness in one of the CVSs or one of the
20	computer components on the train where one of the
21	wires had caught fire. But I can't remember if
22	that had caught fire on the track and they brought
23	it back in, or if it had actually caught fire in
24	the facility. But I know stuff caught fire on the
25	track.

1 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know what the 2 cause of those fires was? 3 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, the one big 4 one was the fact that the driver drove the train 5 too far past the end of the track, and the nose of 6 the train touched the OCS as it came down into the 7 So at the end of the rail, the OCS goes around. 8 from the top of the pole down into the ground where 9 it's grounded. And he had gone past a barrier and 10 the horn on top of the train touched the OCS and 11 the big huge light thing happened and there was a 12 little fire there, stuff like that. 13 EMILY YOUNG: Would that have been at a 14 stage when that operator was in training, or was 15 that --16 That wouldn't have STEPHEN LENNERTON: 17 been --18 EMILY YOUNG: -- later on. 19 STEPHEN LENNERTON: As far as I 20 remember, that was later on. I don't believe that 21 was an OCS -- or an OC driver. That would have 22 been somebody employed by the OLRT at that time. 23 EMILY YOUNG: Okay. 24 STEPHEN LENNERTON: None of the 25 production guys drove the train. So every time a

1 train went out for dynamic, somebody was sent from 2 OLRT to drive the train. Usually it was a quideway 3 tech. 4 EMILY YOUNG: And do you know whether 5 there were any mitigations put in place as a result 6 of these electrical fires? 7 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, so the 8 barrier was put in properly. They immediately put 9 safety protocols in for that. I know they --10 one -- one good thing about Alstom, especially in 11 production, is once something was either -- if they 12 knew something was unsafe, things were stopped, and 13 they would put in safety measures. And then also, 14 you know, when fluke things happened when we're 15 unaware of, you know, obviously major changes were 16 made for safety purposes. 17 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that Alstom 18 had the workers that it needed in the MSF in the 19 construction phase? 20 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Construction for 21 the trains still, or the building? 22 EMILY YOUNG: The trains. 23 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, yes. There 24 was a lot of people there that were very good at 25 what they were doing. Like, there was a lot of
1 guys that were very passionate about it, and they 2 were definitely very qualified to do it. But just 3 like any facility, you're going to have people who 4 are there, and they don't care about what they're 5 You know, there was a lot of younger doing. 6 people, who, you know, this is just a job because I 7 need a paycheque, and they cared more about going 8 and partying on Friday night than they do about 9 what's going on on the trains.

10 I think because of Randstad, it made it 11 a little bit less appetizing to people to get a job 12 because, you know, you're \$18 an hour, and you are 13 required to do a ton of stuff, and a lot of the 14 people, a lot of the younger guys that were in 15 there, they didn't want anything to do with 16 maintenance. Like, they didn't care. They were 17 going to go on to something else, and so they just 18 wanted the paycheque that they were getting to, you 19 know, go out and party and stuff.

So I think if they had made more
incentives to it, there would have been a little
bit more quality in the people that were there.
But then when you got into, like, jobs as though -like, somebody that's on the test team, they were
paid much better due to the fact that they came in

Т

1	with, like, electrical engineering degrees, and
2	they were very qualified to do what they were
3	doing.
4	EMILY YOUNG: And did Alstom retain
5	Randstad to do the recruitment for the assembly
6	crew?
7	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, so that's how
8	it was advertised. So actually I actually a
9	friend so my sister's best friend's boyfriend
10	worked there. And he actually told me, like, Hey,
11	man, like, your skill set could really be used
12	here. You should look into it. This is what made
13	me start looking into what the project was. And
14	then I actually went to the Randstad website to
15	apply for the job. So that's like, I didn't go
16	to an Alstom website and apply. It was applied
17	through Randstad. So they would have they would
18	have recruited and I guess if they
19	advertised I don't know if they did, but if they
20	advertised for it, it would have been through
21	Randstad.
22	EMILY YOUNG: And so it sounds like
23	you're suggesting that the the overall quality
24	of people might have been better if Alstom had done

 $^{25}$  recruiting directly and paid people more.

23

1 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. I mean, 2 like, I made \$18 an hour, and I think it was \$8 3 above that went to Randstad. So that was money that I should have been making. And then on top of 4 5 that, they would tell you right at the beginning, 6 like, You're not getting a raise. So how it worked 7 was I made \$18 an hour and Randstad made \$8. Now, 8 if I got bumped up to \$20 an hour, that meant 9 Randstad only made \$6, and then if I got bumped up 10 to 21, they only made 5. You know what I mean? So 11 when you went and asked for a raise, they didn't 12 want to give it because they were making a profit. 13 So for instance, to get a raise, later 14 on in the project, my value as an employee was 15 extremely high because I was now at a certain point 16 where I was the only one in the world who was doing 17 these things because they're not being built 18 anywhere. I know that sounds pretty elaborate, but 19 it was part of the coolness of this job. So for 20 instance, I got to the point where my job was 21 being -- I was required to do too much, so I went 22 to the production manager, and I said you need to

give me more money. And he says, well, I can't do 24 And I says, well, Friday's my last day, and, that. 25 miraculously, the next day I was bumped up to \$26

1	an hour, and I had been back-paid for that
2	difference the last 2 months.
3	So you had to corner them to do that.
4	And you had to have leverage in order to do it,
5	which I when I look back at now, it's not really
6	fair, so to speak, because it's not really fair to
7	the other people who are making the \$18 an hour.
8	But it also wasn't fair to the people who were much
9	more valuable in the sense of how driven they were
10	and their expertise in what was going on.
11	EMILY YOUNG: What kind of training did
12	you receive for the construction work on the
13	vehicles?
	Venicies:
14	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training,
14 15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there
14 15 16	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque
14 15 16 17	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque
14 15 16 17 18	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque wrench, how to properly torque a bolt because that
14 15 16 17 18 19	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque wrench, how to properly torque a bolt because that was a lot of what was going on. And then after
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque wrench, how to properly torque a bolt because that was a lot of what was going on. And then after that, you would have more person-to-person
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque wrench, how to properly torque a bolt because that was a lot of what was going on. And then after that, you would have more person-to-person training. So for instance, like, if you went to
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque wrench, how to properly torque a bolt because that was a lot of what was going on. And then after that, you would have more person-to-person training. So for instance, like, if you went to the first station, a gentleman named Easy was
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque wrench, how to properly torque a bolt because that was a lot of what was going on. And then after that, you would have more person-to-person training. So for instance, like, if you went to the first station, a gentleman named Easy was well, his actual name was Malaku (phonetic), and
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So formal training, you would get torque and glue training, so there was some gluing that went on. And then torque training would be, like, how to set a torque wrench, how to properly torque a bolt because that was a lot of what was going on. And then after that, you would have more person-to-person training. So for instance, like, if you went to the first station, a gentleman named Easy was well, his actual name was Malaku (phonetic), and his nickname was Easy. He was the team lead for

1	him, and he would shadow you and show you how to
2	read the micro and back and forth.
3	But by way of formal training for this,
4	they had Alstom has this idea that if they make
5	the instructions readable to a Grade 9 level, then
6	anyone that they hire with a high school education
7	is going it to be able to walk in and do this.
8	There's definitely this idea of that at Alstom
9	that everybody's replaceable and anybody can come
10	in and just do anything. Like, you you know
11	what I mean? Like, if I don't do it, somebody else
12	will right? which, in a very specific
13	situation that we were in here, that was not the
14	case, and that kind of kind of hindered things a
15	little bit.
16	EMILY YOUNG: So your view is that not
17	just anyone could walk in from the street and read
18	Alstom's instruction and do the job?
19	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. No.
20	Definitely not. Like, you'd never seen the thing
21	before. That would be like can you go in and do a
22	heart surgery on your first day. You know, like,
23	you can't. Like, nobody can. Even after going
24	through medical school, you can't just walk in
25	after medical school and do a surgery. There's

1 there's multiple different tests and things they do 2 leading up to that, right? So this was controlled 3 by the team leads. 4 Like, for the first 6 months you were 5 there, the average person was not actually allowed б to do anything without a team lead watching them. 7 So that was how they had to do the training. And 8 the situation of that it was built nowhere else is 9 what caused this type of training. It was not that 10 they were doing it out of negligence; it was that 11 there was no -- like, we were still learning as we 12 There was a lot of trial and error going on. went. 13 So they couldn't really just hand you 14 an instruction book that was already set in stone 15 and you could go out and figure your way out, you 16 There was a lot of times where the team lead know. 17 would look at me and say, we got to go to 18 engineering because I'm at a point where I don't 19 even know, and this person had been there for a 20 year, let's say. So then you'd use your 21 engineering and stuff like that. 22 So there was a lot of learning as we 23 go, which is why I imply that having higher pay 24 would have brought people who are more interested 25 in it, which would have brought a higher learning

1 level into a facility. 2 FRASER HARLAND: You mentioned earlier 3 that you are able to do things -- I can't remember 4 the exact numbers you gave, but I think you did 5 something in 5 days that --6 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. 7 FRASER HARLAND: -- had taken others 8 3 weeks, so --9 STEPHEN LENNERTON: 2 and a half weeks, 10 yeah. 11 FRASER HARLAND: 2 and a half weeks? 12 Okay. 13 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. 14 FRASER HARLAND: So what -- what 15 explains that? Is that your level of experience at 16 that point compared to people who are 17 unexperienced? People's motivation? What was 18 going on there? 19 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I would say it 20 encompassed all of it. So when I first got there, 21 they were still -- like, they knew what they were 22 doing, but -- how do I explain that? They knew the 23 procedure that they were doing, but also the 24 repetitions that they had, at that point, weren't 25 very high either.

1 So one of the big learning things is 2 how many times you've done something. Once you --3 if you've done something twice, you're not going to 4 be as good as it as if you've done something a 5 hundred times. 6 So there was that aspect, and then also 7 the motivation. There was a lot of, like, I'm not 8 paid enough to go that fast; I don't care about 9 their deadline because, you know, I'm only paid \$18 10 an hour; whereas I walked into the facility and 11 said if I do, it's going to be undeniable that I go 12 to maintenance, right? Like, my whole goal was to 13 get to maintenance. Like, they could have paid me, 14 like, minimum wage for all I care, and I still 15 would have worked that hard to get it done. So a 16 lot of it was motivation. 17 And then also, yeah, my experience -18 like, I was able to pick up on it a lot faster than 19 some of them were. And then also just my -- my --20 being a little bit older and some of the other jobs 21 I had, I was able to manage the job a little bit 22 better, so I was a little bit more organized, I

<sup>23</sup> knew all the tools I needed.

And then there was memorization too.
 Like, I literally memorized all these micros.

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

1 Like, to this day, I could name you probably all of 2 the torque values of all the bolts as we pointed to 3 them type thing. So being able to do it out of my 4 brain instead of having to look at an instruction 5 all the time also sped things up. 6 Now, there were certain -- I want to be 7 clear too, there were certain components of what I 8 was doing in those 5 days which would require 9 somebody else to be with me, and in some cases they 10 would have someone work with me just because they 11 thought they were working me into the ground, and 12 they thought it would make things a little bit 13 easier for me. 14 EMILY YOUNG: Can you just clarify for 15 us, Mr. Lennerton: What is a micro? 16 STEPHEN LENNERTON: So a micro is like 17 an instruction. So for instance, like -- it's a 18 French term. So, like, if you buy a barbecue and 19 you pull out the instructions, that's a micro to 20 them, just more detailed, I guess you would say. 21 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that the 22 training you were given to prepare you for your job 23 assembling the vehicles was sufficient? 24 STEPHEN LENNERTON: For me it was 25 because I was able to learn extremely quickly, but

> neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

I don't think overall, to the majority of the people in there, it was sufficient. I mean, in some stations there were people who literally spent all day putting zip ties on. Like, that's all they did. They would put a wiring harness down in front, put a zip tie on. They might tighten a 10-mil bolt every now and then.

8 So by -- in that aspect, it wasn't 9 really needed that much. I know in some 10 stations -- like, for instance, ASO 2 was a very 11 big station in the sense of like the components 12 they were using were heavy, and they used, like, 13 more power tools. So that person would spend more 14 time with the team lead learning a little bit of 15 different things than somebody who's putting zip 16 ties on. You know what I mean?

EMILY YOUNG: What do you think that they could have done better to train everyone who wasn't maybe as quick a learner as you or as committed?

STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, they definitely should have had, like, specific training to where the point of -- like, for instance, when -- how do I say that? So, like, when I went and worked with the team lead when I first started

1	there, the job we were doing was not specifically
2	to train me. It was still to complete the task
3	that he was assigned to do. So there wasn't
4	anything where, like, you would go and walk up to
5	the side of the train and you would do something
6	that, even if you messed up, it didn't affect
7	production you know what I mean? so it was,
8	like, specifically to training.

<sup>9</sup> I think if they isolated that more <sup>10</sup> instead of having a person sit there and do a --<sup>11</sup> so, like, for instance, the team lead is trying to <sup>12</sup> train me, but at the same time, he's trying to keep <sup>13</sup> up. Like, he's got to finish this job in enough <sup>14</sup> time to get his next job done and for us to meet <sup>15</sup> his deadlines.

<sup>16</sup> So it's not like they were in a relaxed <sup>17</sup> scenario where they could take the time to explain <sup>18</sup> it and then go through the things they know and <sup>19</sup> then have the person try it, fail, try again, maybe <sup>20</sup> have a little bit of success or -- and adjust in <sup>21</sup> that aspect. I think that would have helped a lot <sup>22</sup> more.

<sup>23</sup> But, again, information on the train <sup>24</sup> was still being developed as we were going, like <sup>25</sup> figuring out why certain things were the way they

1 were or fit the way they fit, like things like that 2 was not as known, so it wouldn't have been -- they 3 wouldn't have really had the information to be that 4 direct. 5 EMILY YOUNG: Are you aware of any 6 issues that were encountered in integrating the 7 Thales and Alstom systems? 8 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. Thales is --9 Thales is junk. That stuff doesn't work. We were 10 actually -- like, I actually installed Thales at 11 one point. I put in, like, over a thousand wires 12 into a train to construct it. They would give us a 13 list of lines that would have remove this and put 14 it to this and take this out and -- completely and 15 add this wire in. 16 So Thales was originally supposed to 17 come already built into all of our wiring harnesses 18 and everything like that. Due to the failure of 19 Thales, that didn't happen, so we actually had to 20 put it in after the train was built, and then 21 obviously now we know that Thales has -- came in 22 during maintenance, and we know that they then had 23 tons of trouble. I mean, I was even told that in 24 Toronto or in another project -- I don't think it 25 was the one in Brampton, but they were actually

1	walked off the site due to the incompetence of what
2	they were doing. So Thales like, the automated
3	system in the train, that is like, at this
4	stage, with what's going on, it would be horrifying
5	to me if we were even trying to use that. So it's
6	kind of a blessing in disguise, but yes, there were
7	major, major problems with the Thales system.
8	EMILY YOUNG: And was the the main
9	problem, it sounds like you're saying, is that
10	Alstom was expecting to receive the system, like,
11	ready to go, kind of plug-and-play into the trains,
12	and that's not what it got.
13	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, that's
14	that's essentially what it seemed like to me is
15	that like, we were there to assemble the train,
16	turn it on make sure it works, turn it on, and
17	sell it to you you know what I mean? not
18	reengineer the Thales system because they failed on
19	it. You know what I mean?
20	And then at that point too, because of
21	the amount of wires on the train, it's hard for
22	them to like, they would send us something
23	that's not complete because we needed to keep
24	going. So then you'd have to put it in after,
25	which then made it even more difficult, which, in

1 turn, could cause more problems due to damaging 2 something else or whatever at the time. 3 EMILY YOUNG: So you were under a time 4 crunch, Alstom was, to --5 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. 6 EMILY YOUNG: -- complete the vehicles, 7 and you didn't have what you needed from Thales 8 when you needed it, so sometimes you had to kind of 9 move ahead and then go back and retrofit or fix 10 the --11 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Exactly, yeah. 12 Retrofit is the exact word, yeah. That was 13 basically what -- and that situation was -- I felt 14 was forced on us due to the lack of completion from 15 Thales. 16 EMILY YOUNG: And did that have effects 17 on Alstom's work as well --18 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, yeah. Well, 19 they had to -- so you had a retrofit team that was 20 supposed to be going around and saying, you know --21 like, for instance, like, this air control panel, 22 well, there's a revision on it, and they've changed 23 one of the valves, so I would go up to it, unbolt 24 that one, bolt the new one on, connect it all up. 25 And in my case, I would turn the train on and make

1	sure it worked. But in most cases, testing would
2	do that.
3	So that's what we were supposed to be
4	doing, but now we had to go in and facilitate a
5	train to come back in that's completed and supposed
6	to be sold. Now we've got to bring that back in;
7	then we've got to allot people to it to do it,
8	right, which then takes manpower away from other
9	things, then causes the need for more hiring, which
10	makes the spending go up and all that sort of
11	stuff, right, so it was like a snowballing effect.
12	Now, in my opinion, we got done what we
13	were supposed to get done, but I think we're all
14	aware that the Thales system is not working, to say
15	the least.
16	EMILY YOUNG: And are there still
17	retrofits ongoing to the Thales system?
18	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I would assume so.
19	I know Thales when I was still there, I know
20	Thales was still in and out of there all the time.
21	EMILY YOUNG: And when you say that
22	having to do those retrofits in the Thales system
23	was taking people power away from other things,
24	what were those other things that were being
25	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, so the

1	retrofit team that I was on was the one that would
2	do it. So for instance, like I don't know
3	we'd have, like one of the things that the
4	retrofit team did was closing points. So we would
5	have all the little tiny things that needed to
6	be so the City is coming, and they want a
7	brand-new train, right? Well, this seat here, for
8	whatever reason, has a tear on the cushion, so we
9	need to fix that because they're buying a new
10	train, not a train with a torn cushion. So you
11	would need somebody to change that cushion.
12	Well, that team of people that would go
13	in to do this now, to put it into perspective of
14	what we're doing, there's, like, a list of, like,
15	hundreds of things that would need to be done,
16	little we're talking little paint dings and,
17	like, little things like that would need to be
18	fixed as well. So you'd have a team of, let's say,
19	six people that would be assigned to do that.
20	Well, two of those people need to go and do Thales,
21	let's say. So then you would have the four people,
22	which would mean, you know, either those people are
23	pushing to do more work, or they're falling behind
24	because they don't have enough people to complete
25	all those tasks.

1	EMILY YOUNG: I see that it's oh.
2	FRASER HARLAND: Sorry. Other than the
3	complications that the Thales system created in
4	terms of retrofits and train construction, are you
5	aware of issues that the Thales system caused for
6	the operation or reliability of the trains,
7	especially during revenue service?
8	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I know that
9	sometimes the testing team would say, you know,
10	this component is, you know, causing an issue or
11	whatever that would have Thales components in it.
12	But I don't know any specifics of that because it
13	goes into the electrical realm, and I I didn't
14	have I didn't have enough time to learn all that
15	as well. I know that train set 2 our original
16	train set 2, almost all of Thales was bypassed by
17	the driver so that he could actually test the train
18	without being interrupted by it because it wasn't
19	working on his train.
20	EMILY YOUNG: What do you mean
21	"bypassed"?
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So, like, train set
23	2 was a validation train. So if he needed to test
24	specific safety features on the train, in order for
25	them to work, he would have to bypass the computer

1 system that wouldn't allow it to happen. So for 2 instance, like, would the door stay shut when the 3 train is driving, you know? He would have to 4 bypass that system in order to get the train to do 5 the wrong thing first to see that the train would 6 respond correctly. So he would have to force 7 issues in order to get to the correct response from 8 the safety feature, if that -- I don't know if that 9 explains that well enough. 10 EMILY YOUNG: And is that because just 11 the Thales system wasn't working? 12 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. Yeah. 13 EMILY YOUNG: Are you aware --14 STEPHEN LENNERTON: From what I --15 that's from what I understood, yeah. 16 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know whether there 17 were any other integration issues between systems? 18 STEPHEN LENNERTON: The compressor. 19 The compressor gave us problems, so we changed to a 20 new compressor. By way of, like, integrating them, 21 I mean, it was more -- like, some of the delays 22 that would happen is, like, if you had to put in 23 new wiring, so a technician would go in to change 24 the wiring and they would accidentally damage 25 something else. You know what I mean? Like, that

1 kind of an issue. 2 But by way of, like, it affecting 3 programming and stuff, I -- I don't know. Т 4 didn't -- again, I didn't do a lot of the 5 electrical stuff. It was mostly towards mechanical 6 failure and stuff like that. 7 EMILY YOUNG: I think it might be a 8 good time for a break, unless, Mr. Harland, did you 9 want to jump in with another question? 10 FRASER HARLAND: No, this is a good 11 time for a break. 12 EMILY YOUNG: Okay. So maybe we can 13 come back at 4:45, if that works. 14 -- RECESS AT 4:33 --15 -- UPON RESUMING AT 4:45 --16 EMILY YOUNG: So, Mr. Lennerton, there 17 was something you wanted to clarify about your job 18 description. 19 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. So later on 20 in the project, I think probably within the last 21 year -- I wouldn't say it was a full year, but --22 the retrofit team got smaller, and I was moved to 23 a -- like, a -- one of the production parts, which 24 was called PCO 9. It was the last train of the 25 before it went to testing, and they made me a team

1	load of that gogtion So I actually in one part
-	read of that section. So ractually, in one part,
2	did all of that or all of the mechanical stuff
3	that you were talking about from before. And then
4	I would also manage a team under an EPU manager to
5	finish, like, closing points and stuff like that,
6	which was more of a production role than it was the
7	other one.
8	I just wanted to throw that in there
9	because one of my questions was if my title
10	changed, so technically I went to a team lead
11	position.
12	EMILY YOUNG: Okay. Thank you. And so
13	did you have any specific role in testing and
14	commissioning, or you were on the retrofit team
15	throughout that phase?
16	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So the extent of my
17	testing was the brakes. Because the people who
18	were testing the train were electrical, once the
19	like, obviously the electricity powers a mechanical
20	device, so on the mechanical side, I would give a
21	lot of yeses or nos as to whether something was
22	working.
23	So if the caliper wasn't working I
24	would set all the hydraulic fluid and everything,
25	and then they would cycle the brake from inside the

1 train, and I would stand in front of the brake and 2 give them yes or no as to whether it's working. We 3 would also then look at, like, hydraulic pressures 4 and things like that and how fast they dropped and 5 things to see if there were other issues because 6 this was more in my avenue of expertise and a 7 little bit outside of what they were. So we kind 8 of colabbed a little bit in that.

9 I didn't normally go for a dynamic 10 test, so -- at one point, though, I was rewarded --11 one of the things I wanted to do was ride the train 12 before any regular citizen was able to do it. Tt. 13 was just -- I just wanted to see what it was like. 14 I wanted to hear it. Sound was a big way of 15 testing things. So there was a couple of occasions 16 where -- well, in one instance I got to actually go 17 for a dynamic test with the testing team and 18 visually test the brakes the way they did out on 19 the track, which gave me an enormous amount of 20 information to make me even better at my job. And 21 then there was also the validation team who would 22 go out on the track, and he would need somebody to 23 assist him in certain things. I would also rescue 24 his train as well during his testing. So I would 25 go out to the track and do it.

92

1 But by way of actually testing electronics and stuff, that was not -- that was not 2 3 I could bring to the attention that something me. 4 wasn't working, but the final decisions were made 5 by the people who were qualified in that department б to do so. But my word did have a lot of weight in 7 it. So if a production person from the floor just 8 said, Hey, I don't think that's working, they 9 wouldn't -- like, they maybe look at it for a 10 second to see, but there wouldn't be really too 11 much done about it. But if I told them there was 12 something that wasn't working, you know, things 13 would stop and we would figure it out. 14 EMILY YOUNG: So you were helping with both validation and serial testing? 15 16 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I was helping with 17 validation, production, the retrofit team, and then 18 when warranty started at the very end, I also 19 assisted that warranty team a lot. So pretty much, 20 like, anything -- any -- any time anything turned 21 into a mechanical issue, I was on it. I was -- I 22 would -- I would consider myself, like, the 23 mechanic of the shop. I was the closest thing they 24 had to, like, an actual licenced mechanic, I would 25 say, without being licenced. I do not have a

93

25

1 mechanical licence or anything like that. 2 EMILY YOUNG: Are you aware of 3 validation testing being delayed on the project? 4 STEPHEN LENNERTON: In some cases, yes. 5 Not due to the person in the validation team, 6 but -- for instance, when we switched from the 7 Revision 1 calipers to the second revision 8 calipers, the caliper itself came to us before the 9 hoses that connect to the train were sent. So we 10 had the device, but we couldn't actually make it 11 function on a whole train because the other 12 component that we needed was not there. So there 13 were ways around it to test it in a static 14 situation, but by way of going out onto the track 15 to do it, that definitely would have caused a 16 delay. 17 But usually the person who was doing 18 validation, the main person for it doing the 19 testing, he will -- he was very ambitious, so he

<sup>20</sup> would just simply switch to something -- he would <sup>21</sup> go and test something different in the time being. <sup>22</sup> So it didn't necessarily completely stop them. In <sup>23</sup> some cases, I guess it would have delayed it by a <sup>24</sup> bit.

Obviously, failures for it too would

25

duration of time.

1 delay him. Like, for instance, when we first got 2 the brakes working on train set 2, the new set of 3 brakes, we were not told that the software in the 4 HPU would have to change, so when he went out to 5 test, the second he applied the brakes, they applied at 100 percent, and this locked up the 6 7 wheels and caused flat spots. Now -- whereas now 8 we deal with flat spots by lathing the wheels. At 9 that point, we didn't have a lathe wheel, and 10 because the train is still being built, they don't 11 want lathe wheels. They need new ones. So for 12 instance, he went out and came back and I had to 13 change 11 wheels on that train because they had so 14 many flat spots due to something like that. 15 So that would have been a delay, but I 16 mean, again, I would do things very guickly and 17 high quality, so I changed all 11 wheels in 3 days, 18 so it wasn't too bad. 19 EMILY YOUNG: Was validation testing 20 still ongoing as serial production was underway? 21 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. So train set 22 2 was built obviously after train set 1, and that 23 was immediately went into validation right away. 24 So he had been validating that train the entire

1	EMILY YOUNG: And sorry, when the
2	validation was going on on 1 and 2, were others
3	also being produced in serial production?
4	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. Trains were
5	still being produced, yeah.
6	EMILY YOUNG: And is it your
7	understanding that normally you would want to have
8	your validation testing done before you start
9	serial production?
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, in a
11	perfect world, when they've built a train that
12	you know, they already know the design of the
13	train. It's built somewhere else, let's say, and
14	they're re-creating it, I could see that being a
15	possibility, but given that these things were being
16	made, tested and everything all at one time, I
17	don't really see that being possible.
18	Now, I personally because of when I
19	started, I don't know if, you know, like, if train
20	set 2 had started validation before production had
21	officially started. At the very beginning of the
22	project, there was a handful of people who had
23	applied right away and were hired, and they were
24	sent to a location in the States were they were
25	trained on how to build train set 1, and that's how

1	we got our start of information. So I don't know
2	if, like, right after that they built train set 2
3	right away, and that's when validation started or
4	if they had built train set 1, then built train set
5	2, validation started and then production started,
6	but I know that validation and production
7	overlapped each other during the time for sure.
8	EMILY YOUNG: Does is the result of
9	that, not having validation done before you go into
10	production of others vehicles, that more retrofits
11	would be required?
12	STEPHEN LENNERTON: It I definitely
13	would say that it's, like, you know let's say,
14	for instance, he gets train set 2, and he's
15	validating the train, and, you know, now train set
16	3, 4, and 5 are built and then he finds an issue,
17	so now they can only start implementing that on the
18	next train that's built, and 3, 4, and 5 would have
19	to be retrofitted to fix said issue, shall we say.
20	EMILY YOUNG: And did that happen on
21	the construction process for these vehicles?
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I would say yes. I
23	would say it would because that's where a lot of
24	our changes would come from, right? Like, he would
25	report back and say you know, for instance,

1	let's use calipers as an example. He reports back
2	and says, These calipers are not up to standard;
3	this is not going to work. And then we would have
4	to continue on with those brakes in order to, you
5	know, be able to continue on with the project while
6	we waited for the new calipers to be brought in.
7	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know whether there
8	were any issues with getting access to the track to
9	do testing?
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: During
11	construction, because the track wasn't completely
12	installed, they were limited to how far they could
13	go. Safety also limited them too in the sense that
14	they didn't have all of their control systems in,
15	so it was there was a lot of permits that needed
16	to be in place and certain construction on the site
17	might stop these things from happening at certain
18	times. But that was all, like, kind of part and
19	parcel of everything. You know what I mean? Like,
20	obviously you can't drive down a track that doesn't
21	exist, so you know what I mean? That would
22	be that would be horrific kind of thing, so
23	obviously those sort of things had an issue.
24	I know that the state of the tracks
25	I don't know if you guys are aware, but the tracks

1	are not built very well, and so it would cause
2	issues in the sense of like, they would say, We
3	think we hear a problem, right, but we can't tell
4	because there's so much other noise being made by
5	the tracks you know what I mean? so that
6	would hinder that as well.
7	EMILY YOUNG: What do you mean when you
8	say the tracks weren't "built very well"?
9	STEPHEN LENNERTON: To give a good
10	example, I sat on the train one time when we were
11	out on a validation run, and I could look straight
12	down on the track and see that it was not straight,
13	like you could visually see, like, the track would
14	go like this and then one would go like this. And,
15	you know, stuff like that. You could look out the
16	front of the bay and see a huge bow in it and stuff
17	like that. So I personally don't think the quality
18	of the tracks was kept up to par, shall we say.
19	EMILY YOUNG: Do you have a sense of
20	whether the testing and commissioning phase on the
21	project was compressed or rushed?
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, Alstom
23	obviously wanted to push it to keep going, but the
24	managers for the test team were amazing, and they
25	wouldn't let because they're liable too, they

1 wouldn't let certain things go by. So, like, if the -- if the testing commissioner -- or sorry, not 2 3 a commissioner but, like, if the testing engineer 4 said, No, we're not going out to test that, there 5 wasn't much Alstom could do about it. So even 6 though they still wanted to stick to their plans --7 it's not like they were saying, hey, go do 8 something unsafe, you know.

9 Like, obviously they would communicate 10 about this topic or whatever, but they would 11 definitely say -- you know, like, we can't, you 12 know, the pantograph won't stay up. Like, we can't 13 go and test. You know, without the pantograph 14 attached to the OCS, let's say -- it's just as an 15 example. I'm not saying this happened all the 16 time, but it's just as an example. If the 17 pantograph can't stay up, we can't go out and test, 18 so it would be foolish for Alstom to say get out 19 there and do it anyways. You know what I mean? 20 EMILY YOUNG: And who would be the 21 person saying that type of thing? Like, the 22 pantograph is not properly in its place --23 STEPHEN LENNERTON: So the testing team

would test it, find out there's a fault, let's say,
and they would report that back to their manager,

which was the engineering manager for the test 1 2 team, and then he would go into this meeting and he 3 would explain this issue of what's happening, and 4 then they would revamp their planning in order to 5 either keep the train in there or move it for now, 6 like have it towed out so they could work on 7 something else until they had the ability to fix 8 said problem. 9 EMILY YOUNG: Are you aware of any 10 changes to the original plan for testing and 11 commissioning or any kind of value engineering in 12 that process? 13 No. STEPHEN LENNERTON: That's a 14 little bit above my head, I think. 15 EMILY YOUNG: Can you just briefly 16 explain for us what the difference between static 17 and dynamic serial testing is? 18 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Okay. So the first 19 stage of static test was put in what we called the 20 cage. So at the end of the station, there was this 21 big cage that we had that they would put the car 22 in, and then members of the testing team would plug 23 in certain machinery that would be able to send 24 power down the line from one end of the line to the 25 other, and it would tell which wires have issues or

<sup>1</sup> pins are not where they need to be or things like <sup>2</sup> that. So that testing would be done to make sure <sup>3</sup> that, obviously, when they turn the whole train on <sup>4</sup> full power that nothing blows up, let's say - which <sup>5</sup> didn't happen, by the way. Nothing every detonated <sup>6</sup> inside the building.

7 But then that train would be put into 8 the last stage of production, where it would be 9 attached and put into a full train. Then it would 10 qo to the second stage of static testing, which 11 would be in the LMB, which is the MSF 1s and 2s, 12 and it would sit there stationary, and they would 13 test all the components that are working. And once 14 they've determined that, one of their last tests 15 would be what's called an earth test, which is they 16 test all the major grounding in it. So they would 17 actually force power down the ground lines in order 18 to make sure that if there was a fault, it would 19 ground properly.

And then they would do what's called a bump test. So they would move the train under power inside the bay, you know, a couple of feet to make sure that, one, they're going to have proper propulsion and then also that they would have brakes that would work.

1 And then after -- sorry, the dynamic 2 part would then be they would schedule a time to go 3 out on the track, and they would go up and down the 4 track and make sure that it does all those 5 different components at different speeds. And then б they would test the doors too. So, like, for 7 instance, one of the tests would be they would have 8 to get up to like, let's say -- actually, they did 9 it at 55 kilometres an hour, I believe. And then 10 at 55 kilometres an hour, you know, one of the 11 technicians would push on the door and to make sure 12 that the door is not going to just open while the 13 train's flying down the track, right?

14 And then they would test the braking in 15 So they would go through, like -- they that too. 16 would go through a dead man's test - so, like, for 17 instance, if the driver has to hold a handle in 18 place, and if the driver were to - you know, heaven 19 forbid - pass away while driving, he would let go 20 of this handle. If this handle is not held, the 21 train would automatically go into an emergency 22 braking system, and it would stop the train 23 immediately. So they would do that sort of test. 24

And then they do the test where they pull the brake all the way back, and that would be

1 like regular braking that the driver would do if 2 he's in control of the train. And then there would 3 be the emergency stop that they would press that 4 would be a full-on, manually initiated test. 5 And also in concerning to Thales, б Thales does work in certain aspects in -- like, 7 it's connected to, like, the GPS system in the 8 train, so it is used in a certain extent to know 9 where it is on the track and stuff like that. It 10 also automates the braking and stuff like that. 11 Like, the drivers are mostly just pushing a button 12 at this point. But by way of it working in an 13 unautomated system is not happening, just to be 14 more clear on that. 15 Do you know how much time EMILY YOUNG: 16 the trains had on the track to run and test before 17 service, how it compared to other rail projects? 18 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I don't know how it 19 would compare to other rail projects, but I 20 definitely know that, for instance -- like, all the 21 trains had a dynamic test. But, like, for 22 instance, when OC Transpo started to take over, 23 they wanted to start training drivers, and as we 24 were building trains, not all those trains -- like, 25 it's not like they cycled through all of the

1 trains, from what I understood. They would have 2 certain trains that were designated to allow the 3 drivers to practice on. 4 EMILY YOUNG: So does that mean that 5 some trains were getting a lot more kilometres than 6 others? 7 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes, yeah. 8 EMILY YOUNG: Could that lead to any 9 issues? 10 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, I mean, 11 obviously, like, wear and tear on the machine is 12 going to bring, you know, maintenance sooner. It's 13 qoing to -- you know, stuff is going to wear down 14 faster. So, you know, definitely if they had flat 15 spots and stuff like that when they did it, the 16 wheels had to be replaced and things like that. 17 But by way of it causing any, like, difference in 18 the issues we're having now versus -- like, you're 19 not going to be able to go there and say, like, 20 well, we know this train's having a lot more 21 problems than this one and then directly relate it 22 to that issue is probably not possible. Τt 23 wouldn't have been that much. It did put more 24 kilometres on it, yes, but I don't think to that 25 extent.

Ottawa Light Rail Commission Stephen Lennerton on 5/19/2022

1 EMILY YOUNG: Did you have any role in 2 the trial running phase? 3 No. STEPHEN LENNERTON: I was never --4 not -- not to, like, learn how to drive the train or anything like that. I -- I don't even -- I 5 6 don't even recall being on the train when OC 7 Transpo drivers were on it until later in 8 maintenance. 9 Would you say or is your EMILY YOUNG: 10 understanding that there were a lot of deferred 11 retrofits going into service as compared to what 12 you might see on other projects? 13 STEPHEN LENNERTON: By way of being 14 able to compare that to another project, I've 15 personally never been a part of another project, 16 and being able to gather that information from an 17 outside source is very difficult. Alstom is very private with some of their information. Like, the 18 19 measurement of the wheel flange is, like, one of 20 their most sacred things. Like, no -- like, train 21 companies do not share their measurement of the 22 wheel flange with each other, and if you ask them 23 what it is, they look at you sideways like, you 24 know, why are you asking this guestion kind of 25 It's a funny topic. We used to tease them thing.

1 with it. 2 EMILY YOUNG: Fair enough. I'll 3 reframe it this way: Did you have any concerns 4 going into service about the amount of retrofits 5 that still had to be done to the trains? 6 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, absolutely. 7 Absolutely. Like, when the trains got launched, 8 the auxiliary line on the brakes is not even hooked 9 up at all. There's no reservoir tank for it. 10 There's no oil in it at all. 11 EMILY YOUNG: What does that mean? 12 Like, what's the effect of that? 13 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Okay. So you have 14 a main line, which is what functions all the time 15 when you're driving the train, right? It's 16 controlled by the HPU, right, so technically when 17 the train breaks on the track, we have to do what's 18 called a rescue. So right now, what they have to 19 do to rescue the train is they have to turn the 20 train off and then they have to turn on certain 21 components of the train, which is basically the 22 HPUs; they have to tell the HPU to release the 23 brakes. Then the HPU and the accumulator are 24 required to then hold this pressure so that the 25 brakes stay released, and then they would tow the
1 train back, right? 2 The correct way to do it is that 3 there's actually a hand pump that's supposed to be 4 mounted inside the train that a technician such as 5 either myself or a warranty technician - whoever's б qualified at the time - would go onto the train and 7 connect this device to a quick connect outlet 8 that's behind a small trap door. He would then 9 physically pump the pressure required to hold the 10 brake open, and then they would tow the train. 11 The importance of that is that the HPU 12 and the accumulator are only capable of holding 13 pressure for approximately 7 to 8 minutes. So once 14 you turn all that on and put the pressure in, they 15 have to turn the train back off, so then the timer 16 starts ticking, so then they start to tow the 17 train. 18 Well, while this is happening, the 19 pressure in the calipers are dropping, which means 20 the pressure is now -- or the caliper is now 21 reapplying pressure to the rotors, which would then 22 This is why -- I don't know of lock up the wheels. 23 how much you're aware of the project, but this is 24 why when they rescue a train, the wheels have to be

1 thing back. So the problem with that retrofit is 2 they need to put what's called an overflow tank in. 3 And that tank needs to sit somewhere -- like, for 4 instance, you can't put a high-pressure tank behind 5 a piece of plastic that would be directly next to a 6 customer's, like, body -- you know what I mean? --7 in case there was a catastrophic failure. So there would have to be a pipe --8 9 like, a hose put in. It would have to be mounted 10 properly. And up to the point of where I left, I 11 never even saw any sort of drawings of this or 12 And to me personally, that's, like -anything. 13 the amount of problems that they're having, not 14 being able to rescue the train properly is one 15 thing that I find is very much, like, in the way of 16 what's going on.

17 In the way in the sense EMILY YOUNG: 18 that it hinders the ability to do maintenance of --19 STEPHEN LENNERTON: To -- well, it --20 it hinders the ability to rescue the train on the 21 track in a timely manner, and it also -- if they 22 had those components in the train, they would be 23 able to rescue the train without further damaging 24 the train. So the way they're doing it now when it 25 fails, it damages the wheels, and that causes more

1 work. So for instance, it can't just come back in 2 and have a quick fix done and go back out. It's 3 qot to be in for a day to be fixed; then it's got 4 to go to the wheel lathe; then it's got to be 5 lathed. All that has to happen and then it can go 6 back into service. So that's definitely something, 7 in my personal opinion, that highly contributes to 8 delays. 9 EMILY YOUNG: Were there any other 10 retrofits that had yet to be done at the time of 11 service that concerned you? 12 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not like that, no. 13 I mean, there were probably little things here and 14 there, but they were out of my scope of work at 15 that time, so I didn't really pay attention to 16 I mean, my thing was, like, I was doing the that. 17 brakes, right, and that's arguably the most 18 important part of the train. So my -- I was so 19 focussed on that that these -- like, you know, oh, 20 this zip tie's not in the right spot, I personally 21 don't care about that zip tie -- you know what I 22 mean? -- that kind of thing. 23 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think it's fair to 24 say that the push to get to service would have

<sup>25</sup> downloaded more work onto maintenance?

1 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, maintenance 2 doesn't do anything -- like, maintenance doesn't 3 take care of any retrofits or changes to the train, 4 so I think what would have hurt more was the 5 warranty team in the sense that, like, things б obviously wouldn't have worked properly, and the 7 warranty team is what looks at that. 8 The -- the maintenance team is more 9 supposed to be preventive maintenance - so, you 10 know, at 150,000 kilometres, you need to grease 11 your caliper pins; you need to flush the train; you 12 need to check your wheels and fix the sander or, 13 like, do, you know, maintenance to the sanders and 14 other components, re-level the train, like, things 15 like that - whereas the warranty team would 16 actually have to -- so for instance, if there's a 17 retrofit where a program in one of the computer 18 systems needs to be changed, the warranty team 19 would be the one that would go in and change it. 20 EMILY YOUNG: Would that have an effect 21 on Alstom maintenance by making it harder to get 22 access to the trains to do maintenance? 23 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Absolutely. If 24 this takes time and stuff like that -- so for 25 instance, if the train is scheduled to come in for

1 150K maintenance but warranty has control of the 2 train because they're trying to do something to it, 3 obviously the train is not going to be able to be 4 brought in for that, and vice versa. Like, they 5 might say, Okay, forget about the warranty thing 6 for now; let's do the maintenance. They're still 7 going to have to do the warranty part after. So no 8 matter what, it's causing that extra step in there. 9 FRASER HARLAND: Is there a hierarchy 10 between maintenance and warranty? Like, who would 11 get precedence to get their work done if there's

<sup>12</sup> demand for the trains like that?

13 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, in the 14 beginning -- in the beginning stages, when the 15 train is still under warranty, I would assume that 16 the warranty team would, for the most part, get the 17 priority to it - not necessarily because their 18 hierarchy is -- or, like, they're in more control 19 of it, but just for the simple reason that the 20 maintenance team can go to another train and do 21 maintenance -- right -- so they would sub out 22 another train that we'd go and do maintenance to 23 that one while the warranty team was working on the 24 other one. So I think that's the way they would 25 make that decision, as opposed to saying, like, I

> neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

Τ

1	am I am a higher level of management or
2	something like that, so I deem this to be more
3	important to me. The warranty team is the team
4	right now that's supposed to be doing the fixes to
5	the trains because it's still, obviously, under
6	warranty.
7	EMILY YOUNG: Are you aware of the
8	agreement between the City and RTG at the beginning
9	of service that allowed 13 trains at peak times
10	instead of 15?
11	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, we heard
12	now, by way of, like, all the legal details within
13	it, no, I never saw a physical contract or
14	anything. But, obviously, when you're, you know,
15	the team that's launching the trains, we are told,
16	you know, hey, we're not launching 15 anymore, we
17	only need to get this number type of thing, so that
18	we know what we're planning and everything like
19	that. So I was aware that that was happening.
20	I it's actually funny, I had a
21	conversation about that with the validation guy one
22	day, like, back in production, and he was like,
23	They won't even be able to keep all 15 trains
24	going; they're going to have to lessen that number.
25	Because you there's no like, when you build

1 15 trains and then you want to launch 15 trains, it 2 doesn't really leave much room for error, right? 3 Like -- but I think in respect to Alstom, that was 4 one of their biggest faults is their planning 5 structure was amazing; they were on top of 6 everything, but they never left room for error. So 7 the second something in their plan went wrong, it 8 shattered the whole thing, and they would have to 9 redo all this planning. And of course they planned 10 it, let's say, over a 6-month period, and a problem 11 happens that takes place, you know, a month to fix, 12 that drastically changes that aspect. The Alstom 13 plan for this to go off without a hitch, like, no 14 issues ever, we're just going to plug and play and 15 here we go, but obviously things are a lot more 16 complicated than what the employers, I guess, would 17 want to think. You know what I mean? 18 EMILY YOUNG: Do you know whether the

<sup>19</sup> 15 vehicles for morning peak service was reached,
 <sup>20</sup> like when it went back to that level?

STEPHEN LENNERTON: By the time I had left, I mean, there might have been a couple of times in there where we hit that mark, I would say. But on a consistent basis, I would say I never really experienced that much. I mean, they may

1	have said, hey, we're going to launch 15 trains,
2	but I don't think there were ever like, I can't
3	recall where there were 15 trains that were working
4	properly in order to do that, like, in my
5	experience.
6	EMILY YOUNG: Did lower ridership
7	during COVID provide an opportunity to work out
8	more bugs with the trains and get more trains back
9	up to an operational level?
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, in theory
11	it should have, but it didn't change the demand for
12	the amount of trains being launched, right? So
13	even during COVID, I think they went down to 11
14	trains I think is what it was I'm not
15	100 percent sure, but it may have helped a
16	little bit, but they they still needed to meet
17	all those intervals. Like, the train needed to be
18	at this station at this time over and over and over
19	again, and in order to reach that, they still
20	needed the same number of trains on the track.
21	Otherwise, you'd have a void area in that time
22	where there was no train to pull into the station.
23	So they would have to change you
24	know, for instance, like a city bus is expected to
25	be at a bus stop at a certain time, so you call it,

1 they tell you it's going to be there, and you can 2 wait for it, right? Well, if they take that bus 3 out of service and they don't replace it with another one, there's a gap between that bus and the 4 5 next one. You know what I mean? So it would have 6 had the same effect on -- on the -- on them in that 7 case. 8 So I would say for the most part no, 9 but in some aspects, they might have gotten an 10 extra train in. But at the same time, they only 11 had so many MVTs. So you could throw every train 12 at the maintenance team: They don't have the 13 people, and they don't have the facility to work on 14 all of them at the same time. So it -- it wouldn't 15 have had that much of a -- of an impact, especially 16 not with the size of issues that are happening, 17 like the wheel cracks. 18 EMILY YOUNG: Would you say that there 19 was any unnecessary running of the trains that 20 would have sort of speeded up the need for 21 maintenance? 22 STEPHEN LENNERTON: No, I don't think 23 so. 24 EMILY YOUNG: So you spoke about there

<sup>25</sup> being quite a learning curve at the start of

1	maintenance for the MVT team. Could you tell us a
2	little bit more about who was brought in to work on
3	that team, how many of them were previously with
4	Alstom construction?
5	STEPHEN LENNERTON: So by way of, like,
6	exact numbers, I'm not going to be able to remember
7	those, but I know there's, like like, the number
8	one guy in seniority right now, he was a Day 1-er.
9	He started Day 1 of the production process. But
10	then you've got two guys after him who had never
11	seen the project until maintenance. And then
12	there's a couple of us that are sprinkled in there,
13	let's say. I'd say there would be, like, five to
14	six now that are there.
15	And even at that, some of the guys that
16	were brought in from production, they didn't really

CLION, 17 do very much that translates to maintenance. Like, 18 my tasks specifically related to maintenance while 19 the trains were, like, being dynamic tested, right? 20 Like, when the train needed to be fixed, it didn't 21 go back to production to be fixed. It came to me 22 when it was mechanical. So their experience in a 23 station -- like, one guy who's there, I mentioned 24 Easy before, Malaku: Amazing person, great worker 25 and knew his station very well, but his station

1	only consisted of connecting some brackets to it
2	and hooking up a couple of hoses, like a couple of
3	rigid hoses, a couple of wiring harnesses, maybe.
4	So by way of him getting any hands-on,
5	like, testing for instance, he can't go out on
6	the track and hear a sound and know what it is,
7	whereas I could drive down the track and I could
8	say, This gear box tooth is broken; I can hear it
9	clicking. You know what I mean? So that kind of
10	knowledge.
11	So even the people who were hired there
12	didn't all have that level of dynamic training. So
13	it's like their mindset is they're just going to
14	follow this micro, and because they've been
15	following micros all the way through production,
16	they should be able to do this properly. They
17	would have an advantage in the sense of they know
18	where parts are, they know what they're called,
19	they know what certain torque values are, things
20	like that and what tools they would need. That
21	would help with the learning curve, but by way of
22	diagnosing something, you know like, I've even
23	seen some of them: They look at something that I
24	know is not right, but they don't notice it because
25	they're not used to seeing it.

1	EMILY YOUNG: Did Alstom make efforts
2	to try and hire the sort of people who were in
3	roles more like yours who would be
4	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No.
5	EMILY YOUNG: well-suited to
6	maintenance?
7	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Actually, the
8	complete opposite. Like, I was resisted against by
9	the maintenance vehicle manager. He
10	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know why?
11	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, because he
12	wants to be right, and he's not. So that we're
13	kind of touching into a different a bit of a
14	different topic. So, like, for instance, when I
15	was hired, as I spoke before, I was called and
16	asked if I would take part in this brake project
17	before moving on - or if I wanted to, I could just
18	move on, right? So I had had this conversation
19	prior to them. They literally looked at me and
20	said, when this project is over, you go to
21	maintenance because we want you in maintenance -
22	like, the production managers did.
23	This manager then came in and thought,
24	well, he's not a mechanical engineer or an
25	electrical engineer, so he's not going to be able

1 to be part of maintenance. The argument to that was the company's not requiring those requirements 2 3 in order to do the job. 4 So then, for instance, the day that 5 everybody left from that brake project, I was б called upstairs to his office 45 minutes after they 7 And I walked in, and he closed the door, and left. 8 told me that he had fight with everybody to hire 9 me, when I already knew what was happening because 10 he didn't know that these conversations had 11 happened before. So he tried to play it off as 12 though he was, like, my buddy and doing a favour 13 for me by hiring me because he didn't think I was 14 qualified -- he actually told me that was I was 15 going to have a hard time transitioning from 16 production to maintenance because I was not as 17 educated as everyone else, when in reality it was 18 the complete opposite. I had the most experience 19 in the entire country at least, if not the world, 20 for this type of stuff, and I was the best suited 21 for the position. 22

So right away I knew -- you know, for instance, we would be standing in certain situations where we would be talking, and he would give out information, which I would abruptly <sup>1</sup> correct because wrong information leads to wrong <sup>2</sup> decisions which leads to problems. So I would <sup>3</sup> correct this, so he didn't like that because it <sup>4</sup> would make him look like he didn't know what he was <sup>5</sup> doing. So there was that turmoil between us, so <sup>6</sup> there was always that game going on.

7 So what he wanted to do, in my personal 8 opinion from what I saw, is that he wanted to 9 remove the people who could correct him so that he 10 could then look as though he knows everything 11 that's going on. It's what -- in my personal 12 opinion, he's basically, like, a fake it 'til you 13 make it kind of manager. Like, he doesn't know 14 what's going on, to the point where I actually 15 questioned his actual education that he claimed -16 like, I formally went to management above him and 17 said, I don't believe that he actually knows what he's talking about - because it was becoming 18 19 He was literally giving instructions concerning. 20 to MVTs that were wrong and then the MVT would 21 carry out that instruction.

FRASER HARLAND: Are you able to tell us who that maintenance vehicle manager was? STEPHEN LENNERTON: His first name is Hussein, and I'm unaware -- I don't even know if I

1	can pronounce his last name, but his name is
2	Hussein.
3	EMILY YOUNG: Do you think,
4	Mr. Lennerton, that Alstom missed out on recruiting
5	people involved in construction who would have been
6	good at maintenance
7	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, yeah, I could
8	have put you together a team of 18 people that
9	would have be able to walk up to that train and do
10	anything that was needed without any of those
11	micros. Like, when I went to PC09, I so for
12	instance, they looked at me and said, Would you go
13	to maintenance? We need somebody that can flush
14	the brakes. So I trained a guy on the brakes. And
15	then they found some Randstad found some little
16	excuse to fire him because they had a bonus
17	incentive.
18	So they told all the production
19	technicians, if you stay to this date, we're going
20	to give you X amount of dollars. I don't remember
21	the exact number, but if you stay to this date, you
22	will you'll have it. Well, Randstad turned
23	around and realized, oh, everybody's going to stay.
24	That's a lot of money. So then they turned around
25	and started nit-picking people and getting rid of

122

them so they wouldn't make it until that time. They tried to do it and make it a legal thing. When you're there, you know what's happening. So I literally trained this person and then they fired him for, like, some sort of -- like, 2 minutes of misappropriation of time or something like that, like something ridiculous. You know what I mean?

8 EMILY YOUNG: You said that you thought 9 about five or six people were hired on from 10 construction to maintenance. How many maintenance 11 people were there at the start?

12 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I think by the time 13 I left, we were upwards around -- like, at one 14 point, we were at 18 people, and people were 15 They actually hired three people from the leaving. 16 test team, but because the schedule was so bad --17 like, there was -- like, Hussein took -- put effort 18 into making the schedule as miserable as possible, 19 so they would leave because of that, and these 20 testing guys to me are even better than I am for 21 the maintenance position. So they left for better 22 opportunities, whether it was completely outside of 23 the company or if they just -- like, I know two of 24 them moved to the help desk and stuff, which better 25 suited their liking because they did not want to

1 work under Hussein. I don't know if that answered 2 everything or not. 3 EMILY YOUNG: Yeah. No, that's very 4 helpful. Thank you. I'm wondering if you could speak about the transition from OLRTC to RTM or 5 6 Alstom construction to Alstom maintenance and 7 whether you think that that was a smooth 8 transition, was managed well or not so well. 9 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Absolutely 10 terrible. Hussein didn't do anything for the -- he 11 was there a year early and had all this time to 12 prepare to get all of our tools and set up the 13 facility, and when I got to maintenance, I had no 14 tools. So for instance, like, when I first 15 started, I was hired, like, number 12, I think, was 16 my first level of seniority. Everyone up to that 17 point got tools, right, then I didn't. So they had 18 a little toolbox and they'd get this tool kit that 19 covered some basic tools, like basic hand tools, 20 nothing too crazy, and then when it got to me, I 21 conveniently did not have any tools. And then the 22 next person who was hired got tools. And then 23 another person got hired and they didn't get tools. 24 And then another person would. And then even at 25 one point -- I had been requesting tools for a very

was?

1 long time. 2 And at one point, another gentleman's 3 toolbox broke, and this person had a very good 4 rapport with Hussein. They got along with each 5 And his toolbox was replaced in an hour. other. б Within the hour, he had a brand spanking new one. 7 And I had been asking for an extremely -- like, 8 we're talking almost a year I had been asking. So 9 that lack of commitment to making sure that 10 everyone was up to par with what was going on. 11 And then the mistakes that he was 12 making with purchasing things caused budget issues, 13 which then Alstom stopped approving things that 14 they needed. So for instance, when I went and said 15 I needed tools, they said, Well, no, you don't; 16 Hussein says you have them. So they just went off 17 with what he said, right? So he definitely failed 18 miserably in preparing everything to be set up to 19 launch at that year mark. 20 EMILY YOUNG: I -- sorry, go ahead. 21 Mr. Harland, I see your... 22 FRASER HARLAND: Could you just explain 23 a little bit more. You said a year mark, so can 24 you give us a rough indication of what that year 25

Was that a year prior to revenue service?

1 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah -- sorry, a 2 year prior to -- for the sake of the conversation, 3 let's say the year prior to handing the keys over 4 to OC Transpo for their drivers to take over and 5 actually start putting customers on the train, б there was a portion of time where they were going 7 through the hiring process and they were supposed 8 to be setting up MSF 2 in order to be able to take 9 on this maintenance, and that is the part where --10 for instance, like, for the majority of the time there, the technicians that were hired, the MVTs 11 12 that were hired, they sat in a room on a computer 13 to do these -- you know, when you start a job and 14 they give you your safety stuff and all that kind 15 of thing, you've got to fill out these little skits 16 that they put up in front of you? They did all 17 those. And then they finished them, but because he 18 didn't have anything together -- and they didn't do 19 anything else other than that.

So, like -- for instance, like, they should have been going and, like, you know, seeing what was going on. Like, they may not have been able to touch anything, but they should have gone and shadowed other people that were working on the trains to get used to the trains, especially the <sup>1</sup> ones that were just getting there. So they didn't <sup>2</sup> really get exposed to anything until the launch <sup>3</sup> happened and then they're like, Hey, here's the <sup>4</sup> trains; start telling us what was wrong. You know <sup>5</sup> what I mean? So there was no lead-up to that.

6 And in that time, for instance, like, I 7 remember he bought a -- it's for sheet metal. It's 8 for bending like aluminium and stuff like that, 9 which is a manufacturing thing. We don't 10 manufacture anything in there. Like, we don't make 11 these parts. So it was a completely useless tool 12 that will never be bought, right, and he spent 13 thousands of dollars on it.

So these problems were affecting the
 budget and affecting, like, the MVTs having access
 to what they needed in order to get off on a better
 foot during that time.

18 FRASER HARLAND: So if I can just 19 paraphrase your evidence quickly, you're saying 20 there was a team of MVTs, of maintenance workers 21 hired in the lead-up to maintaining the trains, and 22 they did not work with the trains at all until they 23 actually took over maintenance. Is that fair? 24 They had little STEPHEN LENNERTON: 25 training bits in there where, like, you know, they

1	were like, for instance, they were trained on
2	the wheel lathe. So, like, a guy came from I
3	believe it was Germany, and he came and trained
4	actually, don't take my word for that. They may
5	have sent somebody from America. I know that the
6	machine is made in Germany. But they sent someone
7	to the facility to train them on the wheel lathe,
8	but by way of, like by way of going to the train
9	and actually physically doing something to that, it
10	didn't come until way later on in that year, like
11	much closer to the transition. Like, for instance,
12	the trains were already in service when I started
13	in the maintenance position.
14	EMILY YOUNG: Do you feel like the
15	training that the MVTs received in advance of
16	maintenance got them ready to maintain?
17	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No.
18	EMILY YOUNG: What should have
19	happened?
20	STEPHEN LENNERTON: They should have
21	been shadowing people. That entire team should
22	have followed me around all fricking day, like all
23	day long and listened to everything I said. And,
24	like, I'm not trying to be arrogant in that aspect,
25	but, like, I had an enormous amount of information

1	that I could have given them to prepare them for
2	what's going on: Hey, guys, you got to keep an eye
3	on this because this is what happens when the train
4	vibrates down the track; you know, so this will
5	come loose or this will happen, so you need to keep
6	an eye on them when the trains are in here.
7	There's little things like that.
8	Or even just how to take something off.
9	So for instance, like removing a gearbox off, for
10	instance, there's a way to do that, and it's
11	different taking it off than it is putting it on,
12	and it changes when the train has been driven and
13	there's dirt all over it and, like, all that kind
14	of stuff. It changes the aspects of doing the
15	jobs.
16	So for instance, when maintenance had
17	started I remember I missed a day of work and
18	they had to change a gearbox. So when I came in
19	the next day, the operations manager and the number
20	one guy at that time, who was Dennis, came up to me
21	and said, Hey, man, we changed a gearbox
22	yesterday because, like, this was a big thing.
23	I had changed all of the gearboxes up until that
24	point. And I looked at them and I said, Well, how
25	long did it take you? And they said, Well,

1 8 hours. Well, I can change a gear box in 2 45 minutes, so I looked at them and I said, Well, 3 that's a really long time. Did you follow the 4 instructions? Like, did you put the o-ring in the 5 Because that's one of the things that's back? 6 missed with new guys when they go to try to do 7 I said did you put the O-ring in the back, this. 8 and did you clean off the heat spray and put new 9 And they looked at me cross-eyed, being, stuff on? 10 like, what O-ring and this kind of thing. So I 11 looked at the operations manager and I said, You 12 need to bring that train back to me, and we need to 13 put the proper things on.

And so then he told me, Well, we don't have 8 hours to do that, and I said, Well, we'll do it in 45 minutes, and they doubted me drastically on this, and I explained to the technician what it was, and we changed it and everything was fine.

19 So there were a lot of gaps in their 20 instruction, and I believe even in that specific 21 situation, I believe Dennis went to engineering and 22 was upset because the instructions that I gave him 23 to do weren't in the instructions he was given. So 24 even if he had followed those to the tee, which he 25 did, the instruction wasn't there to do it. So

1	they didn't know what to do with that o-ring. So
2	they did what they thought they should do, which is
3	where I believe the issue is with, like, hiring
4	people who aren't necessarily trained in that
5	field, right? Like, when you run into a problem
6	where you don't know the answer, there's you
7	need to stop what they're doing and go and get the
8	answer, not guess you know what I mean? due
9	to the lack of experience.
10	EMILY YOUNG: So the instructions were
11	deficient, then?
12	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. Oh, yeah.
13	Oh, yeah.
14	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know who would
15	have prepared the instructions?
16	STEPHEN LENNERTON: That would have
17	been their engineering team, most likely.
18	EMILY YOUNG: And at what so when
19	you're describing this process of them changing the
20	gearbox, not knowing how to do it, was that before
21	service started? Was
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No, I was on the
23	MVT team at that time.
24	EMILY YOUNG: So it sounds like they
25	hadn't received proper training on how to change a

1	gear box before service started?
2	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Correct. It was a
3	situation of, You're supposed to be able to read
4	this micro at a Grade 9 level. We've provided you
5	with said micro from engineering, so follow it, and
6	that's that.
7	FRASER HARLAND: Can I ask how you knew
8	what to do with the O-ring? I understand that
9	you're more experienced, but, you know, was there a
10	complete manual that
11	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes, there were
12	full micros on the bogies. So for instance, Sorel,
13	who built the bogies, sent over two binders that
14	were hundreds of pages - because we have a motor
15	bogie and we have a trailer bogie, so there's two
16	different sets. Most of the instructions are the
17	same in both of them. But yes, I had that.
18	And then I also had the fact that they
19	had at the beginning of the project, when they
20	knew that they needed to do this, engineering
21	before I got there was involved in figuring out how
22	to do this and obtaining the correct information
23	for the production technicians. But like I said
24	before, once maintenance hit, they just said, We
25	don't want any of your information because it's to

1	build the train, and we want information to fix the
2	train, which a lot of it would have a lot of it
3	would have, like, meshed together with each other.
4	EMILY YOUNG: So the information that
5	you had was from the construction phase, and the
6	maintenance people didn't have that information.
7	STEPHEN LENNERTON: They had some of it
8	but not all of it.
9	EMILY YOUNG: And is that sort of
10	reflective of how document transfer went in
11	general?
12	STEPHEN LENNERTON: In my opinion,
13	yeah. In maintenance, it was I remember the
14	first time I went to the supervisor, and I said,
15	Where's the micro for the bogies? I know it's in
16	the building somewhere. Where is it? I want it.
17	And they said, Well, we have control over our
18	version, and it's not ready to be given to you. So
19	it's just, like like, when I'm not there, I
20	can't correct anything, and I can't be there
21	24 hours a day. This is a 24-hour thing; right?
22	In production, I was there the entire
23	time, so any of these questions that I knew could
24	be asked, right, but then there was also the whole
25	thing of, like, okay, so we don't have the

1	information, but then telling Hussein, telling
2	somebody to go ask Steve would admit that he
3	doesn't know, which makes him look bad, so they
4	would avoid that at all costs.
5	EMILY YOUNG: Who is Steve, sorry?
6	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Me.
7	EMILY YOUNG: Oh.
8	STEPHEN LENNERTON: That's okay.
9	EMILY YOUNG: I was going, who's the
10	Steve who's higher up who has more information?
11	Thank you. Were you often receiving the
12	maintenance documents that you needed late, or did
13	you get them in advance with enough time to train
14	on them?
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: It's almost like
16	they would come together with so like I said,
17	maintenance is supposed to be a preventive thing,
18	and due to the lack of knowledge on it, it became a
19	reactive thing quickly. So for instance, the
20	sanding thing would happen, so immediately
21	engineering's priority is figuring this out. So
22	very quickly well, we'll say relatively quickly,
23	we would get information concerning those
24	injectors. Now, whether they were correct or not,
25	sometimes yes, sometimes no, but that's how they

1 would work: Oh, this gear box needs to be changed, 2 quick scramble, let's try and find these 3 instructions; if not, let's create them. 4 Also, at the beginning of it, there was 5 a gentleman called Bashar (phonetic), and he was part of a different entity to the validation team, 6 7 and he actually had an entire -- his whole job in 8 production was to set up a maintenance manual --9 right -- Hussein didn't like him, so they had 10 quarrels between each other, which actually forced 11 him out the door. So he left due to issues with 12 Hussein. He would always complain that Hussein 13 would not let him kind of take charge with what 14 needed to be done, and he would in fact, like, stop 15 him, I guess you would say, from doing what he 16 needed to do, so that was a huge setback when he 17 left because the next people stepping into the 18 position were great at what they did. They were 19 from production. But their whole thing in 20 production was not to do what Bashar was doing. So 21 it created, again, a learning curve in order for 22 them to get up to speed.

EMILY YOUNG: And did that mean that it took longer to finish the maintenance manual that Bashar had been working on?

1	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I would say yes. I
2	mean, I can't speak to, like, any direct thing
3	because I would not be involved in those
4	conversations, but I would assume that the fact
5	that this person who just spent all that time in
6	production learning all that information leaving,
7	you know, it's going to leave out areas that you
8	might need to consult the person in order to figure
9	out some of the stuff that was going on.
10	EMILY YOUNG: Did the MVTs have
11	training leading up to service on some of those
12	basic skills you were talking about before like
13	torquing bolts
14	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, yeah. They
15	had to go through torque training. I'm not going
16	to lie to you, I can't remember all of them because
17	by then, I had done like, for instance, they
18	made me go and do torque training because it was a
19	technicality, but I had actually done the torque
20	training class like four or five times in
21	production because you have to renew it and stuff.
22	And I had also taught that class twice with the
23	instructor. So it was really kind of ridiculous
24	for me to go and do that again, but at the same
25	time it was a technicality.

1 So the -- like, everybody had to go 2 through that, but to be honest with you, that's --3 like, I don't want you to think, like, this torque 4 training is not some extensive thing. They just go 5 through and teach you that when you torque the 6 bolt, you're stretching it. This is why you don't 7 stretch it too much. This is what happens if you 8 This is what happens if you don't. And then do. 9 you would actually test torquing bolts, and that 10 would be about it. So it was not some sort of 11 elaborate training thing. 12 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that it was 13 sufficient to teach the technicians how to properly 14 torque a bolt? 15 Yes. I believe the STEPHEN LENNERTON: 16 instructions actually covered what they needed to 17 do. I would say yes. 18 EMILY YOUNG: Was the MSF properly 19 equipped for you to start doing maintenance at the 20 beginning of service? 21 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I would say no. 22 EMILY YOUNG: What would have been 23 missing? 24 Well, for instance, STEPHEN LENNERTON: 25 like, they had to use my old flush cart to flush

1	the brakes, and the production team had to do that
2	because the new machine that had come in did not
3	get up and running fast enough for them to keep up
4	with it, like, as an example. So when we were
5	going through, like, the maintenance stuff, they
6	weren't touching the brakes. Now, there could be
7	an aspect of that where that has something to do
8	with the warranty and meaning that they can't touch
9	it, but I knew, like, for instance, they still used
10	that old cart, which is now broken, but that was
11	the direction that they went with that. So it
12	would affect other things as well, I guess, like
13	other job situations.

EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that Alstom maintenance was sufficiently staffed going into revenue service?

17 STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. 18 people is 18 not enough people to take care of that many trains 19 with that many problems. They need more people. 20 They -- they needed to retain people who knew what 21 they were doing, and they needed to hire more 22 people, and they needed to have the people who had 23 been there train the people who were not, 24 basically. 25 EMILY YOUNG: And they didn't do those

138

1

things? 2 STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. They --3 they -- Hussein consistently looked for, like --4 for instance, like, Hussein was huge about this. 5 So on the air conditioning system, there is a б certain type of gas that you're supposed to have a 7 certain certificate that you get at Algonquin, 8 right? You go to Algonquin for 8 hours or 9 something, like, you do this little course and then 10 they give you a certificate so that you understand 11 what you're doing with this gas, right, because a 12 certain amount of it can't emit into the air for 13 emissions purposes, right?

14 He was so amazed, like, we're getting 15 this training; like, we're giving you all this 16 training; and literally you never have to do that 17 to the train. Like, it's one of the things that 18 works, and you don't always have to be doing this. 19 So it was basically, like, if he thought he was 20 doing something that was good in getting us 21 training, he would blow it up real big, but it 22 would have, like, a small, small, small impact on 23 it.

24 Like, one -- with these trains, you 25 can't go to school for trains. There's no

1	course like, I looked. There's no course in
2	Algonquin that teaches you how to build a train,
3	and then especially not one that's never been built
4	before, right? So the training would have had to
5	specifically come from the people with experience.
6	So again, with one of the biggest
7	faults for Alstom, they wanted to look at people
8	only with an education, and they thought experience
9	isn't good enough. They want to be able to say
10	like, for instance, the City comes and says, This
11	is broken because the person that's working on it
12	doesn't know what they're doing. They say, Well,
13	here's his electrical engineering degree; you can't
14	say he's not educated, right?
15	Whereas, like, for instance, with
16	someone like me, their argument would have to be,
17	Well, he's been here for this amount of time,
18	which, unfortunately, the way things are in the
19	work field, education supersedes experience over
20	and over. While these kids well, not kids but
21	people were in school getting this education, I was
22	doing what they were trying to learn about. So
23	it's I mean, a good mixture of both is there.
24	I'm not taking away from people who obtain
25	education, but when you can't learn about it

<sup>1</sup> anywhere else other than in that facility. Like, <sup>2</sup> school for that train was production. That was <sup>3</sup> your schooling, and production ended, so there's no <sup>4</sup> more school. You know what I mean?

5 And then when you have the aspect of б training, the trainer knows 100 percent of what 7 they're training. They train the person, and it's 8 assumed by statistics that that person would know 9 80 percent of what they were trained until they 10 qain more experience, right? So if that person 11 goes and trains somebody else, they're going to 12 leave out information too due to lack of 13 experience, and then as you trickle down the 14 training, you know, it becomes less and less and 15 So they would have needed to stay with the less. 16 priority of the person who knew what they were 17 doing.

18 And I'm not the only one that could 19 have participated in that either. They were other 20 people that they could have used for certain 21 aspects of training. So essentially when they 22 would come out with -- so for instance, when the --23 when they were having problems with the levelling, right, there were certain things we needed to do to 24 25 fix certain components of the train so that we

<sup>1</sup> could level things properly, so the engineer
<sup>2</sup> himself would have to come down and talk to two of
<sup>3</sup> the maintenance guys and say, This is what we're
<sup>4</sup> trying to do, and they would trial and error it,
<sup>5</sup> and that would be their level of training in that
<sup>6</sup> aspect.

7 But they wouldn't sit in a room and 8 have formal training like -- like, for instance, 9 when you're in the legal system, you're going to 10 sit in a room, and they're going to simulate legal 11 systems so, like -- you know, so that you can get 12 an idea of how things work, right, and that kind of 13 wouldn't really happen because there was literally 14 no one there to do it. You can't call somebody at 15 a training facility and say, hey, come and train us 16 on something you've never seen. So it made it --17 they were definitely in a difficult situation, but 18 they didn't make the correct decisions in a 19 difficult situation to make it not so difficult, I 20 guess you would say.

EMILY YOUNG: So if they didn't have the people who knew how the trains worked - like you and others - doing the training, who was doing the training of the new maintenance people? STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, for instance, Т

1	when I did the torque training thing, a guideway
2	tech taught me it. They literally tightened, like,
3	one or two bolts at the frogs and stuff. They
4	checked bolt like, one single bolt tightness
5	for, like, the entire track kind of thing.
6	So it's like, again, I'm having
7	somebody who's never physically worked on the
8	trains teach me, who built them, how to work on the
9	train.
10	EMILY YOUNG: And so it sounds like, in
11	your view, they didn't have the right people doing
12	the training.
13	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, not they
14	did at one point, but they shunned them away. They
15	made it so that they wouldn't like, I remember
16	when we were going through the hiring process, tons
17	of people from the floor applied, right, and all of
18	them like, they would all come up to me because
19	they knew I could go and say things to people and
20	try to help them out, and they would come up to me
21	and say, Steve, why am I not getting an interview?
22	I just watched this other guy come in off the
23	street for an interview, I have the exact same
24	education that he has, and I've been here for a
25	year. I have all this experience. Why are they
1 not interviewing me? 2 And that goes back to the stigma that 3 they thought that us in production were just a 4 bunch of failures because, you know, a deadline 5 didn't get met -- you know what I mean? -- that 6 kind of thing. 7 There was a lot of negativity pushed 8 towards us. Like, I -- I spoke with Jaime about 9 this when we met before. Like, for instance, I 10 couldn't -- it got to the point where I couldn't turn the radio on when I drove to work because they 11 12 would talk so badly about a certain problem that I 13 am dealing with, so it would mentally affect me 14 when I was going into work. I would be angry at --15 this person is in a radio studio, telling me I 16 don't know what I'm doing, when all he does is push 17 a button and talk into a microphone. You know what 18 you mean? And none of them would come -- I would 19 always say, go to Randstad, apply, come down here 20 and tell us how to do it then. You know what I 21 mean? 22 So that would -- that was also, like, a

<sup>22</sup> So that would -- that was also, like, a <sup>23</sup> huge problem. Like, the media and the outside view <sup>24</sup> of what was going on definitely affected me and <sup>25</sup> other people that were in there. It became a

1 little bit personal, to be honest with you. 2 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that RTM and 3 Alstom had sufficient processes put in place to 4 make sure that maintenance was done correctly? 5 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, personally 6 I don't because, obviously, the information wasn't 7 there to give, but I could definitely see them 8 arguing that in the sense that, like, they'd be 9 able to provide a binder with, like, what they 10 would consider instructions and stuff like that. So I would say, like, they had a lot of procedures 11 12 in place, certainly safety procedures were in 13 place, even to the point of too much. Like, the 14 safety issues were -- like, they would -- they made 15 some small issue like a huge safety thing, so you'd 16 have to spend like 20 minutes setting up this 17 safety procedure to do something that takes 18 5 minutes, when you could just safely walk up to it 19 and do it, right? 20 So those procedures were certainly 21 there. Even track maintenance and stuff, like, 22 I -- for instance, sig and comms, like for the camera system and stuff like that, I have a friend 23 24 that worked on the sig and comm thing, and he's

<sup>25</sup> like, I'm going down there, and I've got no

1 instructions; I have no idea what I'm doing; I just 2 have to figure it out. You know what I mean? So 3 there was that aspect in other teams as well. 4 So I would personally say that no, they 5 weren't there to the point of being accessible to б the people who needed them, but I could definitely 7 see them making the argument of, like, we have 8 them -- like, we have them over here; look at this 9 type thing. 10 So I don't know exactly how to answer 11 that because it's kind of like a grey area, I would 12 say. 13 EMILY YOUNG: And what was the main 14 barrier to accessing them for the techs in your 15 position? 16 Well, they didn't STEPHEN LENNERTON: 17 want us touching the train. So there was an aspect 18 of it that they knew in the back -- like, they 19 wouldn't say it, but they knew that they couldn't 20 just let everyone walk up to the train and touch it 21 because they might not do it right. Like, quys 22 were putting levelling valves on upside down and --23 you know, like, some guys weren't even -- like, I 24 know there was some guys that weren't even 25 physically capable of torquing the bolt to the

1	value that it needed, so the bolt wouldn't get
2	torqued to that value. And a lot of the guys
3	would like, I don't want to say speak poorly
4	to the MVTs, but there were guys who would just
5	say, Well, I can't do it, so, you know, torque mark
6	it, away it goes. Like, there was no way around
7	it.
8	So for instance, you have somebody
9	like, you know, I'm 230 pounds. You know what I
10	mean? Like, I can torque 400 Newton-metres no
11	problem, right, but you get a younger 22-year-old
12	who's only, you know, 140 pounds soaking wet - you
13	know, never been to a gym before, never played
14	sports growing up. He's not physically in the same
15	strength level as, say, I am, so he would have an
16	extremely large difficulty doing this.
17	Now, what Alstom should be doing is
18	providing them with what's called, like, for
19	instance, in this specific case, a torque
20	multiplier, which would allow somebody of that
21	stature to do it, which is the correct thing in the
22	work field to do. I don't think anyone should be
23	discriminated based off their physical abilities or
24	anything, right? We have a lot of technology

<sup>25</sup> nowadays to allow people to do that. But those

1 things weren't there to do that. Like, there was 2 one torque multiplier, for the sake of the 3 conversation, to put the coupler -- or -- yeah, to 4 put the coupling system on. But that had a 1,500 5 Newton-metre torque, so, like, no one in the 6 building could physically do that. You'd need, 7 like, Eddie Hall, strongest man in the world kind 8 of thing.

9 So -- but when you get to the lesser 10 amounts -- like, for instance, putting a shaft on, 11 like a gearbox shaft, you need a lot of physical 12 strength to do that. So there were definitely 13 those situations that arose. Now, I don't think 14 the MVT did that out of spite. I think they did it 15 out of the fact that they were physically unable to 16 do it and not given the proper things to do it. 17 Like, I don't think it was a malicious action.

EMILY YOUNG: And, sorry, so they just didn't do it because they couldn't to it, or did they ask you or someone else to do it? What was the solution to that problem?

STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, if I was
 there, they would definitely ask me, and I would
 also know what they were doing, and I would
 approach them to make sure that it was being done

1 correctly. But like I said, I can't be there all 2 the time, right? And in some cases, the MVTs that 3 were paired up were all -- you know, would all be 4 physically incapable of hitting something -- like, 5 a torque value like that. 6 And so would the result EMILY YOUNG: 7 be that the bolt is just not torqued to the proper 8 value? 9 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, in that 10 specific instance, yes. 11 EMILY YOUNG: And do you know 12 whether --13 STEPHEN LENNERTON: There's also 14 knowing the torque value. Like, they may not even 15 know the correct torque value as well. 16 EMILY YOUNG: Although that would be 17 something that will be in the instructions, would 18 it not? 19 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, if they had 20 got ahold of said instructions. 21 Okay. Do you know EMILY YOUNG: 22 whether Alstom now has the proper equipment to 23 assist technicians in torquing to the proper value? 24 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I've been gone for 25 over a year, so no, I don't know what changes -- a

1	lot can happen in a year.
2	EMILY YOUNG: But when you left, they
3	didn't have it?
4	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No. There was no
5	torque multiplier for somebody to hit 400
6	Newton-metres. The torque multiplier was, like,
7	huge, right, because it was used for a 1,500
8	Newton-metre torque value, so you couldn't turn
9	around and put that torque multiplier on a smaller
10	bolt type thing.
11	EMILY YOUNG: What would be preventing
12	a tech in that case to access the instructions to
13	find out the proper torque value if they didn't
14	know it?
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, for instance,
16	like, when we put that micro onto the computer,
17	that computer crashed and stopped working. Like,
18	it wouldn't turn on anymore, and they never fixed
19	it. So we went from having that torque value in
20	that instance to not. So then the process to get
21	that torque value would be, you know, talk to the
22	supervisor; the supervisor would then go to
23	engineering; engineering would look up said thing,
24	and then the information would flow back down.
25	This would take time, especially if

Т

1	if it's at midnight, let's say, and there's no
2	engineering there because they're not on 24 hours,
3	then, you know, that has to wait for the next time.
4	So for a technician to say, I can't do this until
5	tomorrow, a lot of those supervisors would say,
6	Just get it done because we need to launch the
7	train. So that would create again, like I had
8	spoken before about, that would create the
9	incorrect pressure on the technician to get the job
10	done, and they would just go ahead and do it.
11	EMILY YOUNG: And a failure to torque a
12	bolt to the right level could is that a
13	potential safety issue?
14	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, that's why
15	you have sanding blocks falling off the train.
16	That's why your wheel fell off. Like, that
17	probably has like, I can't say 100 percent
18	that's the cause, but I would say that there would
19	be something to do with torque values there or
20	definitely lack of maintenance to the components
21	involved in that said incident, which could be a
22	torque value thing.
23	It I also think that would be a

greasing issue. I know some of the axles, where
you grease these bearings, don't even have grease

1 nipples on them, so you can't even physically do 2 it. 3 What about the FRASER HARLAND: 4 Can you just actually explain briefly qearbox? 5 what goes into torquing a gearbox. 6 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Okay. So first, 7 you have to have a gearbox shaft, it goes in the 8 centre of the wheel, okay? It has 12 bolts on it, 9 and they have to be torqued in a certain pattern. 10 The torque pattern for those is you torque it to 11 50 Newton-metres so that everything sets in 12 properly. And to give you the idea of a torque 13 pattern, it would be similar to torquing the wheels 14 on your car. I don't know if you quys -- if 15 everyone's aware, but just in case people aren't, 16 you always go in a -- like an opposite pattern, 17 right? You don't just go around in a circle. You 18 go across from each other, right? So there's a 19 certain pattern to it. 20 It's not directly the same, but there's 21 a number code to it that you do certain bolts in a 22 certain order. So you'd go to 50 Newton-metres in 23 this pattern. And then you would go to 24 150 Newton-metres with a torque -- with a torque 25 wrench, but then the next value is you turn the

1	bolt 135 degrees from that 150 Newton-metre torque
2	value in order to reach the maximum torque value
3	that that bolt takes.
4	This isn't done with a torque wrench.
5	This is you use a you would measure out the
6	distance on the bolt and then you would use what's
7	called a breaker bar is what we would use, which is
8	a very long piece of steel that gives you a lot of
9	leverage to be able to do this.
10	This takes an enormous amount of
11	strength to do. Like, you have to like,
12	small smaller weighted people would literally
13	slide across the floor when trying to push this
14	wrench.
15	So then once that's on, you would then
16	apply this heat coating. So there's, like it's
17	like a metallic grease that's supposed to prevent
18	the everything from heating up too much. You
19	would then put a vegetable grease a
20	vegetable-based grease onto the o-ring in the back,
21	and you would place it into a ring where it sits.
22	Then, you would actually physically put the gearbox
23	onto this shaft, okay, and then in all of this,
24	you're torque-marking bolts and all of the little
25	things that go into it.

1	So you would then put the gearbox onto
2	this. Then there's what's called the torque
3	reaction link, which has two connections that go to
4	the top of the frame of the gearbox and then the
5	other section connects to the frame of the train,
6	okay? So you would torque both of those on.
7	Then, the shaft sticks through the
8	centre of the gearbox, and you have this little
9	opening where you'd unscrew this plate and there
10	would be three holes and you put another puck
11	inside. It's like a thick piece of metal about
12	this thick, it's got three holes in it, and it's
13	circular, and it sits it covers over the end of
14	the shaft, but it also covers over a section of the
15	gearbox to hold the gearbox to the actual train.
16	Then this these three bolts are
17	torqued to 95 Newton-metres. That may have changed
18	in the time. I know that there was revisions on
19	what the torque value needed to be. This also
20	required a washer. Then you put another o-ring
21	that's coated in the same vegetable-grade grease
22	inside another sling in the front, which then you
23	would put your plate back on, and that would seal
24	the front of it.
25	At this point, you've now installed the

Т

1	physical gearbox on the train. Then you have two
2	couplings that you would connect the front of the
3	gearbox to the motor of the train, and that would
4	require a series of bolts. And then you would
5	torque that down as well and then that would be it.
6	You would have your gear box on the train.
7	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know which part of
8	that process was the part that failed and caused
9	the second derailment?
10	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Second second
11	derailment to me happened back in production, so
12	I'm
13	EMILY YOUNG: Sorry. The second one in
14	operation, so in September of 2021.
15	STEPHEN LENNERTON: The one that just
16	happened, where they lost, like, most of the wheel
17	and stuff? To be honest with you, I don't know
18	where the separation from the train actually
19	happened. I don't know if it was if the wheel
20	actually physically stayed on the train, or if the
21	wheel, the gearbox, and the shaft came off the
22	train. So there's a hub behind the wheel as well,
23	so if that was neglected, that could cause
24	everything to come off, right?
25	The ether thing tee is if the cheel

1	itself was replaced, that also has a bolt pattern
2	on it, that if that wasn't torqued correctly
3	which I don't think would have been the case
4	because that's only 40 Newton-metres, and they
5	would have probably torqued that in sequence
6	properly.

7 But in that aspect, like, if you didn't 8 torque the shaft to the train properly, absolutely 9 it would fall off. The amount of torque that's 10 going on in there -- one of those motors out of the 11 six motors on one of those trains, one motor is 12 powerful enough to propel both units. Like, it's 13 complete overkill in the power, right, so you can 14 just imagine the amount of torque that's going 15 through that gearbox onto that shaft. So if that's 16 not properly torqued, those bolts are being heaved 17 on immensely.

18 And then when you -- when you have, for 19 instance -- like, the motor also has assisted 20 braking, so when the train starts to brake, now you 21 have reverse torque on that shaft going the other 22 So you're -- so if this thing is loose, wav. 23 you're constantly jolting it back and forth like 24 this while you're going. And I mean, if you take a 25 paperclip in your fingers and bend it like this,

1 eventually it breaks. You know what I mean? This 2 happens at all levels of metal when you have enough 3 force in order to do that. 4 So there's a plethora of things that 5 could have happened in that situation. So I don't 6 want to say specifically what it is because I've --7 obviously, now that I'm out of there, I haven't 8 been given this information, right? 9 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that it 10 would have helped Alstom do maintenance work if the 11 yard had been automated? 12 STEPHEN LENNERTON: What do you mean by 13 "automated"? I'm not too -- I don't -- I don't 14 understand that. Sorry. Like, if the whole thing 15 was computerized? Like, the -- the train -- like, 16 if Thales worked for the train system? 17 EMILY YOUNG: No. I think more to do 18 with if the movements in the MSF were automated. 19 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I think if they 20 cleaned up the facility, it would have helped. I 21 mean, I don't know if anybody's ever seen the 22 inside of that facility, but when I left, it looked 23 like a scrap yard vomited in the middle of the 24 floor, to be quite honest with you. Like, I 25 just -- like, it was a shock too because in

1	production, the Alstom has a thing called 5S,
2	which is a cleaning thing. Like, it's an
3	organization system. And they have what's called a
4	footprint, which is like a they they
5	literally paint out lines on the ground where a
6	cart sits, right?
7	Once maintenance started, there was so
8	much all over the place that Alstom didn't
9	implement this 5S system because they, themselves,
10	could not follow it. So the complete
11	disorganization of the entire facility would is
12	definitely a major issue. You know what I mean?
13	Like, it's not like it's not like they're
14	properly using the entirety of that facility,
15	that's for sure.
16	EMILY YOUNG: Can you tell us how many
17	derailments there were in the yard before service?
18	You had mentioned that I think there were two at
19	least.
20	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, man. Okay. So
21	I can't I can't give you a specific number
22	because I can't remember them all, but I definitely
23	can tell you that there were derailments that the
24	City never knew about. Like, I remember there was
25	a derailment that happened outside of the shed, and

25

<sup>1</sup> they actually got a forklift driver to go out and <sup>2</sup> move the chassises over and place them in front of <sup>3</sup> the place so that when the media showed up, they <sup>4</sup> couldn't take a video of it. So I think that was <sup>5</sup> the second derailment out of production.

<sup>6</sup> So the first -- it's actually funny, <sup>7</sup> when I looked at the news, they actually used the <sup>8</sup> picture from the first derailment to talk about it <sup>9</sup> because they could hear on the radios what was <sup>10</sup> going on, so they knew something happened, but they <sup>11</sup> couldn't get a visual on things because they had <sup>12</sup> placed things in front of it.

13 There was also things like train set 17 14 and train set 19 were -- collided into each other 15 in the shed about 3 kilometres per hour when a 16 movement was being made. It smashed the entire 17 front of both trains, smashing the windows and 18 everything. This -- there was a lot -- now, I 19 don't know all of the exact details on the 20 engineering side, but there was a lot of talk going 21 around that this was enough speed to actually 22 penned the chassis, which would, then, eliminate 23 the train completely. Like, you would have to 24 change that chassis.

Now, obviously, engineering made

1	decisions, and I'm I'm not going to sit here and
2	tell you that the chassis bent and didn't get
3	replaced or anything. I don't think anything that
4	crazy like that happened, but there were like,
5	the City never knew about that. Like, I remember
6	being looked at by one of the managers and being
7	specifically told to not speak about this outside
8	of the building.
9	EMILY YOUNG: Do you know what the
10	causes of the derailments were?
11	STEPHEN LENNERTON: It's really I
12	mean, I would I would blame most of that on the
13	track, to be honest with you, if I were to say. I
14	had a like, again, I'm not at that level of
15	engineering, and I did not research that very much,
16	but in talks with with, for instance, the
17	validation guy, he expressed all the time, like,
18	these tracks are terrible. You can go and look at
19	the wheel flange and see that in certain like
20	you can see markings on the wheel flange that
21	actually show that the track actually rode up the
22	side of the flange too high. So there's that.
23	There's also like, for instance, and
24	the first derailment happened because the train

<sup>25</sup> was still overtop of one of the switches, and the

25

1	switch was operated while the train was on top of
2	it, so it pushed the train off the track, right?
3	Obviously the derailments that are happening on the
4	track, if it's not overtop of a switch, then it's
5	either going to be the train or the track.

6 Now, again, with the wheel coming off 7 and all that kind of stuff, I don't know if they 8 were overtop of a switch or anything like that to 9 speak on it, but there -- definitely I would say 10 the track is the number one enemy of that train 11 when out there operating. Like, it's -- they have 12 a section of track that they were supposed to be 13 able to go through it doing approximately 60 14 kilometres per hour, I believe, or even 80, and 15 they have to slow down to, like, 35 or 40 because 16 it's just -- like, the train, like, vibrates and 17 it's just so loud and you can't really do anything 18 about it. So if they were to fly through there too 19 fast, they would probably flow throw the train off 20 the track.

EMILY YOUNG: And so if I'm understanding the timeline correctly, you had left before the August and September 2021 derailments occurred?

STEPHEN LENNERTON: With the wheel one

1 that we're talking about? 2 EMILY YOUNG: Yeah, so the one -- so 3 the second one was the gearbox falling off. 4 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah. So really 5 funny -- really funny thing: With -- with the one б that was serious, where the wheel fell off and the 7 gearbox and stuff, my last meeting with HR, I 8 looked at Alex L'Homme and I said you've got months 9 left until you lose an entire piece of equipment 10 off the side of the train, like you have months 11 left, like, I'm warning you. And it was kind of 12 shrugged off, like that's crazy, Steve, we're 13 not going to -- you know, the wheel's not going to 14 fall off. That's a little bit too much, you know? 15 And then, you know, sure enough, there it is. 16 EMILY YOUNG: And why did you think 17 that was the case? 18 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Because they're not 19 maintaining the trains properly. Like, so for 20 instance, like -- well, there's a couple -- there's 21 a bunch of things that could have happened in that. 22 Like, again, I don't know if the wheel specifically 23 came off with it or not, or if it was just the 24 gearbox. I did hear from technicians who had 25 talked to me that they had installed the gearbox in <sup>1</sup> MSF 1, and when they literally went to drive the <sup>2</sup> train out, it fell off the train before it even <sup>3</sup> made it out of the bay and smashed all over the <sup>4</sup> stairs and stuff like that.

5 To -- to speak to the issues that were 6 out on the track, like, for instance, behind the 7 hub, there's, like, a -- there's these grease 8 nipples to grease this bearing, right? In order to 9 grease it correctly, you have to take out a set 10 screw on the other side, so when you push grease 11 in, the bad grease has to come out. Also, if you 12 have a sealed area and you push fluids or grease 13 into it, air is what pushes that in there. So now 14 you've pressurized this compartment, which is not 15 supposed to be pressurized. That puts pressure on 16 the bearings and it makes them sit weird and then 17 they grind and stuff like that, right?

18 Now, those set pins are very difficult 19 to take out. And I know that there were a lot of 20 guys who were like, I don't want to deal with that, 21 so they would just inject the grease. They would 22 think, Well, I'm an engineer, right? Like, they've 23 been to school, they've got their mechanical 24 engineering, and they think it's okay to just pump 25 the grease in without taking the set screw off,

1 because why would anything happen -- right -- like, 2 the grease is still in there. But because they 3 don't understand the whole thing, you know what I 4 mean, they're making decisions that are not on 5 their shoulders to make, so to speak. б EMILY YOUNG: And when you say that 7 they weren't doing maintenance properly, could you 8 sort of summarize the main points of weakness that 9 vou saw? 10 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, the due 11 diligence to go through everything. They're very 12 behind. Like, the kilometres are way higher on the 13 trains than where they're at ready to do 14 maintenance, in my opinion, at least when I was 15 I would say specifically to just not leaving. 16 caring. Like, when I touch the train, I can't help 17 my brain but think, like, humans are going to get 18 Like, I may not know them, I may on this thing. 19 not care about them, but, like, other people do, 20 and I should at least do my job well enough that 21 they're not going to get hurt, right? But some of 22 them are just there for a paycheque, so, like, I'm 23 not going to get down there and get all dirty and 24 crawl on the ground to take this one pin out when I 25 can just pump it in.

1 So I'd say, like, maintenance on the 2 brake system for sure, like, by way of flushing the 3 fluids and stuff, they weren't doing that properly. 4 I mean, I remember walking through the bay and 5 asking the manager or the guy for the production б guys that are flushing the train being like, What 7 are they doing over there? And he's like, Oh, 8 they're flushing the brakes. And I would say, 9 Well, I can see the flow metre on the machine that 10 I installed, and it says zero, so you're not even 11 pushing any fluid. Like, they're not doing it 12 correctly. So they'd hook this machine up, turn it 13 on, and they wouldn't have it set right, so it 14 wouldn't do anything to the train, and then they'd disconnect it and be like, yep, done, good to go, 15 16 and off they would go. So there's that.

17 The wheel lathing is not consistent for 18 sure. You'd have some -- so for instance, like, 19 the wheel lathe system works -- they've got to 20 break it down into sections, right? When you're 21 lathing something that's metal, especially that 22 size, you don't take an inch off at a time. That's 23 a large amount of material to take off under that 24 level of force. So you want to take it off in, 25 like, 2 to 3-mil increments, you know what I mean?

<sup>1</sup> So a lot of guys would do it correctly. Like, I <sup>2</sup> worked with a guy who would 100 percent -- he <sup>3</sup> didn't care what timeline they were given - he was <sup>4</sup> going to do it properly. So he would set it up so <sup>5</sup> that the machine would lathe the wheel on three <sup>6</sup> separate occasions.

7 So for instance, you need to take a 8 whole entire mil off, he would make the machine 9 divide that by three and take it off in three 10 smaller increments, which is the correct way to 11 lathe something. But then you'd have people who 12 want to look good in front of the managers, and 13 they would say, we need to take a mil off, so 14 they'd say, whatever, let's do it in one shot. You 15 know what I mean?

16 So that's going to have an effect on it 17 It leaves like a -- have you ever touched, too. 18 like, a record, and you know how it's, like, has 19 divots in it if you run your finger across it? Ιt 20 would create the same effect to the wheel, which 21 you think is not a big deal, but now you've got 22 separation, so you've got these, like, high points 23 and low points on the wheel, and the high points 24 are making contact and the low points aren't, so 25 you just lost a certain amount of your surface area

1	on the wheel touching the rail. You know what I
2	mean? So that's the level of importance to that.
3	And that specific task also speaks to
4	my analogy of, like, the trainer came and trained
5	the couple of guys that were in there, and they got
6	about 80 percent of the information, right?
7	Because they don't have enough experience yet to
8	learn all the rest of it. Well, those MVTs are the
9	ones who showed the next one, and then the next one
10	and the next one, right?
11	So when you've got a guy there who was
12	trained at the end, and the other ones that have
13	more experience aren't there, he's going to make
14	decisions based on what he knows, right? So that's
15	where they're making wrong decisions. And again,
16	to the technician's defence, they're put under
17	pressure to get things done, right? So cutting a
18	corner is, like, you know, in some cases to them,
19	they think they're saving their job, so to speak.
20	EMILY YOUNG: I'm conscious that we've
21	gone a bit past 6. Is it okay for everyone if we
22	go for a few more minutes?
23	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I'll sit here all
24	night with you if you want. It doesn't matter to
25	me. This is my last chance to be able to help this

1	project. Like, I can't work there anymore because
2	of what happened, so if you've got more questions,
3	ask away. I'm not going anywhere.
4	EMILY YOUNG: Okay. And one more
5	question, going a bit back to sort of the worker
6	side of things: Is there a high degree of turnover
7	of Alstom maintenance employees?
8	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, it's hard
9	to say, like to say, like, it's a high rate of
10	turnover because you don't really have very many of
11	them, but you get this so for instance, like, an
12	MVT gets paid \$60,000 a year, right? In the world
13	of, like, a 22-year-old, let's say, or a
14	25-year-old, that's a lot of money, right? That's
15	a pretty hefty paycheque for someone like that,
16	especially during the times that we're in right
17	now. So someone walking in who has ability to go
18	to another job like, for instance, myself, I
19	could put my résumé into a job searching thing, and
20	I'd have a call right away because I have a very
21	extensive résumé, right? Like, I've worked a lot
22	in the country. But when you've got guys who are
23	just getting here and they don't have that résumé,
24	they're stuck there.
25	So what you found was a lot of higher

So what you found was a lot of higher

1	qualified people would come in, and they'd be like,
2	this schedule sucks, the organization isn't here, I
3	don't have any fricking tools, I don't know what
4	I'm doing, so I'm just going to go to this better
5	place; This other place offered me the same amount
6	of money or even, like, a little bit less, but it's
7	much more it's a lot nicer to work there, so I'm
8	just going to take off. You know what I mean? So
9	you'd lose people like that for sure. I guess you
10	could say there's a high turnover rate because,
11	like, when I was hired at number 12, like, I
12	remember three people quit within, like, the first
13	month or so that I was in that position, and these
14	were people from the testing team and stuff like
15	that, like people I knew.
16	EMILY YOUNG: So we want to speak
17	briefly about some of the technical issues that
18	arose on the trains.
19	STEPHEN LENNERTON: M-hm.
20	EMILY YOUNG: First of all, the wheel
21	flats.
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah.
23	EMILY YOUNG: Can you tell us briefly,
24	if possible, what Alstom maintenance's response was
25	to that?

1	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, when you get
2	a flat spot, you bring the train in, and if the
3	flat's so in the world of trains, if you have
4	anything that's really, like, the size of a dime,
5	let's say, and it doesn't divot in more than a
6	certain amount of millimetres which I can't off
7	the top of my head remember exactly what that
8	number is, but if it's that small and it's not
9	disrupting, it's actually recommended that you just
10	drive the train until it works itself out. It will
11	actually like, over time, it will basically beat
12	itself back into submission kind of thing.
13	But when you get bigger ones that are,
14	you know, the size of a toonie or even larger, then
15	you have, like, a massive flat spot. I know it's a
16	little bit of an exaggeration, but you've almost
17	turned the wheel into part of a square, so then you
18	would have to wheel lathe it, and that's the extent
19	of what they do in response to that. You know what
20	I mean?
21	The causing of it, though, is, like,
22	different. Like, I don't think they would
23	necessarily like, nothing that the MVTs are
24	doing are causing the trains to go out and have
25	flat spots unless they're, like, totally neglecting

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

1 the brakes and stuff like that, but at this point, 2 Wabtec is still there doing maintenance on them as 3 well, so I don't think it would be to neglect. 4 Like, to answer your question, the wheel lathe is 5 their response to flat spots. 6 EMILY YOUNG: And were there any 7 problems getting the wheel lathe working? I mean, 8 we understand at the beginning --9 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, yes. Oh, all 10 the time. Always this side down. So there's two 11 sides to the wheel lathe, so you could do a whole 12 bogie at a time, and a lot of times, it's like, you 13 know, the other side won't work. Like, it's got an 14 error; it won't let us do anything, right? This 15 could be due to the fact that, like, I know there's 16 safety features in that thing if, you know, you 17 avoid a couple of things or go to far with a couple 18 of things, that might cause the errors. Т 19 personally was never formally trained on the wheel 20 lathe, and because of that, I would always tell 21 them, I'm not doing that on my own. I will assist 22 somebody who's trained, but because you have not 23 brought me the number one guy to train you, I'm not 24 going to take -- I don't want training from 25 somebody who doesn't know 100 percent of the

Τ

1	information, so I would refuse to do that. Some
2	other guys would do that as well.
3	But yeah, that thing was down all the
4	time. Like, there was one time where the whole
5	thing was down, and they had a guy come in, and he
6	working there for weeks on it, like pulling the
7	whole thing apart, so and to their defence,
8	like, that's more of the company-side thing, like
9	the company who provided it. Like, it was like a
10	\$2 million device. You know, you'd expect it to do
11	\$2 million-worth of amazing things, not break. You
12	know what I mean? So it's not entirely their fault
13	for that. Like, you can't point a finger at them.
14	EMILY YOUNG: That's OLRTC's
15	responsibility.
16	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yes. They're to
17	maintain the machinery and stuff like that in the
18	building. Absolutely.
19	EMILY YOUNG: And what about the
20	cracked wheels? Can you talk about the cause and
21	the response?
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: That was a
23	nightmare. Well, I can't speak to the cause
24	because I'm not 100 percent sure. I was told
25	certain for instance, like, I was told by a

1	couple of Sorel guys I had a pretty good rapport
2	with Sorel in Montreal, and I was told that when
3	they transport the wheel, there's a brace that they
4	put onto the wheel, and sometimes where those
5	cracks were were around these little set screws,
6	and that set screw would be proud past that piece
7	of metal or sit higher, sorry. And when they
8	manoeuvred this brace around and put it on, it
9	would put pressure on this set screw, which could
10	potentially cause that crack.
11	All of the cracks that I saw - and I
12	found one of the earlier ones - were all coming
13	from that set screw hole, and it was also on a
14	piece of like, the metal that it was cracking
15	was not the actual, physical, whole entire wheel,
16	right? Like, there was a piece that was overtop of
17	it that was the part that was cracking. Not to
18	take anything away from the severity of the crack,
19	but that was more or less what was going on.
20	Now, I don't know 100 percent that that
21	is what caused it from Sorel. It could be the fact
22	that there's so much banging around, and the
23	track from the tracks that are so bad that this
24	could be causing it, and that could be a weak point
25	on the wheel, but, I mean, judging from what I saw,

173

1 the set screw being out of there and stuff like 2 that seems like one of the most plausible ideas or 3 scenarios for that. 4 EMILY YOUNG: What did maintenance do 5 to fix that? STEPHEN LENNERTON: They hired a bunch 6 7 of random people from a hiring company and brought 8 them in to look for them. So I would sit in the 9 sand bay with an iPad, and the train would pull in, 10 and I would go on, and I'd put my lock on and make the train safe for all these workers, and then they 11 12 would go to each skirt, open the skirt with a 13 flashlight, and they would inspect each wheel. So 14 this went on for a while - for, like, maybe 2 15 days - and I went to management, and I said, how 16 are you supposed to check for cracks through a 17 bunch of grease and debris? Like, they're not 18 cleaning the wheel off. Like, you're telling me 19 they can see through that? 20 So then they had to change it. Thev 21 had brake cleaner, and they would spray the brake 22 cleaner onto it. Well, now they've washed off all 23 of the corrosion protection. So you need to put 24 the corrosion protection back on, but then we're 25 not doing that either. So, like, again, it was

1 this reactive thing. Like, oh, this is stopping 2 Okay, this is the quick solution; let's do us? 3 this, you know? 4 So, basically, a whole bunch of random 5 people off the streets from a hiring company, you б know, came in outside of the union -- so one of the 7 loopholes that the company uses is that if they hire a full fleet -- so let's say they decide that 8 9 they need 18 people to work on an MVT team, right? 10 If they hire all 18 people, okay, then from my 11 understanding, what I discussed with the union, 12 that means that from that point forward, if they 13 have to hire anybody else to work on the train, 14 they have to be an MVT, right? And the company 15 does not -- like, Alstom does not want to hire more 16 It's expensive. So they keep it so that people. 17 they don't hire that full fleet of people so that 18 they can use a loophole to bring in other people 19 that are there.

Because I remember, like, a lot of guys went to the union and were like, Hey, why are you bringing in these random people and not hiring MVTs? And this was roughly what was explained to us. There may be more legal details in that that I'm unaware of, but generally that's what it seemed

1	as though they were doing. But people who had
2	never seen the train, some of them, like, couldn't
3	even some of them couldn't even communicate it
4	to me properly, like, at all. Like, they couldn't
5	communicate to me properly in English to even relay
6	what they were finding, right? And it got to the
7	point where that procedure got so redundant and so
8	annoying to the people that were working in there
9	that I can almost guarantee you that, at some
10	point, they weren't checking them properly.
11	There also came this time where we had
12	assumed or they had assumed that, like, the cracks
13	were caused by some sort of issue not on the track,
14	so we had found the ones that were cracked and
15	that, you know, people wouldn't look as hard for
16	them because we weren't finding them anymore. So
17	there was that. That was a nightmare. That whole
18	entire procedure was an absolute nightmare.
19	EMILY YOUNG: And for the door
20	problems, my understanding is that's sort of more a
21	computer issue.
22	STEPHEN LENNERTON: M-hm.
23	EMILY YOUNG: Is that something you
24	know about?
25	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, I

1	personally know the gentleman who installed those
2	doors, and I'll tell you he did his job the same
3	way I did. He put those things in there exactly
4	for the design. So I would say the electrical
5	would be more of the issue than anything. I mean,
6	I remember at the beginning they went and they
7	sent me to Canadian Tire to buy remote controlled
8	lights so that they could put them in the fronts of
9	the trains with the driver so that they would have
10	these other people from another hiring company
11	stand at the platform and push a button to turn
12	said light on so that the driver could know that
13	the doors were closed. Like, that was one of their
14	solutions to it.
15	EMILY YOUNG: And the switch failures,
16	that's something that's more track-related?
17	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, that's too
18	outside of my spec to speak on.
19	EMILY YOUNG: And I think there's also
20	been an issue with track buckling, but you've
21	already told us about your view on the quality of
22	the track, so
23	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I don't know
24	anything about the construction of tracks either,
25	so I just know that I can see that the track is

1 supposed to be straight and it's not, you know. Ι 2 think anybody could see it. 3 EMILY YOUNG: Do you have any sense as 4 to the reason for all of these issues with the 5 vehicles that arose after service started? What б could have mitigated those problems, prevented them 7 from arising? 8 STEPHEN LENNERTON: If we could get rid 9 of winter, that would be basically the main 10 I mean, maybe store them, at least, solution. 11 Like, basically winter is our downfall, properly. 12 humidity. Like, for instance, those coils in the 13 roof were exploding when it went through the wash 14 bay, so just the water, the salt water that they 15 spray with -- or not salt water, sorry, but there's 16 a chemical in the water to clean the trains, and 17 this thing would drive through and it would 18 explode. Sorry, "explode" is a very strong word 19 It wasn't like there was a detonation, and here. 20 then there was shrapnel everywhere. It was just 21 you'd hear a loud, thunder-like pop, and then 22 obviously the train would cease to work at that 23 point, and then you'd have this coil that's just 24 like, you know, all covered in soot from basically 25 some crazy electric arc that went on in there. And

1 their solutions were to change hardware, clean the 2 bay that it was in -- like, clean the little box 3 that it was in, but it was all not actual solutions 4 to the problem. 5 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think the 6 reliability of the trains would have increased if 7 there had been a burn-in period? 8 STEPHEN LENNERTON: What do you mean by 9 a "burn-in period"? 10 EMILY YOUNG: More time for the trains to just run the full length of the track and figure 11 12 out whether there are bugs that needed to be 13 resolved. 14 STEPHEN LENNERTON: I think if we did 15 that, you would have delayed launching the 16 maintenance, for sure. You would have delayed it 17 because you would have found all this stuff, and 18 stuff would have started falling off before we had 19 customers on there. I mean, some of that is 20 because, like, for instance, sanders were falling 21 off -- I don't think any of this stuff made the 22 news like big things, but, like, the sanding block 23 on the first one has, like, a 5-pound piece of 24 metal that has, like, a -- it has an angled piece 25 on the front which is to deflect things away from
<sup>1</sup> the wheel.

2 When they replaced -- they have to take 3 these off to lathe the wheel, and when they do 4 that, one of Alstom's rules -- and this is 5 something that would come from production training. б When you take hardware off -- a crush washer, in my 7 opinion, can only be used once. To their 8 standards, they can use it twice, but a locking nut 9 needs to be replaced every single time, and that 10 was not happening. So things like that, like reuse 11 of hardware and things like that is also causing 12 certain problems. They may have corrected that 13 problem by now, but that for sure.

14 But basically, like, in my personal 15 opinion, like, these trains do not run in our 16 weather conditions, period, full stop. Like, so 17 unless you get a new train, in my personal opinion, 18 these problems will never go away. Like, it rides 19 too low for the amount of snow that we get, and 20 then, for instance, the snow deflector - or we'll 21 call it a snowplow - that sits on it on an angle is 22 a flimsy piece of rubber that you can bend with 23 your hands, so it's not going to deflect the type 24 of snow we get. We have a pretty intense winter. 25 You know what I mean? So that's going to be your

1 biggest downfall to it, in my opinion. 2 EMILY YOUNG: Has the reliability of 3 trains and the level of maintenance improved over 4 time? 5 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Not when I was 6 I mean, guys were learning stuff, I would there. 7 say, and, you know, you had your core group of 8 people who were, you know, hellbent on making sure 9 that things were done correctly, but, I mean, it's 10 not like when I was leaving, they were launching 11 all these training things and all this information 12 was coming out, you know what I mean? Like, we 13 were getting a new grease gun when I left. Like, 14 that was, like, the big thing. Like, oh, they 15 bought a new Milwaukee grease gun. It's like 16 whoop-de-doo, like, you know, like, I need way more 17 stuff than that. Like, I personally, like, 18 estimated, like, if they gave me a budget, I would 19 have needed anywhere from, like, 100 to \$150,000 20 worth of tools. 21 EMILY YOUNG: Do you think that RTM and 22 Alstom maintenance were partly overwhelmed by the 23 number of work orders that were coming through? 24 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Oh, yeah. Oh, 25 Absolutely. Absolutely. I mean, you had -yeah.

1 the thing that made it overwhelming is, again, you 2 have somebody -- so you have a guy who takes an 3 iPad, has never seen this train before until he's 4 started at this job, right? So he's got minimal 5 time seeing this. He's going to walk up to б something - again, never seeing it before - and 7 look at it, and then have to tell somebody if it's 8 right or wrong. You know what I mean? So, like, 9 for instance, like, in my case, speaking with 10 Jaime, she's giving me legal information about, 11 like, the summons, let's say -- right? -- and so 12 I'm asking questions because I've never seen a 13 summons. So I can't look at her and say, Oh, I 14 know everything about this. Like, I've never seen 15 it before.

16 So now you got, like I said, somebody 17 who walks up, and it's like they say, Oh, this is 18 okay, but then I'd walk up and say, No, this is 19 bent; like, this is supposed to be like this; or 20 this isn't working anymore; or do you hear that 21 sound? That means this is broken. Like, this is 22 leaking air, or, you know, look, this has fluid on 23 it; like, this isn't supposed to be wet. So, like, 24 they don't see those things. They just think --25 you know, recognizing water versus hydraulic fluid,

1	you know, like, these kind of things. They don't
2	know that. So then you make an order that says
3	this is what's wrong, let's say, and then you have
4	to send somebody out to try and fix something
5	that's not actually there.

6 So now the next person goes who's never 7 seen this train before, walks up to a situation 8 that somebody else said that something's wrong. 9 Now, if anybody with half a brain looks at that, 10 they're going to think, well, if I don't do 11 anything to it, then it's obviously not fixed, 12 right? Like, if I'm walking up to something, and 13 it's broken and I don't change it, then it's 14 obviously staying in a broken stage. So if they 15 say something's broken and it's not broken, then 16 the person's going to alter that item, right, and 17 once they've altered it, now it's for sure broken. 18 You know what I mean? Or not functioning or not 19 installed properly.

And this is a continuously snowballing effect, right, because now the first person who found something thinks they know something, so then they go and tell the other, Hey, I know this like, I did this; I know this. But their information is wrong, so they just passed wrong <sup>1</sup> information on to the next person who then goes, <sup>2</sup> Hey, I've been educated by that guy, so now I'm <sup>3</sup> going to educate this, and then you just -- like, <sup>4</sup> you see the snowball effect that's happening. You <sup>5</sup> know what I mean?

б And that aspect of it, when I was 7 there, was insanely, insanely frustrating for me, 8 like, mentally because they wouldn't listen to me 9 either, right? Like, I'd say, No, that's on 10 backwards, and I remember one guy turning around, 11 looking at me, and being like, I'm a mechanical 12 engineer and you're not, so I say that's right. 13 And it's like, well, I've fixed that over a 14 thousand times in the time I've been here, and I'm 15 telling you it's wrong.

16 And so it got to a point where I didn't 17 want the conflict anymore. I didn't argue with 18 them anymore. It was getting to the point where I 19 had to give up because I was so overwhelmed by 20 everything that was going on. I mean, and I know 21 that's continuing to happen. Like, and that's a 22 very scary thing to me, like, for the fact that we 23 put humans on that thing and fly them up and down a 24 track at 80 kilometres an hour. You know what I 25 Especially for, like, levelling systems and mean?

1	stuff like that. You have to put things back the
2	way they're supposed to be, to the design to the
3	design of the train, to even have a small chance of
4	this thing working.
5	EMILY YOUNG: So the people at the
б	beginning of service, I understand they were City
7	staff who were looking at, you know, the track and
8	the trains and spotting issues. Sounds like your
9	view was that they weren't properly qualified or
10	trained to be doing that?
11	STEPHEN LENNERTON: I mean, qualified,
12	sure. You can come in with whatever education you
13	want, and if you want to say that that's qualified,
14	sure. When you're looking at the track, I don't
15	know because I don't know what kind of experience
16	they have. But my point my direct point to what
17	I'm saying is that when you don't retain the
18	experience, you're not going to be able to pass on
19	the things that happen. I know what the inside of
20	the HPU looks like. There's only four other people
21	in Canada who know that, who have opened up an HPU.
22	I'm the only one in Canada to rebuild two calipers.
23	None of the MVTs have ever seen the inside of a
24	caliper, so how are they going to know how it works
25	inside. You know what I mean? To be able to say

1 that's not doing what it's supposed to do type 2 thing, right? 3 So I would say that it's not 4 necessarily that they're coming in ungualified in 5 the sense of, like, you know, education gives you qualifications. I think it's the fact that they 6 7 just detest experience there. They don't want 8 somebody to tell them they're wrong. Like, Alstom 9 will never admit they're wrong. They'll say it's 10 because of something else. You know what I mean? 11 You really got to prove to them that it's their 12 fault before they'll make any admittance to it, 13 right? So that's definitely -- that's horrifying 14 to me, to say the least. 15 EMILY YOUNG: You mentioned earlier 16 that there were some occasions on which Alstom 17 maintenance people had pointed out or noted issues 18 with the trains that meant that they, according to 19 the rules, shouldn't go out on the tracks, and 20 sometimes those trains still went out? 21 STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, me 22 specifically. 23 EMILY YOUNG: Could that lead to 24 failures on the track and --25 STEPHEN LENNERTON: 100 percent.

Т

1	EMILY YOUNG: potential safety
2	issues?
3	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Yeah, absolutely.
4	Like I had said, I had notified my supervisor,
5	Fakah, hey, this pipe on the main line of our brake
6	system is physically leaking. It's dripping oil.
7	I need to disconnect that, then I need to reconnect
8	it and see if it's the actual Parker fitting that's
9	not working or if I need to replace the hose
10	altogether, and then I need to re-flush the train
11	and re-setup that braking system, and then I need
12	to cycle it and see that it's working before it
13	goes out. That means that this train is not going
14	anywhere, right? But it's just a little leak to
15	him. He thinks like, oh, it's just a little thing,
16	and because he's not mechanically sound like I am
17	or with the same experience on the brakes as I am,
18	so he just thinks that's, you know, whatever. Like
19	bit's just a little leak. Like, what's the worst
20	that could happen, right?
21	Well, that thing starts leaking, and
22	the next thing you know by the other and of the

the next thing you know, by the other end of the track, we've lost a litre of fluid and the HPU throws a low fluid fault, and now your brakes are locked up. You got to rescue the train. You know

1	what I mean? And that causes more now you got
2	to stop the whole track to get the guys out there
3	to tow the stinking thing back. And it's all just
4	so that like, that whole scenario is so that
5	Alstom can say, Well, it happened out there on the
6	track; it has nothing to do with us. You know what
7	I mean? So I made a work order for that and
8	nothing ever came of it. It got launched. Like,
9	the train got launched.
10	So that specific situation, like,
11	infuriated me. Like, I was extremely angry that
12	that was happening because, like, I've had to tell
13	my own family, You are not allowed to get on the
14	train. Like, my sister wanted to use this train to
15	commute, and I told her, You are literally
16	forbidden from getting on the train; like, do not
17	do it. You know what I mean? So she won't ride
18	them for those type of reasons because I was seeing
19	that in front of my face. You know what I mean?
20	So it's alarming.
21	

Like, I remember on train set 6, I wasn't allowed to do anything because it was in the shed, and I would walk by this train, and I could smell that the brake pads were literally melting off the train. There is a brake failure here. I

1 can smell it -- like, whatever, right? And you're 2 walking by these warranty technicians that are 3 supposed to identify that -- or even the Wabtec 4 team, right? And you go to them and say, Can you 5 not smell that? And they're like, Yeah. I said. б Well, it's coming from here, so do something about And they're like, Listen, I don't have a work 7 it. 8 order for it; I haven't been told to touch it. Or, 9 like, Wabtec would be like, It's not part of our 10 warranty until it's brought up to us, and then it 11 would be this big, like, I don't want to deal with 12 it. And then I'd go in and say, This is a fricking 13 problem; we need to do it. And they would tell me, 14 like, Stay in your lane, Steve. Like, fill out 15 vour check sheet. It's not part of your check 16 sheet, you know, leave it alone. And it would 17 drive me mad knowing that this -- like, because now 18 it's going to make flat spots, and then I'm going 19 to have to fricking lathe the damn thing, or, like, 20 whatever, we're going to have to keep the train 21 back and have it lathed again.

And then the thing's going to melt -- I remember taking two calipers off the train that at some point were physically on fire because they were malfunctioning so bad, and it's like, I'm

taking these off, and it's alarming me because 1 2 there were people sitting above it. And, like, 3 when they did the testing for the fire resistance 4 in it, it didn't exactly pass with flying colours. 5 You know what I mean? And to think that there's, 6 like, an open flame underneath someone who's 7 sitting on the train, like, it made my blood boil, 8 so to speak. I mean, you can probably tell that 9 I'm getting agitated just talking about it, but 10 it's -- like, it was so horrifying, and that's part 11 of the moral reasons that I left. 12 Like, I personally believe that they're 13 going to kill someone, like a customer. Like,

14 they're going to do -- it's going to happen. We're 15 headed in that direction. Like, when I was 16 speaking before about the sanding block, if that 17 falls off at 40 kilometres an hour and bounces up 18 onto the platform properly and hits someone square 19 in the chest, a 5-pound object at 40 kilometres an 20 hour, that person's gone. Like, that's it for 21 them, you know what I mean? And that's horrifying 22 to me that that's -- so I -- like, that's part of 23 also the reason that I left. I would not be able 24 to mentally handle someone being, like, deceased 25 because of potentially an action of a team that I'm

1	on. You know what I mean? So that was also
2	sorry. That was a little bit touchy for me there.
3	EMILY YOUNG: If you saw something on a
4	train that you thought was, like, an imminent
5	safety issue, who could you talk to aside from your
6	manager to if you had a real concern, could you
7	talk to the contact the City's chief safety
8	officer or something like that?
9	STEPHEN LENNERTON: No, no, no, I could
10	never do that. I would have to contact somebody
11	within Alstom. And to speak on that, we're during
12	COVID, right? Like, 90 percent of the facility is
13	sitting at home, right? So they're not even there.
14	Like, when we were in production, if this manager
15	who's like, let's say, an EPU manager told me
16	something that was wrong, I'd go right to the head
17	of the entire thing and say, This is what's
18	happening; stop doing it right now, or I'm going to
19	go sit in a chair, and you're going to sell no
20	trains until you fix it, and that would make them
21	jump, right? But now I don't have that say
22	anymore, so, you know, the only thing I could do is
23	make this work order, but they had so much control
24	over the work order that they would just bypass it,
25	right? And then it's like, what is the purpose of

1	me being there? Like, why am I even bothering,
2	right? Like, I need to report this, and I'm the
3	only reason I'm reporting it is so that I'm not
4	liable anymore. Like, that's what it came to for
5	me. Like, I have to put this into the system so
6	there's a record of it. Like, I've reported it so
7	that it doesn't come back on me. At least I've
8	passed it on to somebody else. But that's a really
9	bad way to run a facility like that, you know what
10	I mean? Like, it's like I said, we're putting
11	humans that other people love on the train. Like,
12	we're putting other people's family members on
13	there. So it's alarming.
14	EMILY YOUNG: Mr. Harland, do you have
15	any more questions?
16	FRASER HARLAND: Well, I think,
17	Ms. Young, you and I could probably talk to
18	Mr. Lennerton for another several hours, but given
19	the time and given especially the court reporter's
20	time, I think we should probably wrap things up
21	soon.
22	EMILY YOUNG: Okay. Well, I think
23	that's all that I have for now, and we'll let you
24	know if there's any need to have Mr. Lennerton
25	back.

Τ

1	STEPHEN LENNERTON: Well, thank you
2	very much to everyone that's involved in this
3	because this is very important that this is
4	happening, and it's wonderful that I got to partake
5	in it.
б	Concluded at 6:31 p.m.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, JOANNE A. LAWRENCE, Registered
4	Professional Reporter, certify;
5	That the foregoing proceedings were
6	taken before me at the time and place therein set
7	forth, at which time the witness was put under oath
8	by me;
9	That the testimony of the witness
10	and all objections made at the time of the
11	examination were recorded stenographically by me
12	and were thereafter transcribed;
13	That the foregoing is a true and
14	correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.
15	
16	Dated this 13th day of June, 2022.
17	
18	1 - Louise
19	your the
20	NEESONS, A VERITEXT COMPANY
21	PER: JOANNE LAWRENCE, RPR, CSR
22	COURT REPORTER
23	
24	
25	

WORD INDEX	<b>150K</b> 27: <i>11</i>	<b>3.5</b> 45:8	<b>80</b> 67:9 141:9	advantage
	112: <i>1</i>	<b>3:00</b> 1: <i>14</i> 3: <i>1</i>	161: <i>14</i> 167:6	118: <i>17</i>
< \$ >	<b>17</b> 32:23 33:3	<b>30</b> 58: <i>15</i>	184:2 <i>4</i>	advertised 73:8,
<b>\$10</b> 19: <i>13</i>	159: <i>13</i>	<b>33</b> 4:11	8-week 12:5	19, 20
<b>\$150,000</b> 181: <i>19</i>	<b>18</b> 16: <i>11</i> 122:8	<b>33(7</b> 5:4		advised 5:5
<b>\$18</b> 25:18	123:14 138:17	<b>35</b> 161: <i>15</i>	< 9 >	affect 82:6
72:12 74:2, 7	175:9, 10	<b>36</b> 32:22	<b>9</b> 67:15 76:5	138: <i>12</i> 144: <i>13</i>
75:7 79:9	<b>19</b> 1:8 159: <i>14</i>	<b>3-mil</b> 165:25	90:24 132:4	after 3:22 9:13
<b>\$2</b> 172:10, 11	<b>19-mil</b> 50:16		<b>90</b> 67:10 191:12	12:24, 25 15: <i>16</i> ,
<b>\$20</b> 74:8	<b>19th</b> 1: <i>13</i>	< 4 >	<b>95</b> 154: <i>17</i>	17 21:5 25:20
<b>\$26</b> 74:25	<b>1-er</b> 117:8	<b>4</b> 13:22 49:25		29:24 30:14
<b>\$30</b> 25:17	<b>1s</b> 102: <i>11</i>	97:16.18	< A >	31:6 33:14
<b>\$6</b> 74:9		<b>4:30</b> 5:12	abilities 147:23	37:7 44:16
<b>\$60.000</b> 168: <i>12</i>	<2>	<b>4:33</b> 90:14	ability 10:13	57:13 75:19
<b>\$8</b> 74:2. 7	<b>2</b> 11:23.25	<b>4:45</b> 90:13.15	101:7 109:18.	76:23.25 83:20
<b>~~</b> , .	13.25 14.21	<b>40</b> 50.17 156.4	20 168.17	84.24 95.22
<1>	22.13 23.13	161.15 190.17	abruptly 120.25	97.2 103.1
1 6.4 6 18.13	33.24 34.9	19	absolute 176.18	112.7 117.10
22.12 33.15	36.16.24 37.10	<b>400</b> 147·10	Absolutely	120.6 178.5
36:15 37:7 16	40.12 15 44.13	150.5	30.16 59.18	andressive
18 21 38.25	22 45:10 58:16	<b>45</b> 120.6 130.2	64·2 107·6 7	22.10
39.1 40.15	61.8 75.2 78.9	16 120.0 100.2,	111.23 124.9	anitated 190.9
$AA \cdot 12  QA \cdot 7$	11 81·10 88·15	10	156.8 172.18	ago 15.7
05·22 06·2 25	16 23 05·2 22	~ 5 >	181.25 187.3	agroo 62.3
95.22 90.2, 20 07.4 117.0	10, 20, 30.2, 22 06.2, 20, 07.2, 5	<b>5</b> 5.6 12.1 2	101.20 107.0 200066 35:25	agree 02.0
162·1	10.2, 20 91.2, 3,	J 3.0 12.1, 2	38.22 22 20.2	21.17 50.2
<b>1 500</b> 1/18·1	165.25 174.14	40.22 44.75	50.22, 25, 59.5, 6 21 54.25	24.17 J3.2
1,500 140.4	<b>20</b> 59:17 1/5:16	79.5 90.9	0, 27 $04.20$	10.12 21.12 1A
100.7 100 12.7 16.7	<b>20</b> 50.77 145.70 <b>2000</b> 1.12	07.16 18 145.18	90.0 111.22 127:15 150:12	10.13  24.13, 14, 22  27.20  22.2
20.25 17.25	<b>2009</b> 4.72 <b>2014</b> 0.17	50 35·24 44.14	accessible	23 21.20 33.3, 5 50·15 113·8
20.23 47.23 50:17 05:6	<b>2014</b> 9.74 <b>2017</b> 0.10	152.11 22	1/6.5	3 39.75 113.0
115·15 1/1·6	<b>2017</b> 9.79 <b>2018</b> 0.10	<b>55</b> 103.0 10	accossing	50.12
151.17 166.2	<b>2010</b> 9.79 <b>2021</b> 155.17	<b>5</b> -nound 170.22	1/6·1/	39.72 aboad 21.25
171.75 172.24	161.22	100.10	accidentally	85.0 125.20
172.20 101.10	<b>2022</b> 1.0 11	<b>59</b> 159.1 0		151.10
196.25	101.16	<b>JJ</b> 130.7, 9	09.24	abold 55:1
100.20 10-mil 81.7	194.70 20e 11.17	-6.	107.22 108.12	1/0.20
<b>10</b> -1111 01.7 <b>11</b> 27.10 20	<b>203</b> 11.77 <b>21</b> 7/1·10	6 A.12 52.12	Act 1:12 5:1 7	air 16.10 21
33.6 05.12 17	21 74.70 22-year-old	62.24 77.4	<b>action</b> $21.15$	85.21 120.5 12
115.12	1/7·11 168·13	02.24 11.4 167·21 188·21	1/8·17 100·25	163.12 182.22
<b>1</b> 0.75 <b>12</b> 12/115	<b>330</b> 1/17·0	<b>6.31</b> 1.11 103.6	actual 7:15 0:1	alarm 30.6
152.8 160.11	<b>230</b> 147.9 <b>24</b> 133.21 151.2	<b>60</b> 161.13	AD:17 75:22	alarmina 188.20
<b>132.0</b> 109.77	<b>24</b> 133.27 131.2 <b>21</b> -hour 133.21	6-mil 50:16	42.17 13.23	100.1 102.12
<b>13</b> 113.9 <b>135</b> 153.1	24-110ul 133.27	6-month 114.10	93.24 121.10 154.15 173.15	190.7 192.73 Alox 23.22
<b>13</b> +h 10/-16	25-year-olu 168-17	<b>0-1101111</b> 114.70	170.2 187.8	162.8
<b>13</b> 134.70	<b>270</b> 15.1 <i>1</i>	.7.	add 57:1 83:15	Algonauin
<b>14</b> 44.75 <b>140</b> 147.19	279 10.74 270/ALSTOM	<b>&lt; / &gt;</b> <b>7</b> 52.12 108.12	additional 26:14	120.7 9 140.2
170 141.12 15 20.02 22.2		<b>1</b> J2.13 100.13 <b>70</b> ΛΛ·1Λ	adonuato 61.7	allot 86.7
1 50.20 00.0, 1 50.20 112.10	1.7 <b>2</b> e 102.11	<b>79</b> 31.5 6	adjust 82.20	
T JJ.ZZ 113.10,	<b>23</b> 102.11	1 <b>2</b> 34.0, 0	aujusi 02.20 admit 16:10	anow 03.1 105.2 117.20 25
10,20 114.1,19	. 2 .		aumi 40.12	100.2 141.20,20
110.7, 0 150 50.40	2 12.00 25.00	<b>9</b> 10.6 100.10	admittanco	alloweu 20.10, 21 22:15 10:12
150 JZ. 12 150.01 150.1	78.8 05.17	120.1 15 120.0	186.12	ZI JZ.10 42.13 77.5 112.0
102.24 100.1 150.000 07.40	10.0 30.17	130.1, 13 139.0	100.12 advance 120.15	100.10 00
111:10	91.10, 10 109.10		134: <i>13</i>	100.13,22

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

Alston 2.0	166.25 160.5	arquing 56.0	15 100.14 102.0	12 111.2
AISIOIII 2.9	100.25 109.5		13 100.14 102.9	12 144.2
5:23 7:6, 21, 24	170:6 180:19	145:8	attaches 67:6	146:78 150:24
8:1, 4, 9 12:13,	amounts 148:10	argument 120:1	attempt 34:19	153:20 154:23
<i>14</i> 16:5 18:8	analogy 62:22	140: <i>16</i> 146:7	57:8	155: <i>11</i> 156:23
19: <i>4</i> , 5 20: <i>4</i>	167: <i>4</i>	arising 178:7	attendance 8:12	168:5 170: <i>12</i>
21:18 38:22	angle 180:21	arose 148: <i>13</i>	attending 1:13	174:2 <i>4</i> 185: <i>1</i>
39:4, 11, 14	angled 179:24	169: <i>18</i> 178:5	attention 18:24	188:3 189:2 <i>1</i>
47:5, 15, 22	angry 144:14	arrogant 128:24	68:21 93:3	192:7, 25
48:2 49:2 51:9	188: <i>11</i>	aside 191:5	110: <i>15</i>	background
52:3 59:4	annoving 176:8	asked 4:15	attest 34:15	5:16. 19. 22
62:16.17 63:2.	answered 124:1	13:20 20:16.23	<b>ATU</b> 1:7 15:14	6:23. 24
7 64 3 5 12 14	answers 13.12	74.11 119.16	August 161.23	back-paid 75.1
65.25 66.9	anybody 52.21	133.24	authority 28.5	backup 66.18
71.10 17 73.4	76.9 175.13	asking 20.17	automated 84.2	backwards
16 24 76.4 8	178.2 183.0	106.24 125.7 8	157.11 13 18	184.10
83.7 81.10	anybody's	165.5 182.12	automates	had 23.15 36.2
95.7 04.70	157.21	103.3 102.12 ASO 40.12 22	104:10	52.6 05.19
00.4 99.22	107.27 onumoro 51:17	ASU 40.12,22	104.70	00.0 90.70 100.16 107.0
100.3, 10	anymore 51.77	01./U		123.70 134.3
106:77 111:27	56:27 113:76		18:78 103:27	163:11 173:23
114:3, 12 117:4	150:18 168:1	79:6 81:8	auxiliary 107:8	189:25 192:9
119:1 122:4	176:16 182:20	82:21 114:12	available 49:20	badly 20:3
124:6 125:13	184:17, 18	128:24 138:7	54:9, 13, 18	48:22 144:12
138:14 140:7	191:22 192: <i>4</i>	141:5 142:6	<b>avenue</b> 53:25	baffled 52:18
145:3 147:17	anyways 100:19	146: <i>3</i> , <i>1</i> 7 156:7	92:6	banging 173:22
149:22 157:10	apart 172:7	184:6	average 77:5	<b>bar</b> 153:7
158: <i>1</i> , 8 168:7	appended 4:8	aspects 23:7	avoid 26:17	barbecue 80:18
169:24 175: <i>15</i>	appetizing 72:11	104:6 116:9	28: <i>10</i> 134: <i>4</i>	bargaining
181:22 186: <i>8</i> ,	applied 73:16	129: <i>14</i> 141:2 <i>1</i>	171: <i>17</i>	18:2 <i>1</i>
<i>16</i> 188:5 191: <i>11</i>	95:5, 6 96:23	assemble 84:15	aware 16:9	barricade 39:8
Alstom's 8:7	143:17	assembled 20:9	18:2 23:3 33:8	barrier 26:15
65:11 76:18	apply 7:23	41:8 43:4	38:21 67:1	27:1 70:9 71:8
85:17 180:4	73:15.16	assembling	83:5 86: <i>14</i>	146: <i>14</i>
alter 183:16	144:19 153:16	68:23 80:23	88:5 89:13	based 30:14
altered 183:17	approach 31:24	assembly 33:23	94:2 98:25	64:19 147:23
altogether	148:25	35:16 37:18	101:9 108:23	167:14
187.10	approached	39.25 49.21	113.7.19 152.15	<b>Bashar</b> 135.5
aluminium 127.8	13.19 25.13	73.5	awesome 17.8	20.25
amazed 139.14	appropriate	assessment	axles 151.24	basic 124.19
amazing 61.9	49·20	41.20		136.12
64·15 99·24	approving	assigned 82.3	< B >	hasically 7.10
114.5 117.24	125·13	87·10	hack 12.4 13.8	11 8.20 9.6
172.11	approximately	assist 02.23	9 17.23 22.12	13.4 18 14.25
ambitious 0/1.10	6·13 12·6 20	1/0.22 171.21	3 11.23 22.12 23.14 24.10	23·10 26·16
Amorica 128.5	13.25 15.7	assisted 03:10	28.20 21.7	20.10 20.10 50:16 51:20
American 120.0	16.11 25.22	156.10	20.20 31.7	55:19 62:0
American 44.4	10.11 33.22	100.79 Acception 2:10	51.7 40.9 50.12 17 60.22	55.70 05.9 65.24 05.42
	100.73 101.73	Associates $2.10$	JO. 1J, 17 09.2J	00.24 00.13
20.2 30.0, 0	arc 7.0 20.10	assume 13.14	10.0 10.2 00.9	107.27 100.23
37.0 40.70	alea 7.9 30.70	00.70 112.70	00.0, 0 90.73	121.12 130.24
58:5 84:27	39:9 115:27	130:4	95:12 91:25	139.19 1/0.11
92:79 107:4	146:11 163:12	assumed 141:8	98:7 100:25	1/5:4 1/8:9, 11,
109:13 115:12	166:25	1/6:12	103:25 108:1,	24 180:14
122:20 128:25	areas 136:7	assuming 16:11	15 109:1 110:1,	pasis 4:1
139:12 140:17	arguably 110:17	attach 20:9	2, 6 113:22	114:24
153: <i>10</i> 156: <i>9</i> ,	argue 184:17	attached 40:14,	114:20 115:8	bay 37:4, 13
14 165:23	I		117:2 <i>1</i> 130:5, 7,	99:16 102:22

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

163:3 165:4	70:3, 11 79:1	133:15	92:18 95:2, 3, 5	<b>bugs</b> 115:8
174:9 178: <i>14</i>	81:11 92:14	boil 190:7	98: <i>4</i> 102:25	179:12
179:2	101:2 <i>1</i> 129:22	<b>bolt</b> 38: <i>16</i>	107:8, 23, 25	build 33:14
bays 36:3	139:2 <i>1</i> 166:2 <i>1</i>	50: <i>19</i> , <i>20</i> 54: <i>4</i> ,	110:17 122:14	51: <i>11</i> 62:20
bearing 163:8	179:22 181: <i>14</i>	6, 23 75:18	138: <i>1</i> , 6 165: <i>8</i>	96:25 113:25
bearings 151:25	189: <i>11</i>	81:7 85:24	171:1 187:17, 24	133: <i>1</i> 140:2
163: <i>16</i>	bigger 170:13	137:6, 14 143:4	braking 29:1	building 22:2
beat 12:6.9	biggest 19:12	146:25 147:1	103: <i>14</i> . 22	32:21.22 35:2
170:11	20:6 56:17	149:7 150:10	104:1.10	36:7. 17. 20. 22
beautiful 56.25	114.4 140.6	151.12 153.1 3	156.20 187.11	38.14 39.4
becoming 55.20	181.1	6 156:1	Brampton 16:24	42.14 60.8
121.18	Bilgen 2.16	<b>bolted</b> 41.9 17	33.23 34.21	61.7 10 62.13
begged 50.10	bill 66.15	bolting 42:3 17	35:11 51:6	21  64.14  68.25
begged 30.70	binder 1/5.0	20 21	83.25	71.21 102.6
5 20.10 52.2,	binders 122:12	bolte 90:2	brand 125.6	104.94 122.16
5 39.19 52.10	<b>billuers</b> 132.73	126:12 127:0	brand new	104.24 133.70
55.2 59.19 64.2 74.5	DIC 9.17 10.70	130.73 137.9		140.0 100.0
61:3 74:5	19:5 24:77	143:3 152:8, 21	65:23 87:7	172:78
96:27 112:14	25:21, 24 33:22	153:24 154:16	break 5:9	<b>DUIIT</b> 11:4 23:5
113:8 132:19	34:14 36:5, 19	155:4 156:16	28:25 29:15	32:20, 25 33:18,
135:4 137:20	41:6 48:4, 10	bonus 122: <i>16</i>	66:11 67:22	19 34:7 35:19,
171:8 177:6	54:24 57:23, 25	book 77:14	90:8, 11 165:20	21 36:14, 17
185:6	64:22 66:17	booths 42:10	172:11	38: <i>14</i> 43:5
behaviour 13:6,	72:11, 22 76:15	border 48:7, 9	breaker 153:7	52: <i>12, 15</i> 60:6,
7	79:20, 21, 22	boss 27:23	breakers 66:11	17 63:6 64:12,
believe 15:22	80:12 81:14	29:11, 19	breaking 21:17	15 65:13, 16, 21
16:25 17:17	82:20 92:7, 8	bothering 192:1	breaks 48:15	74:17 77:8
23:20 33:2, 5	94:24 101: <i>14</i>	bought 47:12	107:17 157:1	83: <i>17, 20</i> 95: <i>10</i> ,
34:3, 8, 13	115:16 117:2	50:13, 14 56:17,	brief 3:3	22 96:11, 13
43:14 47:18	119:13 125:23	19. 21 63:5. 8	briefly 5:15	97:2. 4. 16. 18
51:25 61:15	145:1 162:14	64:8 65:4	101:15 152:4	99:1.8 132:13
64.18 70.20	167.21 168.5	127.7.12 181.15	169.17.23	140.3 143.8
103.9 121.17	169.6 170.16	bounces 190.17	bright 24.6	humn 28.6
128:3 130:20	191.2	how 99.16	bring 28:20	48.17 102.21
21 131.3	hits 127.25	box 118.8	86·6 93·3	humned 12.21
137.15 161.14	<b>bit's</b> 187.10	130.1 132.1	105:12 130:12	31.13 71.8 0 25
100.12	blamo 63:17	135.1 155.6	170.2 175.18	bunch 45.25
hond 156.25	160.12	170.2	bringing 175.22	55.1 1/1.20
100.20	hlocoing 04.6	hoves 9:21 22	broke 21:10	160.01 174.4
100.22 hending 107.0	blessing 04.0	boxes 0.21,23	105.0	102.21 174.0,
Dending 127.6	DIOCK 179.22	boymend 73.9	125.3	// //J.4
Benjamin 2:70	190:70 blocko 454:45		<b>Droken</b> 118:8	burn-in 179:7, 9
<b>bent</b> 160:2	DIOCKS 151:75	brackets 40:8	138:70 140:77	DUS 15:21, 24
182:19	blood 190:7	118:1	182:2 <i>1</i> 183: <i>13</i> ,	115:24, 25
best 38:1	blow 68:17	brain 29:16	14, 15, 17	116:2, 4
62:11 63:24	139:21	52:18 80:4	brought 7:9	business 59:7
73:9 120:20	blowing 60:14	164: <i>17</i> 183: <i>9</i>	45:25 55:22	63:21 65:9
betrayed 23:17	blows 102:4	brake 9:10	69:22 77:24, 25	businesses
better 36:5	board 10: <i>18</i>	13:24   30:24, 25	98:6 112: <i>4</i>	63:2 <i>0</i>
72:25 73:24	<b>body</b> 109:6	31:6 91:25	117:2, <i>1</i> 6	<b>button</b> 104:11
79:22 81: <i>18</i>	<b>bogie</b> 40:24	92: <i>1</i> 103:25	171:23 174:7	144: <i>1</i> 7 177: <i>11</i>
92:2 <i>0</i> 123:2 <i>0</i> ,	132:15 171:12	108: <i>10</i> 119: <i>16</i>	189: <i>10</i>	<b>buy</b> 63:8 64:4
21, 24 127:16	bogies 8:21	120:5 156:2 <i>0</i>	buckling 177:20	80:18 177:7
169: <i>4</i>	37:11 43:20	165:2 174:2 <i>1</i>	buddy 120:12	buying 87:9
<b>big</b> 10:25 20:1	48:22 53:22	187:5 188:2 <i>4</i> , 25	budget 125:12	bypass 88:25
21:18 25:15	132:12, 13	brakes 20:8	127:15 181:18	89:4 191:24
32:4 65:22		69: <i>4</i> 91: <i>1</i> 7		

<b>bypassed</b> 88: <i>16</i> , 21	<b>cared</b> 18:24 72:7	<b>certificate</b> 139:7, <i>10</i> 194: <i>1</i>	<b>chief</b> 191:7 <b>China</b> 61:8	<b>coil</b> 61: <i>14</i> 178:23
	career 19:20	certify 194:4	choice 62:24	coils 178:12
< C >	caring 164:16	chain 48:2, 10	circle 152:17	colabbed 92:8
cage 101:20, 21	Carolina 43:12	<b>chair</b> 191: <i>19</i>	circular 154:13	<b>cold</b> 57:2
California 56:25	carrot 12:16	challenge 12:8	Citadis 39:23	collaborative
caliper 44:12,	carry 121:21	challenges 44:8	65: <i>18</i>	3:9
13, 18 46:13	cars 40:24	46:7	<b>citizen</b> 92:12	colleagues
53:10, 12, 16, 18	<b>cart</b> 20:7, 8, 12	chance 60:2	<b>City</b> 15:23	46:17
91:23 94:8	137:25 138:10	167:25 185:3	18:18 59:11	<b>collided</b> 159:14
108:20 111:77	158:0	change 21:23	62:76, 23 63:7,	<b>colours</b> 190:4
100.24	76.11 95.25	29.0 31.9	9, 14, 22 04.1, 0,	Come 7.14
21.23 13.0 10	10.74 03.23	33.23 44.73 15·21 16·2 12	0 00.3, 19 01.0 113.8 115.2 <i>1</i>	0.22 17.23
A4.5 11 25	147.10 150.12	57·3 8 58·18	140.10 158.24	20.9 21.20 22.3 23.2 30.4
45.1 5 46.8	152.15 156.3	60·23 87·11	160.5 185.6	22.0 20.2 00.4 34·18 38·15
47.2 10 19	162.17 182.9	89:23 95:4 13	<b>City's</b> 191.7	39.20 40.4
48:25 94:7.8	cases 44:17	111:19 115:11.	<b>civil</b> 4:19	43:25 45:23
98:1, 2, 6	58:9 63:14	23 129:18	claimed 121:15	54:1 56:20
108:19 185:22	80: <i>9</i> 86: <i>1</i> 94: <i>4</i> ,	130: <i>1</i> 131:25	clarify 41:5	58:13 61:6
189:23	23 149:2 167:18	159:24 174:20	80:14 90:17	76:9 83:17
<b>call</b> 13:5 22:12,	catastrophic	179: <i>1</i> 183: <i>13</i>	<b>class</b> 136:20, 22	86:5 90:13
13 44:3 115:25	109:7	<b>changed</b> 9:2 <i>4</i> ,	classification	97:24 110: <i>1</i>
142: <i>14</i> 168:20	catenary 37:15	25 31:4 33:6	27:15 31:10	111:25 128: <i>10</i>
180:21	67:11	45:15 46:12, 21,	classified 30:12	129:5 134:16
called 7:10, 18	caught 12:5	22 49:5 85:22	clean 55:18	138:2 140:5
10:15 44:22	69:21, 22, 23, 24	89:19 91:10	130:8 178:16	141:22 142:2,
67:7 90:24	<b>caused</b> 68:14	95:17 111:18	1/9: <i>1</i> , 2	15 143:18, 20,
101:19 102:15,	11:9 88:5 04:15 05:7	129:27, 23	<b>cleaned</b> 157:20	22 144:18, 19 155:24 162:11
20 107.70	94.10 90.7 125.12 155.8	150.70 155.7	22	100.24 100.77
110.15 120.6	173.21 176.13	changes 32.11	cleaning 158.2	180.5 185.12
135:5 147:18	cease 178.22	71.15 97.24	174·18	192.7
153:7 154:2	<b>centre</b> 47:3	101:10 111:3	<b>clear</b> 24:21	comes 60:4
158:1.3	152:8 154:8	114:12 129:12.	80:7 104:14	62:1 140:10
camera 145:23	certain 3:11	14 149:25	clearer 10:16	coming 43:4
Canada 5:6	25:22 26:20	changing 47:2	<b>click</b> 54:18	58: <i>15</i> 87:6
60:7 185:2 <i>1</i> , 22	39: <i>8</i> 56:2 61: <i>5</i> ,	131: <i>19</i>	clicking 118:9	161:6 173: <i>1</i> 2
Canadian 177:7	14 62:19 74:15	charge 27:5	climate 61:2	181: <i>12</i> , 23
cannibalize	80:6, 7 82:25	135: <i>13</i>	clog 57:4	186: <i>4</i> 189: <i>6</i>
49:12	92:23 98:16, 17	chassis 40:4, 6	close 14:21	<b>comm</b> 145:24
capable 108:12	100:1 101:23	41: <i>14</i> 159:22,	35:17, 18 60:6	commence 3:19
146:25	104:6, 8 105:2	24 160:2	closed 27:18	commencing
capacitor 69:16	107:20 115:25		48:7, 9 120:7	3:1
Cal 40.75,23	110.19 120.23	30.19 $139.2$	1//.13 closor 12:17	COMMISSION
152.14	141.20 24 25	cheaper 63.2	128.11	1.6 2.1 3.16
card 53.21	144:12 152.9	check 27.11	closest 93.23	commissioner
care 7:12.15	19. 21. 22	111:12 174:16	closing 87:4	100:2. 3
19:20 23:25	160:19 166:25	189:15	91:5	commissioning
72:4, 16 79:8,	170:6 172:25	checked 143:4	coated 154:21	91: <i>14</i> 99:20
14 110:21	180: <i>12</i>	checking 176:10	coating 153:16	101: <i>11</i>
111:3 138: <i>18</i>	certainly 51:22	chemical 178:16	co-counsel 3:10	Commission's
164: <i>19</i> 166: <i>3</i>	145: <i>12</i> , 20	<b>chest</b> 190:19	<b>code</b> 152:21	3:8, 17, 21, 25
I				

commitment	completion	Confederation	continuing	cost 26:19
125:9	85: <i>14</i>	6:9	184:2 <i>1</i>	59:6 64:19, 22
committed	complicated	confidential 4:1	continuously	65:8
81:20	114: <i>1</i> 6	confirm 9:9	183:20	cost-cutting
common 30:18	complications	conflict 64:16	contract 24:17	64:24 65:6
comms 145:22	88:3	184: <i>17</i>	46:5 113: <i>1</i> 3	<b>costs</b> 60:7
communicate	complied 30:1	connect 8:25	contractual 52:2	134: <i>4</i>
100:9 176:3, 5	comply 30:3	85:24 94:9	contributed 49:4	<b>COUNSEL</b> 2:1,
communicating	component	108:7 155:2	contributes	3, 4 3:12, 25
62:16	88:10 94:12	connected	110:7	17:23
commute 188:15	components	36:20 48:25	control 26:23	countries 59:20
companies	41:16, 17 46:18	104:7	85:21 98:14	country 30:5, 7
106:2 <i>1</i>	69:2 <i>0</i> 80:7	connecting	104:2 112:1, 18	66: <i>1</i> , 2 120: <i>19</i>
<b>company</b> 7:9,	81: <i>11</i> 88: <i>11</i>	118: <i>1</i>	133:17 191:23	168:22
11, 18 23:5	102: <i>13</i> 103:5	connections	controlled 10:1	couple 12:23
47:10 50:4	107:2 <i>1</i> 109:22	154:3	77:2 107:16	29:16 40:24
64: <i>15</i> 65: <i>8</i>	111: <i>14</i> 141:25	connectors 6:21	177:7	66: <i>12</i> 92: <i>15</i>
123:23 172:9	151:20	connects 154:5	conveniently	102:22 114:22
174:7 175:5, 7,	compressed	conscious	124:2 <i>1</i>	117: <i>1</i> 2 118:2, 3
14 177:10	99:2 <i>1</i>	167:20	conversation	162:20 167:5
194:2 <i>0</i>	compressor	consider 93:22	45:7 113:2 <i>1</i>	171: <i>17</i> 173: <i>1</i>
company's	46:2 <i>0</i> , 21 89:1 <i>8</i> ,	145: <i>10</i>	119: <i>18</i> 126:2	coupled 33:1
120:2	19, 20	considered 8:16	148:3	36: <i>4</i> , 7
company-side	computer 13:4	consisted 118:1	conversations	coupler 148:3
172:8	28:5 46:18	consistent	63: <i>13</i> 120: <i>10</i>	coupling 148:4
compare 104:19	53:24 69:20	114:2 <i>4</i> 165: <i>1</i> 7	136: <i>4</i>	couplings 155:2
106: <i>14</i>	88:25 111: <i>1</i> 7	consistently	coolness 74:19	course 114:9
compared	126: <i>12</i> 150: <i>16</i> ,	139:3	<b>co-op</b> 55:19, 22	139:9 140: <i>1</i>
78:16 104:17	17 176:21	constantly	56:13	<b>court</b> 192: <i>19</i>
106: <i>11</i>	computerized	156:23	core 181:7	194:22
comparison	157: <i>15</i>	construct 83:12	corner 75:3	covered 50:16
22:20	computers	constructed	167:18	124: <i>19</i> 137: <i>16</i>
compartment	54:2 <i>1</i>	10:7 33:9, <i>11</i>	correct 4:3	178:24
163: <i>14</i>	computer-wise	41: <i>19</i>	15:18 42:16	<b>covers</b> 154: <i>13</i> ,
compatible	46: <i>14</i>	construction	89:7 108:2	14
46: <i>11</i>	concern 65:3	5:20 6:9 8:3	121: <i>1</i> , <i>3</i> , 9	<b>COVID</b> 115:7,
competed 22:23	68:20 191:6	24:10, 25 34:11	132:2, 22	13 191:12
compile 21:20	concerned 24:2	37:17 40:3	133:20 134:24	<b>crack</b> 173: <i>10</i> , <i>18</i>
complain 135:12	25: <i>1</i> 110: <i>11</i>	44:8, 9 51:5	142:18 147:21	cracked 172:20
complaint 7:23	concerning	52:7 64:25	149:15 166:10	176: <i>14</i>
complete 8:22	42:25 43:1	71:19, 20 75:12	194:14	cracking 173:14,
12:1 55:24	104:5 121: <i>19</i>	88:4 97:21	corrected	17
82:2 84:23	134:23	98: <i>11</i> , <i>1</i> 6 117:4	180: <i>12</i>	cracks 116:17
85:6 87:24	concerns 8:11	122:5 123:10	correcting 24:4	173:5, 11
119:8 120: <i>18</i>	62:6 107:3	124:6 133:5	corrections	174:16 176:12
132:10 156:13	Concluded	177:24	3:22, 24 4:8	crashed 150:17
158:10	193:6	consult 136:8	correctly 89:6	crawl 164:24
completed	condensation	contact 25:6	145:4 149:1	crazy 124:20
65:15 86:5	58:19	166:24 191:7, 10	156:2 161:22	160:4 162:12
completely	conditioning	contacted 16:18	163:9 165:12	178:25
31:19 32:12	139:5	17:10 20:16, 23	166: <i>1</i> _181: <i>9</i>	create 35:8
37:8 57:6	conditions 64:7	21:2, 22	corrosion	52:4 53:5
83:14 94:22	180:16	content 59:11	174:23, 24	58:19 135:3
98:11 123:22	conductor	continue 22:15		151:7, 8 166:20
127: <i>11</i> 159:23	61: <i>14</i> , <i>1</i> 6	98: <i>4</i> , 5	I	

created 26:22	81: <i>4</i> 110: <i>3</i>	deflect 179:25	detonation	disrupting 170:9
29:3 43:9 53: <i>4</i>	113:22 117:8, 9	180:23	178: <i>19</i>	distance 153:6
88:3 135:2 <i>1</i>	120: <i>4</i> 128:22,	deflector 180:20	developed	divide 166:9
creates 58:20	23 129:17, 19	degree 52:22,	31:25 82:24	divot 170:5
crew 73:6	133:2 <i>1</i> 194: <i>1</i> 6	23 140:13 168:6	device 56:24	divots 166:19
cross-eved	davs 12:1.2	<b>dearees</b> 73:1	91:20 94:10	document
130:9	78:5 80:8	153: <i>1</i>	108:7 172:10	133:10
<b>Crown</b> 4.20	95.17 174.15	delay 39.13	diagnosing	documents
crucial 54.12	dead 103.16	49.12 94.16	118.22	52.7 134.12
crumple 28.21	deadline 79.9	95.1 15	die 67:16	doing 8.20
crunch 85.4	144·4	delaved 94.3	difference 67.2	9.21 11.14
crush 180.6	doadlings 12.4	22 170.15 16	75.2 101.16	10.15 22.5
crushing 22.9	92.15	23 179.10, 10	105:17	77.0 12 51.17
Crushing 23.0	02.70 docl 05.9	00.21 110.0	different 10:2	21.9, 12 01.17, 10 55:15 50:1
CSR 194.27	<b>Uedi</b> 90.0	09.27 110.0		19 55.15 59.1
Curve 35:8	163:20 166:21		19:8 22:8	00:12 04:8
52:11 53:1	189:11	115:77	27:15 42:15	65:8 66:79
116:25 118:27	dealership 62:23	demanding	50:9 57:9	71:25 72:5
135:21	dealing 144:13	11:14	61: <i>11 77</i> :1	73:3 74:16
cushion 87:8,	debris 174:17	<b>Dennis</b> 129:20	81:15 94:21	77:10 78:22, 23
10, 11	deceased	130:2 <i>1</i>	103: <i>5</i> 119: <i>13</i> ,	80:8 82:1 84:2
customer	190:24	department 93:5	<i>14</i> 129: <i>11</i>	86:4 87:14
190: <i>13</i>	deceived 20:3	depicted 24:15	132: <i>16</i> 135:6	94:17, 18
customers	deceptions 20:6	<b>deploy</b> 58:5, 6	170:22	109:2 <i>4</i> 110: <i>16</i>
126:5 179:19	decide 175:8	depth 18:23	difficult 11:16	113: <i>4</i> 120: <i>12</i>
customer's	decided 22:6	derailment	84:25 106:17	121:5 128:9
109:6	23:1 24:6 51:24	155: <i>9</i> , <i>11</i>	142: <i>17</i> , <i>19</i>	129: <i>14</i> 131:7
cutting 167:17	decision 34:2,	158:25 159:5, 8	163: <i>18</i>	135: <i>15</i> , 20
<b>CVS</b> 46:14, 17	21 64:19 112:25	160:24	difficulty 147:16	137:19 138:21
<b>CVSs</b> 69:19	decisions 22:18	derailments	diligence 164:11	139:11. 18. 20
<b>cvcle</b> 45:4	30:9 60:18	158:17.23	<b>dime</b> 170:4	140:12.22
91.25 187.12	93.4 121.2	160.10 161.3 23	diminish 41.22	141.17 142.23
cvcled 104.25	142.18 160.1	describe 5.15	dings 87.16	143.11 144.16
cycles 45.8	164.4 167.14 15	63.24	direct 83:4	146:1 147:16
cycling 44.16	declaration 3.8	describing	136.2 185.16	17 148.24
cyching 41.70	deem 113.2	131· <i>1</i> 0	direction	161.13 164.7
< D >	deemed 4:14	description	138.11 100.15	165.3 7 11
daily $28.17$	defects AA:10	10.2  A1.12	directly 12.13	160: <i>3</i> , <i>7</i> , <i>11</i> 160: <i>4</i> 170:24
damage $80.21$	defence 62:12	00.2 41.72 00.18	13.11 73.25	171.2 21
damage 100.24	167.16 172.72	dosign 62:15	105.21 100.5	171.2, 21
damaging 95:1	deferred 106:10	20 65.14 16 22	152.20	195.10 196.1
100.22	deficient 121.11	20 03.14, 10, 23 06.12 177.1	director 10.21	101.10
109.23 domn 190.10	definitely 26:12	90.12 111.4 105:2 2	dirt 120.12	dellare 122:20
date 15:10 11	20.0 27.22	loj.2, J	dint 129.73	107.10
<b>Uate</b> 15.70, 77	29.9 31.23		dirty 104.23	127.13 deemed 50:10
34:13 122:19,21	38:7 49:3	100:2 decimed 07:04		<b>doomed</b> 59:79
Dated 194:76	60:27 61:23	designed 37:24	165:75 187:7	<b>door</b> 15:7 89:2
dates 12:27	72:2 76:8, 20	38:8	discovered	103:11, 12
14:22	81:22 94:15	<b>desk</b> 123:24	57:13	108:8 120:7
day 1:13 13:18	97:12 100:11	detailed 80:20	discriminated	135:11 1/6:19
17:9 18:13	104:20 105:14	details 68:13	147:23	doors 103:6
21:4, 5 22:4	110:6 125:17	113:12 159:19	discussed	177:2, 13
23:16, 21 26:17	142:17 144:24	175:24	175:11	dormant 13:1
27:6 56:25	145:7 146:6	determined	disguise 84:6	doubted 130:16
57:1 58:16, 17	148: <i>12</i> , 23	45:2 102: <i>14</i>	disorganization	downfall 178:11
66:7 74:2 <i>4</i> , 25	151:20 158: <i>1</i> 2,	detest 186:7	158: <i>11</i>	181: <i>1</i>
76:22 80:1	22 161:9 186:13	detonated 102:5		

downgrade	early 11:17	8:2. 13 9:11.20	137:12. 18. 22	25 160:15
65:12	44:25 45:2	10:20 11:10	138:14.25	163:24
downloaded	124:11	12:11 13:13	142:21 143:10	engineering's
110:25	earth 102:15	14:8, <i>1</i> 7   15: <i>4</i> ,	145:2 146:13	134:2 <i>1</i>
dragged 108:25	easier 52:8	<i>13, 18, 25</i> 16: <i>4</i> ,	148: <i>18</i> 149: <i>6</i> ,	English 176:5
drastically	55:11 80:13	<i>13</i> , 23 17: <i>4</i> , <i>15</i> ,	11, 16, 21 150:2,	enormous
114:12 130:16	<b>easy</b> 57:16	<i>18</i> , <i>22</i> 18: <i>4</i> , <i>11</i> ,	<i>11</i> 151: <i>11</i>	92:19 128:25
drawings 109:11	75:22, 24 117:24	20 19:1, 24	155: <i>7</i> , <i>13</i> 157: <i>9</i> ,	153: <i>10</i>
dripping 187:6	economy 66:3	24:7, 24 26:3, 8	17 158:16	enter 3:16
drive 56:24	Eddie 148:7	27:4 28:11	160:9 161:2 <i>1</i>	entered 3:22
71:2 98:20	educate 184:3	29:5 30:11, 19	162:2, <i>16</i> 164:6	4:1, 5
106:4 118:7	educated 52:16	31:8, <i>13</i> , 23	167:20 168:4	<b>entire</b> 12: <i>18</i>
163:1 170:10	120:17 140:14	32:17 33:7, 21	169: <i>16</i> , <i>20</i> , <i>23</i>	32:15, 16, 18
178:17 189:17	184:2	34:1, 20 35:15	171:6 172: <i>14</i> ,	34:8 35:4 39:3
driven 66:6	education 76:6	37:16, 20 38:7,	19 174:4	40:2 46:2 47:7
75:9 129:12	121:15 140:8,	21 39:1, 13, 17,	176:19, 23	50:10 55:21
driver 70:4, 21	19, 21, 25	22 43:2 44:20,	177:15, 19	95:24 120:19
88:17 103:17,	143:24 185:12	21 47:4, 14, 21	178:3 179:5, 10	128:21 133:22
18 104:1 159:1	186:5	48:1, 4 49:10,	181:2, 21 185:5	135:7 143:5
177:9, 72 drivene 45:04	educational 5:76	19 52:3, 6 54:7	186:75, 23	158:77 159:76
<b>arivers</b> 15:24		55:9 56:10 57:11 59:7 51	107:1 191:3	102:9 100:0
104.11,23	0.10 offoot 96.11	57.11 50.7, Z1	192.14,22	1/3./3 1/0./0
100.3 100.7	107.12 111.20	59.75 60.25 62.5 62.25	120.12	191.77 opticaly 172:12
driving 61.17	107.72 111.20	02.0 03.20 64:21 65:17	nog. 15 omit 130:12	entirety 172.72
80.3 103.10	20 183.21 184.4	66.8 22 68.1	emil 139.72	entities 16.8
107.15	effects 85.16	22  60.0, 22  00.1, 00.1	employee 7.15	entity 135.6
dronned 92.4	effort 123.17	13 18 23 71· <i>A</i>	8.1 74.14	environment
dropping 108.19	efforts 119.1	17, 70, 23, 11.4, 17, 22, 73.4, 22	employees 50.3	26·9
drops 58.17	egos 51.25	75.11 76.16	57.20 168.7	FPU 91.4
drove 70:4.25	elaborate 64.21	80.14.21 81.17	employers	191.15
144:11	74:18 137:11	83:5 84:8 85:3	114:16	equal 10:1
due 16:21	electric 178:25	6, 16 86:16, 21	encompassed	equipment
17:13 44:19	electrical 52:22	88:1, 20 89:10,	78:20	149:22 162:9
45:3, 4 46:12	68:10 69:12, 14	13, 16 90:7, 12,	encountered	equipped 137:19
50:5 51:25	71:6 73:1	16 91:12 93:14	38:22 83:6	erase 31:18
57:18 72:25	88:13 90:5	94:2 95:19	ended 6:17	error 77:12
83:18 84:1	91: <i>18</i> 119:25	96: <i>1</i> , 6 97: <i>8</i> , 20	141:3	114:2, 6 142: <i>4</i>
85:1, 14 94:5	140: <i>1</i> 3 177: <i>4</i>	98:7 99:7, 19	enemy 161:10	171: <i>14</i>
95: <i>14</i> 131:8	electrician 67:17	100:2 <i>0</i> 101: <i>9</i> ,	engineer 43:25	errors 4:4
134: <i>18</i> 135: <i>11</i>	electricity 91:19	15 104:15	55:2 <i>0</i> , 24 100:3	171: <i>18</i>
141:12 164:10	electrocuted	105: <i>4</i> , 8 106: <i>1</i> ,	119:2 <i>4</i> , 25	escalated 62:7,
171: <i>15</i>	69: <i>16</i>	9 107:2, <i>11</i>	142: <i>1</i> 163:22	8
duration 35:3	electronics 8:19	109: <i>17</i> 110: <i>9</i> ,	184: <i>12</i>	especially
95:25	43:1 46:16, 25	23 111:20	engineering 8:8	21:17 32:6
dynamic 7:4	54:21 93:2	113:7 114:18	43:13 52:22	71:10 88:7
8:15 71:1 92:9,	elements $61:17$ ,	115:6 116: <i>18</i> ,	54:16 55:21	116:15 126:25
1/ 101:1/	19 - 19-00	24 119:1, 5, 10	56:16, 23 58:1	140:3 150:25
103:1 104:21	eliminate 159:22	122:3 123:8	73:1 77:18, 21	165:27 168:76
117:19 118:12	empedaea 29:75	124:3 125:20	101:1, 77	184:25 192:79
4E 5	emergency	120:14, 10	130:27 131:77	
$\leq c >$	103.27 104:3 Emily 2.2 2.2	131.10, 14, 10, 21 122.1 0	102.0, 20	01.19 04.14 1/1·01
173.12 196.15	$ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{LIIIIIy}  \textbf{Z.S}  \textbf{S.Z}, \\ 6  15  \textbf{A} \cdot \textbf{7}  \textbf{14} \end{array} $	∠4 100.4, 9 131.5 7 0	140.13 130.23	141.21 Astablich 1.10
173.12 100.13	5:14 6:2, 8 7:5	135:23 136: <i>10</i>	131.2 139.20,	<b>COLANIIOII</b> 4.10

estimated	143.25 167.7	51.23 58.11	fast 46.2 48.22	finish 13.0
181·18	13 185.15 18	60·5 60·15 21	70.8 02.40.22	23.16 82.13
Furone /3:23	186.7 187.17	72.3 78.1	138.3 161.10	23.70 02.73 01·5 135·2 <i>1</i>
24 43.23	ovporioncod	70.10 116.12	factor 15:16	finished 6:25
24 44.2	25.1 20.12	19.10 110.13	70.19 105.11	9.15 10.7
15.21 157.1	55.4 59.72 66:0 11 <i>1</i> :25	124.75 120.7	fault 29.9 /6.2	0.75 10.7
40.27 107.7	122.0	141.7 142.70	10.2 61.2	120.77 fire 12:14
2 120.5 0 127.1	152.9	157.20, 22	49.2 04.3	
2 120.0, 0 137.7	Experience-wise	100.77, 74	100.24 102.70	09.12, 13, 14, 21,
	0.19 expertise 75:10	191.12 192.9 fact 10.16 25.2	112.12 100.12	22, 23, 24 10.12
70.9 122.23 overvene's	02:6	1001 10.70 20.3	107.24 foulte 114.4	122.70 109.24
150:15	92.0	34.17 30.13 70.4 70.25	140.7	fired 20.2 122.4
102.70 ovidence 2:7	20.7 50.19	10.4 12.20	140.7 fovoro 22:5	fires 70.2 71.6
17 22 A-2 5 22	20.7 50.70	132.10 133.14	favour 120:12	fit 61.2 92.1
<i>11, 23</i> 4.2, <i>3, 23</i>	10.22 02.17	130.4 140.75	foor 20:1	fitting 197.9
5.5, 7 127.19	101.3, 70	171.70 173.27	fecture 29:25	fix 22.0 20.0
<b>exact</b> 14.22	123.22 132.4	104.22 100.0		11X 22.0 39.9
15:12 34:10		fall 82:79	89:8 feeturee 99:24	42:7 55:23
40.0 /0.4	130.1/ 1/3:23	101100 01:10	171.16	00.12 01:22
12 11/10		04:10 125:17	1/1:10	00:9 01:9
122.21 143.23	09:9 explade 170:10		1 <b>eei</b> 49:79	97:79 101:7
159: <i>19</i>	explode 178:78	talling 11:7	128:14	110:2 111:72
exactly 14:23	exploaing 61:76	44:9 (-)) - (0)	feet 102:22	114:77 133:7
15:2 62:13, 14	178:73	talls 53:10	Tell 6:78	141:25 174:5
85:11 146:10	exposed 127:2	109:25	151:76 162:6	183:4 191:20
1/0:/ 1//:3	express 29:9	failure 30:24, 25	163:2	fixed 27:18
190:4	expressed	31:7 38:4	tellow 25:20	28:18 87:18
exaggeration	22:21 160:17	44:14 45:15, 22	felt 19:10	110:3 117:20,
170:16	extension 6:11	48:18 49:3	23:17 26:2	21 150:18
examination	extensive 137:4	83:18 90:6	85:13	183:11 184:13
194:11	168:27	109:7 151:11	Ferrari 62:25	fixes 113:4
example 11:20	extent 91:16	188:25	63:2, 3, 7, 8, 10	fixings 8:24
32:3 98:1	104:8 105:25	tailures 36:8	field 131:5	flame 190:6
99:10 100:15,	170:18	46:4, 8 49:11	140:19 147:22	flange 106:19,
16 138:4	extra 112:8	94:25 144:4	fight 120:8	22 160:19, 20, 22
examples 64:11	116:10	1/7:15 186:24	figure 7:14	flashlight 1/4:13
exciting 11:7	extremely 11:3,	tair 15:4 22:11	58:23 77:15	flat 95:7, 8, 14
excuse 122:16	14 12:7 54:12	41:11, 20, 21	93:13 136:8	105:14 170:2,
exist 56:7	/4:15 80:25	/5:6, 8 107:2	146:2 1/9:11	15, 25 1/1:5
98:21	125:7 147:16	110:23 127:23	figuring 82:25	189:18
expand 25:9	188:11	fairly 6:2	132:21 134:21	flats 169:21
expect 1/2:10	<b>eye</b> 129:2, 6		THE 27:18	TIAT'S 1/0:3
expected 45:5	_	47:9, 10, 12	fill 126:15	fleet 32:15, 16,
115:24	<f></f>	Fakah 30:23	189:14	18 46:2 175:8,
expecting 84:10	face 188:19	187:5	final 39:25 93:4	17
expenditures	facilitate 34:5,	take 121:12	find 24:3 64:9	flimsy 180:22
50:6	11 36:7 37:3	fall 55:6 156:9	100:24 109:15	flip 38:19 40:6
expensive	86:4	162:14	135:2 150:13	tloat 40:10
1/5:16	tacilities 60:17,	talling 12:4	tinding 176:6, 16	tioor 19:10
experience	19	87:23 151:15	tinds 97:16	42:18 93:7
29:13 44:6	tacility 16:24	162:3 179:18, 20	tine 15:13 57:1	143:1/ 153:13
78:15 79:17	33:19 34:4, 25	talls 190:17	130:18	157:24
115:5 117:22	35:6, 16, 18	tamily 188:13	tinger 60:20	tlow 150:24
120:18 131:9	36:2, 12, 14, 20	192:12	166:19 172:13	161:19 165:9
140:5, 8, 19	38:1, 3, 19	fans 61:14	fingers 156:25	fluid 9:2 31:2
141: <i>10</i> , <i>1</i> 3	39:12 42:15	I	I	91:2 <i>4</i> 165: <i>11</i>

182:22, 25	122:15 168:25	future 19:18	157:8 166:3	guideway 71:2
187:23, 24	173:12 176:14	24:5	192:18, 19	143:1
fluids 163:12	179:17 183:22		gives 7:15	<b>gun</b> 181: <i>13</i> , <i>15</i>
165:3	frame 154:4, 5	< G >	153:8 186:5	guy 68:10
fluke 71:14	France 43:23	gain 141:10	giving 3:3 5:2	113:2 <i>1</i> 117:8,
flush 9:1 20:7,	Fraser 2:4 14:9,	gaining 38:22	54:20 62:18	23 122:14
8, 12 21:23	13 36:11 41:5,	game 121:6	121:19 139:15	128:2 129:20
111:11 122:13	11, 21 44:6, 21	gap 116:4	182:10	143:22 160:17
137:25	45:17 46:6	gaps 130:19	glue 75:15	165:5 166:2
flushing 165:2,	51:3, 7 68:15	gas 139:6, 11	gluing 75:16	167: <i>11</i> 171:23
6, 8	78:2, 7, 11, 14	gather 106:16	goal 79:12	172:5 182:2
fly 161:18	88:2 90:10	gear 8:21, 23	good 71:10,24	184:2, <i>10</i>
184:23	112:9 121:22	50:15 118:8	79:4 90:8, 10	guys 55:5
flying 103:13	125:22 127:18	130: <i>1</i> 132: <i>1</i>	99:9 122:6	67:17 68:19
190:4	132:7 152:3	135: <i>1</i> 155:6	125:3 139:20	70:25 72:1, 14
focus 7:4	192: <i>16</i>	gearbox 48:24	140:9, 23	98:25 117: <i>10</i> ,
focussed 19:19	freezing 61:21	129:9, 18, 21	165:15 166:12	15 123:20
110: <i>19</i>	French 80:18	131:20 148:11	173: <i>1</i>	129:2 130:6
follow 20:19	fricking 128:22	152: <i>4</i> , 5, 7	goodness 32:20	142:3 146:2 <i>1</i> ,
21:19 26:21	169:3 189:12, 19	153:22 154: <i>1</i> , <i>4</i> ,	<b>GPS</b> 104:7	23, 24 147:2, 4
118: <i>14</i> 130: <i>3</i>	Friday 72:8	8, 15 155:1, 3,	Grade 76:5	152:14 163:20
132:5 158:10	Friday's 74:24	21 156:15	132: <i>4</i>	165:6 166: <i>1</i>
followed 7:20	friend 53:24	162:3, 7, 24, 25	granted 23:14	167:5 168:22
128:22 130:24	73:9 145:23	gearboxes	grease 111:10	172:2 173: <i>1</i>
following 118:15	friend's 73:9	48:23 129:23	151:25 153:17,	175:20 181:6
follow-up 3:12	frogs 143:3	general 6:16	19, 20 154:21	188:2
food 25:9	front 23:11	133: <i>11</i>	163:7, 8, 9, 10,	gym 147:13
fooled 25:7	81:6 92: <i>1</i>	generally 29:6	11, 12, 21, 25	
foolish 100:18	99:16 126:16	175:25	164:2 174:17	< H >
foot 127:17	154:22, 2 <i>4</i>	gentleman 25:6	181: <i>13, 15</i>	half 6:14 9:13
footprint 158:4	155:2 159:2, 12,	43:16 75:22	greasing 151:24	11:2 <i>3</i> , 25 78: <i>9</i> ,
forbid 103:19	17 166:12	135:5 177: <i>1</i>	great 117:24	11 183:9
forbidden	179:25 188: <i>19</i>	gentleman's	135:18	halfway 5:11
188: <i>16</i>	fronts 177:8	125:2	grey 7:9 146:11	Hall 148:7
force 26:23	frustrated 23:17	Germany 128:3,	grind 163:17	hand 77:13
89:6 102:17	54:24	6	ground 4:16	108:3 124: <i>19</i>
157:3 165:24	frustrating 184:7	give 7:12	38:17 70:7, 8	handed 13:2
forced 85:14	full 39:3, 21	14:2 <i>1</i> 15: <i>11</i>	80: <i>11</i> 102: <i>17</i> ,	handful 35:10
135: <i>10</i>	49:6 90:21	20:20 21:1	<i>19</i> 158:5 164:24	96:22
forcing 24:20	102: <i>4</i> , 9 132: <i>1</i> 2	43:25 54: <i>4</i>	grounded 70:9	handing 126:3
foregoing 194:5,	175:8, <i>17</i>	62:22 74:12, 23	grounding	handle 103: <i>17</i> ,
13	179: <i>11</i> 180: <i>16</i>	83: <i>12</i> 91:20	102: <i>16</i>	20 190:24
forget 112:5	full-on 104:4	92:2 99:9	group 26:13, 15	hands 180:23
forgot 56:18	fun 12:8, 10	120:25 122:20	181:7	hands-on 118:4
forklift 159:1	function 9:1, 5	125:24 126: <i>14</i>	growing 147:14	happen 45:16
formal 75:14	32:7 58:4 94:11	139: <i>10</i> 145:7	guarantee 176:9	52:25 65:13
76:3 142:8	functioning 9:3,	152: <i>1</i> 2 158:2 <i>1</i>	guess 49:10	83:19 89:1, 22
formally 121:16	7 183: <i>18</i>	184: <i>19</i>	60:16 62:17	97:2 <i>0</i> 102:5
171: <i>19</i>	functions	given 4:2, 21	63:23 65:25	110:5 129:5
forth 76:2	107:14	15:23 21: <i>11</i>	73:18 80:20	134:20 142:13
156:23 194:7	funny 106:25	50:11 68:5	94:23 114:16	150:1 164:1
torward 175:12	113:20 159:6	80:22 96:15	131:8 135:15	184:21 185:19
tound 21:10	162:5	129:1 130:23	138:12 142:20	187:20 190:14
23:1 27:13	fuses 66:11	133: <i>18</i> 148: <i>16</i>	169: <i>9</i>	happened 7:24
28:16,21 30:24	68: <i>15</i>	I	guideline 33:13	23:21 28:9

30.20 46.20	headache 14.6	higher 77.23 25	hose 109.9	42.25
47.8 48.8 53.2	57.25 67.25	113.1 134.10	187.9	12.20
55.7 59.3	headed 190.15	164.12 168.25	hoses 94.9	<1>
66:13 69:14	hear 18.4	173.7	118.2 3	idea 46.19
70.11 $71.14$	27·23 92·14	highly 110.7	hour 19.13	76·4 8 142·12
100.15 120.11	99·3 118·6 8	high-pressure	25.17 72.12	146.1 152.12
127.3 128.19	159·9 162·24	1∩q· <i>∆</i>	74.2 7 8 75.1	ideal 38.5
155.11 16 10	178.21 182.24	hinder 00.6	7 70.10 103.0	ideas 65:21
157.5 158.25	heard 113.11	hindered 38.4	10 125.5 6	17 <i>A</i> ·2
150.10 160.20	hearings 3.0 18	76·14	150·15 161·14	identification
24 162.21	10	hinders 100.18	18/1.2/ 100.17	7.10
168.2 188.5	heart 76:22	20	20	identified 57.12
hannening	heat 60.22	hindrance 52.10	20 hours 22.23	identify 180.3
28.24 36.8	130.8 153.16	hire 52.20 76.6	10015 22.23 10:25 130:1 15	imaging 156:14
20.24 30.0	hosting 152:19	110.2 120.9	49.20 100.1, 10	imagine 150.74
31.22 90.17 101·2 104·12	heaved 156:16	119.2 120.0	153.27 159.0	111111eulaleiy
101.3 104.73	heaven 100.70	10.12.15.0,	101.2 192.70	23.12, 14 11.0
100.70 113.79	heaven 103.70	10, 13, 13, 17	$\mathbf{n}\mathbf{FU}$ 40.9 40.9	95.23 103.23
110.70 120.9	heavy of 12	nirea 13.3, 21	95.4 107.70, 22,	134.20
123:3 161:3	<b>netty</b> 168:75	96:23 118:11	23 108:11	Immensely
180:10 184:4	Heid 1:12 13:8	119:75 123:9,	185:20, 21	156:77
188:12 191:18	103:20	15 124:15, 22,	187:23	imminent 191:4
193:4	helibent 181:8	23 126:11, 12	HPUS 8:24	impact 10:25
happens 114:11	help 10:22	127:21 169:11	43:10, 12 44:4	26:5, 8 35:9
129:3 137:7, 8	11:2 13:24	174:6	47:11, 19 107:22	68:22 69:8, <i>9</i>
157:2	14: <i>1</i> 17: <i>12</i>	hiring 7:11	<b>HR</b> 8:10 23:20,	116:15 139:22
hard 14:21	35:12 36:11	13:1, 9 18:14	22 162:7	implement 158:9
23:5 41:22	42:3 43:17	86:9 120:13	hub 155:22	implementing
79:15 84:21	55:8 118:2 <i>1</i>	126:7 131:3	163:7	97:17
120: <i>15</i> 168: <i>8</i>	123:24 143:20	143: <i>16</i> 174:7	huge 53: <i>18</i>	imply 77:23
176: <i>15</i>	164: <i>16</i> 167:25	175:5, 22 177:10	57:22 60:12	importance
harder 111:21	helped 82:21	hit 114:23	70:11 99:16	108: <i>11</i> 167:2
hardware 179:1	115: <i>15</i> 157: <i>10</i> ,	132:24 150:5	135: <i>16</i> 139: <i>4</i>	important
180: <i>6</i> , <i>11</i>	20	hitch 114:13	144:23 145: <i>15</i>	110: <i>18</i> 113:3
Harland 2:4	helpful 34:22	hits 190: <i>18</i>	150:7	193:3
3:10 14:9, 13	124: <i>4</i>	hitting 149:4	humans 164:17	impossible
36:11 41:5, 11,	helping 51:10	hold 40:8	184:23 192: <i>11</i>	23:10
21 44:6, 21	93: <i>14</i> , <i>16</i>	103: <i>1</i> 7 107:24	humidity 57:2	improved 55:9
45:17 46:6	helps 13: <i>13</i>	108:9 154: <i>15</i>	178: <i>12</i>	181:3
51:3, 7 68:15	hey 55:3 73:10	holding 108:12	hundred 79:5	incapable 149:4
78:2, 7, 11, 14	93:8 100:7	hole 173: <i>13</i>	hundreds 87:15	incentive 122:17
88:2 90: <i>8</i> , <i>10</i>	113: <i>16</i> 115: <i>1</i>	holes 154:10, 12	132: <i>14</i>	incentives 72:21
112:9 121:22	127:3 129:2, 2 <i>1</i>	home 191:13	hurt 111:4	inch 165:22
125:2 <i>1</i> , 22	142: <i>15</i> 175:2 <i>1</i>	honest 14:3	164:2 <i>1</i>	inches 35:22
127:18 132:7	183:23 184:2	32:13 137:2	Hussein 50:13	incident 23:21,
152:3 192: <i>14</i> , <i>16</i>	187:5	145: <i>1</i> 155: <i>17</i>	56:4 121:25	24 48:8 151:21
harness 69:19	hidden 31:22	157:24 160: <i>13</i>	122:2 123:17	incompetence
81:5	hierarchy 112:9,	<b>hook</b> 165: <i>12</i>	124: <i>1, 10</i> 125: <i>4</i> ,	84:1
harnesses 10:5	18	hooked 107:8	<i>16</i> 134: <i>1</i> 135: <i>9</i> ,	incorrect 151:9
40:8, 12, 20, 21	high 5:18 6:2	hooking 118:2	<i>12</i> 139: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i>	increased 179:6
83:17 118:3	74:15 76:6	horn 70:10	hydraulic 6:23	increments
hat 37:24	78:25 95:17	horrific 98:22	9:2 31: <i>1</i> , 2	165:25 166: <i>10</i>
head 12:22	160:22 166:22,	horrifying 84:4	40:5 91:24	incriminate 4:17
17:21, 25	23 168:6, 9	186: <i>1</i> 3 190: <i>10</i> ,	92:3 182:25	indication
101:14 170:7	169:10	21	hydraulics 5:22	125:24
191: <i>16</i>			-	inform 56:6

10

information 9:8 12:23 15:22	50: <i>12</i> 51: <i>10</i> 53:8, <i>16</i> 54:3	integrating 83:6 89:20	22 68:2, 23 83:6 88:5 89:7.	June 194: <i>16</i> junk 83:9
20:20 51:11	55:14 60:5.11	integration	17 92:5 98:8	<b>j</b>
53:19 54:1.8.9	74:13.20 75:21	89:17	99:2 101:25	< K >
55.1 4 25 68.5	80.17 81.10 23	intends 3.16	105.9.18	kept 52.14
82.23 83.3	82.11 85.21	intense 180.24	114.14 116.16	61.16 99.18
92.20 97.1	87.2 89.2	interested 11.3	125.12 135.11	kevs 126:3
106.16 18	92.16 94.6	17.12 21.8	145.14 163.5	kids 140.20
120.25 121.1	95.1 12 97.14	77:24	169.17 178.4	kill 190.13
128:25 132:22	25 103.7 17	interesting 11.6	185.8 186.17	kilometres
25 133.1 4 6	104.20 22	43·18 67·1	187.2	27·11 45·12
134.1 10 23	109:4 110:1	interiors 40.17	item 183.16	103.9 10 105.5
136.6 141.12	111.16 25	interrunt 24.14		24 111·10
145.6 150.24	115.24 118.5	interrupted	د.ا.>	159.15 161.14
157.8 167.6	110:24 110:0 110:14 120:4	88·18	iack 37.12	164.12 184.24
172.1 181.11	23 122.12	intervals 115.17	Jaime 2.10	190.17 19
182.10 183.25	124.12 125.12	intervene 3.11	144.8 182.10	kind 5:25 7:8
184· <i>1</i>	126.10 20	interview 3.4 7	lason 17.9 15	13 25·17 34·10
informed 23.3	127.6 128.1 11	10 13 15 5.11	16 10.0 20.16	38.20 10.0
infuriated	120.0 10 16	1/3.21 23	10 10.0 20.10,	12.20 52.2
188.11	129.9, 10, 10	interviewing	lowitt 2.10	42.20 52.2 51.25 57.3 16
initial 64.23	136.17 137.24		$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	58.22 63.16 22
initiated $104.23$	138.0 130.7	intrigued 11.0	10/1·3 21	6 <i>1</i> ·1 65·12
inject 163.21	140.10 15	introduce 66.1	ioh 6:16 0:25	75·11 76·11
injectors 22.0	1/1.22 1/2.8	introduction 3.3	$10.2 \ 17 \ 11.13$	81.6 11 85.8
55.11 131.21	141.22 $142.0,25 1/1.0$	invoctod 23.7	10.2, 77 11.73	0+.0, 11 00.0
104.24	20 144.9	involved 6:1	21.0 26.16 20	08.18 22.7
inquires 4.12	145.22 147.0,	0.22 122.5	21.9 20.70,20	90.70, ZZ 101:11 106:21
incapoly 18/1.7	19 140.10	9.22 122.0	21.0 30.1 30.3 51.10 22 60.10	101.77 100.24
insariery 104.7	20 156·10	151.21 103.2	72.6 11 73.15	110.22 110.9
inselt 9.2	160.16 22	involvoment	71.10 20 76.19	126.14 120.12
26.22 59.10	162.20 162.6	17·5	74.19,20 10.10	120.14 129.13
01.25 102.6 22	165:18 166:7	iPad 17/1.0	19.21 00.22 82·1 12 11	136.72 1/2.72
108.4 154.11	168.11 18	182·2	02.1, 13, 14 00.17, 02.20	1/2.5 1/1/6
100.4 104.77,	172.25 178.12	isolated 82.0	120.3 126.13	146.11 148.7
185.10 23 25	170.20 180.20	Israel 43.15	120.0 120.70	161·7 162·11
insight $AA:1$	182.0		151.0 164.20	170.12 183.1
inspect 27.0	instruction 53.8	30.13 25 38.13	167.10 168.18	185.15
174.13	76·18 77·14	39.6 46.17	107.70 100.70, 10 177·2 182·4	kit 124.18
inspection	80.4 17 121.21	57:12 58:23	iobs 6.1 25.4	knew 19.21
27.12 28.4 17	130.20.25	88:10 90:1	61.9 72.23	33.10 18 45.1
60.12	instructions 8.4	93.21 97.16 19	79.20 129.15	46·17 47·6
inspections 60.9	26.22 51.14 16	98.23 101.3	ioin 19.2.6.9	49.18 57.20 21
install 8.23	18 53:3 6 17	105.22 131.3	ioined 9.19	24 71·12 78·21
10.5 44.14 69.5	55.19 56.12	145.15 151.13	12.15 18.8	27 79·23
installed 53.23	76:5 80:19	24 158.12	ioining 10:21	117.25 120.9
83·10 98·12	121.19 130.4	176.13 21	ioke 66.13 16	22 132.7 20
154.25 162.25	22 23 131.10	177.5 20 191.5	iolting 156.23	133.23 138.9
165:10 177:1	15 132.16	issues 8.12	judaina 173.25	20 141.16
183.19	135.3 137.16	9.10 19.12	July 12.21	142.22 143.10
instance 4.20	145.10 146.1	24.25 38.22	iumn 14.10	146.18 19
10.18 27.12	149.17 20	44.23 46.20	25.15 90.9	158.24 159.10
28.14 15 30.22	150:12	48.2 10 54.10	191.21	160:5 169:15
32.3 39.7 43.7	instructor	56.12 58.20	iumped 50.1	100.0 100.70
11 47:9 48:21	136:23	61: <i>1</i> 66: <i>9</i> , <i>20</i> ,	Jamped 00.7	

				]
knowing 58:1	25 82:11 91:1,	8:6, 13, 17 9:16,	116:22 117:5	192: <i>4</i>
131:20 149:14	10 105:8 186:23	23 10:24 11:12	119: <i>4</i> , 7, <i>11</i>	licence 94:1
189: <i>17</i>	leading 77:2	12: <i>15</i> 13: <i>16</i>	121:24 122: <i>4</i> , 7	licenced 93:24,
knowledge 16:3	136: <i>11</i>	14:12, 15, 20	123: <i>12</i> 124:9	25
39:3, 16, 19, 20	leads 77:3	15:6, <i>15</i> , 21	126: <i>1</i> 127:24	lie 136: <i>16</i>
41:2 <i>4</i> 69: <i>15</i>	121: <i>1</i> , 2	16:2, <i>6</i> , <i>16</i> , 25	128: <i>17</i> , <i>20</i>	lied 21: <i>12</i> 23: <i>1</i> ,
118:10 134:18	<b>lead-up</b> 127:5,	17:7, 16, 20	131:12, 16, 22	4 24:3
<b>known</b> 18: <i>15</i>	21	18:1, 7, 9, 12, 22	132:2, <i>11</i> 133: <i>7</i> ,	lifetime 45:13
19:2, 4 61:2, 4	<b>leak</b> 31: <i>1</i>	19:7 20: <i>1</i>	12 134:6, 8, 15	LIGHT 1:6
83:2	187: <i>14</i> , <i>1</i> 9	24:12 25:3	136: <i>1</i> , <i>14</i>	70:11 177:12
<b>knows</b> 18: <i>1</i>	leaking 182:22	26:6, 10 27:7	137: <i>15</i> , 21, 24	lights 66:14
27:22 121: <i>10</i> ,	187:6, 2 <i>1</i>	28:13 29:8	138: <i>1</i> 7 139:2	177:8
<i>1</i> 7 141:6 167: <i>1</i> 4	learn 13:6	30: <i>16</i> , <i>21</i> 31: <i>12</i> ,	142:25 143: <i>13</i>	liking 123:25
	80:25 88:14	14 32:1, 19	145:5 146: <i>16</i>	limit 66: <i>18</i>
<l></l>	106:4 140:22,	33:7, 10, 25	148:22 149: <i>9</i> ,	limited 98:12, 13
labour 10:18	25 167:8	34:3, 23 35:17	<i>13, 19, 24</i> 150: <i>4</i> ,	lines 83:13
lack 85:14	learned 6:21	36:15 37:19, 23	<i>15</i> 151: <i>14</i>	102: <i>1</i> 7 158:5
125:9 131:9	learner 81:19	38: <i>9</i> , 24 39:2,	152:6 155: <i>10</i> ,	link 154:3
134:18 141:12	learning 11:7	15, 18 40:2	15 157:12, 19	listen 29:11, 12
151:20	35:8 52:11	41:10, 13 42:5	158:2 <i>0</i> 160: <i>11</i>	184:8 189:7
lacking 50:22	53:1 77:11, 22,	43:6 44:10, 24	161:25 162: <i>4</i> ,	listened 128:23
lady 23:22	25 79:1 81:14	45:20 46:9	18 164:10	listening 11:1
landing 29:2	116:25 118:2 <i>1</i>	47:6, 17, 24	167:23 168:8	literally 27:8
lane 189:14	135:2 <i>1</i> 136:6	48:3, 6 49:13,	169: <i>19</i> , 22	28:21 35:7
large 147:16	181:6	22 51:6, 8 52:5,	170:1 171:9	40:4 44:17
165:23	leave 15:17	9 54:11 55:12	172:16, 22	79:25 81:3
larger 170:14	24:6 114:2	56:15 57:15	174:6 176:22,	119:19 121:19
late 134:12	123:19 136:7	58:9, 24 59:16	25 177:17, 23	123:4 139:16
lathe 37:4 95:9,	141:12 189:16	61:4 62:8 64:2	178:8 179:8, 14	142:13 143:2
<i>11</i> 110: <i>4</i> 128:2,	leaves 166:17	65:1,20 66:10,	181:5, 24	153:12 158:5
7 165:19 166:5,	leaving 123:15	24 68:4, 18, 25	185: <i>11</i> 186:2 <i>1</i> ,	163:1 188:15, 24
11 170:18	136:6 164:75	69:13 70:3, 16,	25 187:3 191:9	Litigation $2:3, 4$
171:4, 7, 11, 20	181:70	19, 24 71:7, 20, 00, 70:7, 74:4	192:78, 24 193:7	litre 187:23
180:3 189:79	led 5:23	23 13:7 14:1	lessen 113:24	IIVE 41:2
110.5 190.21	Letebvre 2.10	70:14 70:19 70:6 0 12 10	lessened 53:3	LLP 2:10 LMP 102:11
110.0 109.27 Inthing 27:10	17.20 10.0	10.0, 9, 13, 19	lesser 140.9	
1athing 37.10	1011 14.23, 20 17:0 02:10	00.13, 10,24	EVEL 0.3 42.0	
95.0 105.17,21	11.0 23.10	01.21 03.0	57.2 50.7 70.5 79:1 15 112:1	15:14 10:9
27·20 28·6 12	60·10 100·10	18 86.18 25	11/1:20 115:0	location 33.17
27.20 $20.0, 1232.11$ $33.4$	114.6 22 120.5	88.8 22 80.12	11 <del>4</del> .20 113.3 118:12 124:16	06·24
$11A \cdot 1$ 115 · 1	7 123.13 21	14 18 00.16 10	$132 \cdot 4  142 \cdot 1  5$	lock 108.22
125.10 127.2	135.11 17	01·16 03·16	147.15 151.12	17 <i>A</i> ·10
151.6	150.2 157.22	94.4 95.21	160:14 165:24	locked 95.6
launched 31.5	161.22 162.9	96.4 10 97.12	167.2 181.3	187.25
6 32·16 56·20	11 181.13	22 98 10 99 9	levelling 141.23	locking 180.8
107.7 115.12	190.11.23	22 100.23	146.22 184.25	long 14 <sup>.</sup> 17
188:8.9	legal 113:12	101:13. 18	levels 157:2	45:14 125:1
launching 28:10	123:2 142:9.10	104:18 105:7.	leverage 75:4	128:23 129:25
113:15.16	175:24 182:10	10 106:3. 13	153:9	130:3 153:8
179:15 181:10	length 179:11	107:6, 13	L'Homme 23:22	longer 9:17
Lawrence 2:15	LENNERTON	109:19 110:12	162:8	15:16, 17 22:7
194:3, 21	1:7 2:9 3:5, 14	111:1, 23	liability 4:19	135:24
lead 75:24	4:6, 10 5:13, 15,	112:13 113:11	liable 99:25	longest 67:19
77:6, <i>1</i> 6 81: <i>14</i> ,	17 6:5, 12 7:7	114:21 115:10	-	<b>~</b>

		04.04.07.40		1 444.00
<b>IOOKED</b> 19:17	loud 161:17	21:21 27:10	malfunctioning	<b>mark</b> 114:23
25:13 26:25	1/8:21	34:11 45:9, 13	189:25	125:19, 23 147:5
62:17 119:19	love 13:23	50:8, 12, 14	malicious	markings 160:20
122:12 129:24	192: <i>11</i>	51:9, 17, 19	148: <i>17</i>	massive 52:11
130:2, <i>9</i> , <i>11</i>	<b>low</b> 59:21	52:3, 17 53:2,	man 7:17	57:17 170:15
139:3 140: <i>1</i>	166:2 <i>3</i> , 24	25 54:10 55:10	73: <i>11</i> 129:2 <i>1</i>	material 165:23
157:22 159:7	180: <i>19</i> 187:24	72:16 79:12, 13	148:7 158:20	matter 112:8
160:6 162:8	lower 115:6	83:22 105:12	manage 79:21	167:2 <i>4</i>
looking 36:17	loval 23:6	106:8 109: <i>18</i>	91:4	maximum 153:2
73:13 184:11	LRT 6:4	110:25 111: <i>1</i> . 2.	managed 124:8	Mazda 62:24
185:7. 14	lvina 23:1	8, 9, 13, 21, 22	management	63:5. 6. 8
looks 111.7	·)····j···	112.1.6.10.20	13.6 17.14	<b>MBT</b> 14.10
183.9 185.20	< M >	21 22 116.12	22.10 25.23	McLuckie 2.10
loonhole 175.18	machine 26.7	21, 22 $110.12,21$ $117.1$ $11$ $17$	26.14 29.4 5	meaning 21.24
loopholes 175.7	105·11 128·6	18 110.6 0 21	37.25 38.12	138·8
	138.2 165.0 12	120.1 16	57.20 $50.12$	$m_{000} = 108.10$
156.22	166.5 9	120.7, 70	32.1, 14 34.19	175.10 100.79
100.22	100.0, 0	121.23 122.0,	113.7 121.70	173.72 102.27
105e 31.7		13 123.10,21	174.75	107.13
162:9 169:9	20:14 64:15	124:0, 13 126:9	manager 20:4, 5,	meant 11:23
IOST 50:3	101:23 1/2:1/	127:20, 23	22 21:12, 21	39:24 /4:8
155:16 166:25	machines 11:3	128:13, 16	22:25 24:2	186:18
187:23	mad 189:17	129:16 132:24	27:19 31:9	measure 153:5
lot 5:20 11:7	made 3:22, 24	133: <i>6</i> , <i>13</i>	50:14 74:22	measurement
13: <i>14</i> 17: <i>1</i>	4:8 12:8 16:9	134: <i>12</i> , <i>1</i> 7	91: <i>4</i> 100:25	106: <i>19</i> , <i>21</i>
19: <i>9</i> , <i>1</i> 7 20:2	18:13 22:10	135:8, 24	101: <i>1</i> 119: <i>9</i> , 23	measures 64:24
22:18 25:11, 12	23:9 25:6	137: <i>19</i> 138: <i>5</i> ,	121: <i>13</i> , 23	65:6 71: <i>13</i>
28:11 30:2	30:14 31:3	<i>1</i> 5 142:3, 24	129: <i>19</i> 130: <i>11</i>	<b>mechanic</b> 93:23,
32:9, 10 34:17,	32:11 34:2	145: <i>4</i> , <i>21</i>	165:5 191: <i>6</i> , <i>14</i> ,	24
24 42:16, 19	38:1 42:18	151:20 157:10	15	mechanical
43:12, 22, 23	46:5 60:18	158:7 164:7, <i>14</i>	managers 27:1,	5:21 6:23 7:2
44:1 46:14	61:21 71:16	165: <i>1</i> 168:7	6 99:24 119:22	52:21 69:2
49:9. 15 50:4	72:10.20 73:12	171:2 174:4	160:6 166:12	90:5 91:2 19
52:7 55:15.16	74:2. 7. 9. 10	179:16 181:3.	manipulate 28:1	20 93:21 94:1
61.11 63.18	84.25 90.25	22 186·17	manner 109.21	117.22 119.24
64.15 71.24 25	93.4 96.16	maintenance's	mannerisms	163.23 184.11
72.5 13 14	99.4 128.6	169.24	22.19 23.24	mechanically
75.19 77.12 16	136.18 142.16	maintenance-	manoeuvred	187·16
22 79.7 16 18	143.15 145.14	type 53.7	173.8	mechanics
82·21 QO·A	150.16 25	major $45.15$	mannower 86.8	35.25 46.15
02.27  50.4 01.21  03.6  10	163.70, 20	71.15 81.70	man's 103.16	53·0
07.22 08.15	182.1 188.7	102.16 158.12	manual $52:4$	<b>modia</b> $1/1/22$
105.5 20	102.7 100.7	majority 25:6	122.10 125.9 24	150.2
105.5, 20	190.7 194.70 main 65.2 94.9	111ajointy 55.0	102.70 $100.0, 24$	modical 76:04
100.70 114.70	04.10 107.14	40.22 04.70	manufacture	25
122.24 130.79	94.70 107.74	01.1 120.10 making 25:16	107.40	20 mont 10:2
133.2 144.7	140./3 104.0	111aking 25.70,	127.10	
145:77 147:2,	178:9 187:5	18 20:2 28:14	manufactured	45:11 82:14
24 148:11	maintain 128:76	65:3 74:4, 72	43:10	115:76
150:7 151:5	1/2:1/	/5:/ 111:21	manutacturer	meeting 23:20
153:8 159: <i>18</i> ,	maintaining	123: <i>18</i> 125: <i>9</i> ,	53:14	101:2 162:7
20 163:19	127:21 162:19	12 146:7 164:4	manufacturers	melt 189:22
166: <i>1</i> 168: <i>14</i> ,	maintenance	166:24 167: <i>15</i>	48:19	melting 188:24
21, 25 169:7	7:25 12:14	181:8	manufacturing	Member 2:3, 4
171:12 175:20	13: <i>3</i> , <i>21</i> 14:5,	Malaku 75:23	44: <i>19</i> 45: <i>4</i>	15: <i>14</i> , <i>16</i> , <i>17</i>
lots 48:3	15, 18 18:10	117:24	127:9	
	19: <i>19</i> , 25 20:5			

members 22:12	mind 52:17	motivating 25:1,	149:2 167:8	never-ending
25:11 63:14	mindset 118:13	19	170:23 175:23	47:3
101:22 192:12	mine 53:24	motivation	185:23	<b>new</b> 35:6 47:5,
membership	69:2	78:17 79:7, 16	<b>MVT's</b> 27:8	23 53:5, 12
26:4	minimal 182:4	motor 48:25		66: <i>1</i> , 4 85:24
memorization	minimum 44:15	132: <i>14</i> 155:3	< N >	87:9 89:20, 23
79:24	79:14	156: <i>11</i> , <i>19</i>	named 30:22	95:2, <i>11</i> 98:6
memorized	<b>minus</b> 58:14, 17	<b>motors</b> 156: <i>10</i> ,	75:22	125:6 130:6, 8
51: <i>12</i> 79:25	59:2 <i>1</i>	11	necessarily	138:2 142:24
memory 43:13	minutes 108:13	mounted 108:4	15:10 34:16	180: <i>1</i> 7 181: <i>13</i> ,
mentally 144:13	120:6 123:5	109:9	38:10 49:2	15
184:8 190:2 <i>4</i>	130:2, 16	mouse 54:18	56:23 61:20	news 159:7
mentioned	145:16, 18	move 33:23	94:22 112:17	179:22
10:20 14:10	167:22	34:12, 21 44:22	131:4 170:23	Newton-metre
19:1 24:8 78:2	miraculously	85:9 101:5	186:4	148:5 150:8
117:23 158:78	74:25	102:27 119:78	<b>needed</b> 7:1, 2	153:7
186:15	mississistics	159:2 may and 24:14	13:70 19:22	Newton-metres
mesned 133:3	misappropriation	movea 34:14	21:22 34:72	147:70 150:0
messed 82.0	123:0	35:11 37:7	37:0 45:7, 77,	152:11, 22, 24
metal 127:7	102.10	90.22 123.24	73 40.22 49.7 50:1 0 22	104.77 100.4 nicor 160.7
151.11 157.2	nisorably	150.16	50.1, 9, 22 56:15 16 58:21	nickname 75.2/
165.21 173.7	125.18	movements	69.10, 70, 00.27	night 72.8
14 179·24	missed 122.4	157·18	79.23 81.9	167·24
metallic 153:17	129:17 130:6	moving 41:2	84:23 85:7.8	nightmare
<b>metre</b> 165:9	missing 49:9	119:17	87:5 88:23	172:23 176:17.
metres 67:15	137:23	<b>MSF</b> 35:15	94:12 98:15	18
<b>M-hm</b> 169: <i>19</i>	mistakes 125:11	36:13, 15, 16, 24	115:16, 17, 20	nights 32:12
176:22	mistreated	37:7, 10, 16, 21	117:20 122:10	nipples 152:1
<b>mic</b> 18:6	19: <i>11</i>	38:23, 24 39:1,	125: <i>14</i> , <i>15</i>	163:8
micro 62:13	mitigated 178:6	14, 24 43:4	127:16 132:20	nit-picking
76:2 80:15, 16,	mitigations 71:5	49:2 <i>0</i> 66: <i>9</i>	134: <i>12</i> 135: <i>14</i> ,	122:25
<i>19</i> 118: <i>14</i>	mixture 65:24	69: <i>12</i> 71: <i>18</i>	16 137:16	nobody's 24:20
132: <i>4</i> , 5 133: <i>15</i>	140:23	102: <i>11</i> 126:8	138:2 <i>0</i> , 21, 22	nodding 17:25
150: <i>16</i>	modular 39:24	137:18 157:18	141: <i>15</i> , 24	<b>noise</b> 99:4
microphone	money 54:20	163: <i>1</i>	146:6 147: <i>1</i>	non-
144:17	59:6, 9 60:7	multiple 56:4	154:19 179:12	typographical
micros 8:7	63:22 74:3, 23	77:1	181: <i>19</i>	4:7
51:12 53:22	122:24 168:14	multiplier	needing 45:8	normally 92:9
79:25 118:15	169:6	147:20 148:2	<b>needs</b> 59:21	96:7
122:11 132:12	money-driven	150:5, 6, 9	109:3 111:18	nos 91:21
	25:5 month 111:11	<b>WIVI</b> 12:76, 20	135:7 180:9	<b>nose</b> 40:14, 15
00.0 107.23 midnight 151:1	160:12	14.12 10.7, 10	104:20	70.0 noto 17:24
mil 166.8 13	months 12.21	26·1 37·2	negative 1/1.25	noted 186:17
millimetres	13.25 75.2	117·1 121·20	35.9	notes 194.14
170 <sup>.</sup> 6	77.4 162.8 10	131.23 148.14	negativity 144.7	notice 44.7
million 45:8.10	Montreal 43:21	168:12 175:9 14	neglect 171:3	118:24
172:10	173:2	MVTs 22:21	neglected	noticed 25:14
million-worth	moral 190:11	28:3 29:25	155:23	26:11, 13
172: <i>11</i>	Morals 20:2	36:25 50:25	neglecting	notified 187:4
Milwaukee	morning 28:12	116: <i>11</i> 121:20	170:25	nowadays
181: <i>15</i>	58: <i>15</i> 114: <i>19</i>	126: <i>11</i> 127: <i>15</i> ,	negligence	147:25
mimic 58:22	motivated 11:18	20 128:15	77:10	number 13:22
I		136: <i>10</i> 147: <i>4</i>	I I	22:12, 13 33:5

34:6 45:5, 6 54:4 113:17, 24 115:20 117:7 122:21 124:15	OLRT 70:22 71:2 OLRTC 124:5 OLRTC's 172:14	46:10 48:17 50:21 57:6 75:4 88:24 89:4.7 98:4	owned 18: <i>17</i> 43:9 47: <i>10</i> , <i>11</i>	173:17 189:9, 15 190:10, 22 partake 193:4 participants
129: <i>19</i> 152:2 <i>1</i>	onboard 25:15	101:4 102:17	<b>p.m</b> 1: <i>14</i> 3: <i>1</i>	1:13 2:7 3:25
158:21 161:10	ones 7:12 44:5,	115: <i>4</i> , <i>19</i> 120:3	193:6	4:5
169:11 170:8	13 45:9 47:1 53:1 05:11	120:8 127:70	P1 27:10 28:0 30:12 31:3 16	
numbers 32.21	127·1 167·9 12	152.22 153.2	<b>P2</b> 27.16 28.6	particular 44.7
33:2 54:2 78:4	170:13 173:12	157:3 163:8	31:4	partly 181:22
117:6	176: <i>14</i>	183:2 188:7	<b>P3</b> 27:16	parts 40:5 43:3,
numerous	ongoing 86:17	189:8 191:23, 24	<b>P4</b> 27:16	24 44:2, <i>4</i> , 8
28:19 46:10	95:20	orders 181:23	pace 11:18	46:7 48:11, 16
<b>nut</b> 50: <i>19</i> , 20	<b>open</b> 35:20, 25	organization	pads 188:24	49:6 51:20
100.0 nuts 50.19	42.13 59.22 60:11 61:13 17	organized 79.2	pages 132.14 naid 11.15	90.23 118.18
1013 00.10	103:12 108:10	original 33:8, 15	72:25 73:25	127:11
<0>	174:12 190:6	88:15 101:10	79:8, 9, 13	party 72:19
object 5:5	opened 185:21	originally 36:24	168: <i>12</i>	partying 72:8
190: <i>19</i>	opening 6:10	45:10 83:16	paint 87:16	<b>pass</b> 63:17
objected 4:14	53:10 60:14	<b>o-ring</b> 130:4, 7,	158:5	103:19 185:18
objections	154:9	10 131:1 132:8	painter 42:7	190:4
194.70 oblige 22.14	operated 101.7	153.20 154.20 OTTAWA 1.6	<b>painting</b> 42.7, 5,	102.8
observe 20:20	161: <i>11</i>	6:4 35:16	paired 149:3	passes 58:6
obtain 3:7 33:5	operation 88:6	47:16 61:2	panel 85:21	passionate 72:1
140:2 <i>4</i>	155: <i>14</i>	outages 66:13	pantograph	pattern 152: <i>9</i> ,
obtained 53:21	operational	outlet 108:7	44: <i>4</i> 67:5	10, 13, 16, 19, 23
obtaining	115:9	outside 49:17	100:12, 13, 17, 22	156:1
132:22	operations 6:10	57:17 58:12	paper 28:22	pay 18:24
<b>UC</b> 15:20, 24	20:4 20:5 59:22 120:10	59:23 92:7 106:17 102:00	paperclip 156:25	19:12, 13 24:9 66:15 69:21
70·21 104·22	130 <i>·11</i>	144.23 158.25	<b>pai</b> 99.70 125.10	77.23 110.15
106:6 126:4	operator 70:14	160:7 175:6	parameters 3:4	pavcheque 72:7.
occasions 56:4	operators 15:20	177:18	paraphrase	18 164:22
92: <i>15</i> 166: <i>6</i>	opinion 15:1	overall 73:23	127:19	168: <i>15</i>
186: <i>16</i>	29:12 36:5	81: <i>1</i>	parcel 98:19	paying 19:14, 21
occurred 69:12	55:13 56:23	overflow 109:2	park 36:18	PC09 122:11
161:24 0CS 30:7	57:5 59:18 60:22 64:17	overnead 37:14	Parker 187:8	PCO 90:24
66·12 67·2 3 4	86·12 110·7	overkill 156.13	9.5 10.3 11.11	114.19
13. 16 68:7	121:8. 12	overlapped 97:7	17:4 18:10.15.	penalties 26:17
70:6, 7, 10, 21	133:12 164:14	overloaded 35:1	19 24:23 34:9	27:24 28:10
100: <i>14</i>	180: <i>7, 15, 17</i>	overnight 58:14	37:9 48:14	penned 159:22
offered 169:5	181: <i>1</i>	override 28:5	49: <i>4</i> 51:2 <i>1</i> , 22	penny-pinchers
office 120:6	opportunities	overshoot 29:1	54:2 56:5, 7	64:17
officer 191:8	123:22	overtime 21:22,	61:15 65:11, 12	<b>people</b> 11:22
	11.5 115.7	24 22.20,24 overton 160.25	14.19 91:1 98.18 102.2	12.7 13.7, 3, 19
oil 107.10	opposed 6.11	161.4 8 173.16	106.15 110.18	19.10 17 21.25
187:6	27:1 112:25	overwhelmed	112:7, 16 116:8	22:22 23:11
old 137:25	opposite 119:8	181:22 184: <i>19</i>	119:16 120:1	24:3 25:22
138: <i>10</i>	120:18 152:16	overwhelming	126:9 135:6	26:12 27:5
older 79:20	order 3:19 7:3 31:16 32:11	46: <i>1</i> 182: <i>1</i>	155:7, 8 170: <i>17</i>	30:2, 4   35:2, 4, 6, 10   36:10

15

20.10 12.22	normite 2:12	nick 70:19	plue 24:11	notontial 151.12
39.10 43.23	permits 3.72	pick 79.76	pius 34.77	
45:23 46:1	98:15	picked 64:1	58:16 59:22	187:1
49:17 52:12, 15	person 4:21	picture 159:8	point 5:9 7:13	potentially
61:5, 6, 7, 24	29:14 43:18	piece 28:22	9:20 10:11, 12,	173: <i>10</i> 190:25
71:24 72:3, 6,	69:16 77:5, 19	109:5 153:8	22 14:2 17:23	<b>pounds</b> 147: <i>9</i> ,
11. 14. 22 73:24.	81:13 82:10.19	154: <i>11</i> 162:9	23:4. 12 26:18	12
25 75 7 8	93.7 94.5 17	173.6 14 16	27.25 32.18	nower 25.25
77.24 78.16	18 100.21	179.23 24	$38 \cdot A  A1 \cdot 3$	37.15 40.10
01.0 0 06.7 00	117.24 122.4	190.22	45.21 47.11	66:0 10 15 17
01.2, 3 00.7, 23	117.24 123.4	100.22	45.21 41.11	00.9, 12, 13, 17, 10, 17, 10, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00
87:12, 19, 20, 21,	124:22, 23, 24	<b>pieces</b> 42:3, 17	48:0 53:22	19, 23 67:8, 12
22, 24 91:17	125:3 136:5, 8	43:22	55:17 60:20, 23	68:2, 6, 23 69:1,
93:5 96:22	140: <i>11</i> 141:7, <i>8</i> ,	<b>pillars</b> 35:21	67:23 74:15, 20	10 81:13 86:23
116: <i>1</i> 3 118: <i>11</i>	10, 16 144:15	<b>pin</b> 164:2 <i>4</i>	77:18 78:16, 24	101:2 <i>4</i> 102: <i>4</i> ,
119:2 121:9	183: <i>6</i> , <i>21</i> 184: <i>1</i>	<b>pins</b> 102: <i>1</i>	81:23 83: <i>11</i>	<i>17, 22</i> 156: <i>13</i>
122:5, 8, 25	personal 36:5	111: <i>11</i> 163: <i>18</i>	84:20 92:10	powerful 156:12
123:9, 11, 14, 15	57:5 59:18	pioneer 11:5,6	95:9 104: <i>1</i> 2	powers 91:19
126:24 128:21	60:22 110:7	<b>pipe</b> 109:8	109:10 121:14	practice 105:3
131.4 133.6	121.7.11 145.1	187.5	123.14 124.17	precedence
135.17 138.17	180.14 17	nines 42.21	25 125.2	112.11
18 10 20 22 22	porsonally 15:0	pipes $40.7$	120.24 143.14	nronaro 8:15
10, 19, 20, 22, 23	26:11 20:24	piping $+0.7$	123.24 143.14	00.00 101.10
140.5, 7, 21, 24	20.11 29.24	place 5.7	144.10 145.13	00.22 124.72
141:20 142:22,	50:0 51:24	23:17 30:10		129:1
24 143:11, 17,	96:18 99:17	37:17, 21 40:19	171:1 172:13	prepared 131:15
19 144:25	106:15 109:12	43:20 71:5	173:24 175:12	preparing
146:6 147:25	110:20 145:5	98: <i>16</i> 100:22	176:7, 10	125: <i>18</i>
152:15 153:12	146: <i>4</i> 171: <i>19</i>	103: <i>18</i> 114: <i>11</i>	178:23 184: <i>16</i> ,	<b>PRESENT</b> 2:13
164: <i>19</i> 166: <i>11</i>	177: <i>1</i> 181: <i>17</i>	145: <i>3, 12, 13</i>	<i>18</i> 185: <i>16</i>	31:24 65:25
169: <i>1, 9, 12, 14</i> ,	190: <i>12</i>	153:2 <i>1</i> 158: <i>8</i>	189:2 <i>4</i>	presented 64:6
<i>15</i> 174:7 175: <i>5</i> ,	person's 183: <i>16</i>	159:2, 3 169:5	pointed 80:2	presenting 64:4
9, 10, 16, 17, 18,	190:20	194:6	186:17	press 104:3
22 176:1.8.15	person-to-	placed 10: <i>14</i>	points 87:4	pressure 28:12
177:10 181:8	person 75:20	159: <i>12</i>	91:5 164:8	30:10 107:24
185.5.20	perspective	places 43.23	166.22 23 24	108.9 13 14 19
186.17 190.2	87.13	nlan 33.8	nole 70.8	20 21 151.9
192.11	nhase 8:16	101.10 $114.7$ 13	politely 52.16	163.15 167.17
<b>People's</b> 78.17	31.0 37.17	nlanned 34:15	pointery $52.76$	173.0
102.12	51.5 71.10	114.0	pool 179:21	
192.12	01:15 00:20	114.3	pop 170.27	pressures 92.3
	91.75 99.20			
20:25 35:24	106:2 133:5	113:78 114:4, 9	120:0	163:14, 15
44:14 47:25	phonetic 30:23	plans 100:6	ports 43:27	pretty 5:24
50:17 59:17	75:23 135:5	plastic 109:5	pose 43:14	6:17 7:21 8:8
67:10 95:6	physical 15:9	plate 154:9, 23	posed 26:15	9:18 12:22
115: <i>15</i> 141:6, 9	113: <i>1</i> 3 147:23	platform 177:11	position 6:18	15:23 19: <i>16</i>
151:17 166:2	148: <i>11</i> 155: <i>1</i>	190: <i>18</i>	10: <i>10</i> 91: <i>11</i>	25:19 32:23
167:6 171:25	173: <i>15</i>	plausible 174:2	120:2 <i>1</i> 123:2 <i>1</i>	66:25 74: <i>18</i>
172:24 173:20	physically	<b>play</b> 114: <i>14</i>	128: <i>13</i> 135: <i>18</i>	93:19 168:15
186:25 191:12	11:14 20:22	120:11	146:15 169:13	173: <i>1</i> 180:24
perfect 96:11	44:17 108:9	played 147:13	positions 35:12	prevent 153:17
perform 62:7	128:9 143:7	<b>plethora</b> 157:4	positive 10:25	prevented 178:6
period 12:6	146:25 147:14	<b>plug</b> 101:22	possibility 96:15	preventing
114:10 179.7.9	148:6. 15 149:4	114:14	possible 63.11	150:11
180.16	152.1 153.22	plug-and-play	65.4 96.17	preventive
neriury 5.2	155.20 187.6	84·11	105.22 123.18	111.0 134.17
nermission	180.20	nlugged 67.0	160.22 120.70	nreviouely 19.2
21.1 11 10.7	103.27	piuggeu 01.8	nosted 2.20	PIEVIOUSIY 10.3
∠1.1, 11 43.1			<b>pusieu</b> 3.20	

20:11 117:3	29:17 30:24	proper 17:17	purposes 39:8	73:2 93:5
primary 7:4	32:25 34:21	46:13 56:11	71:16 139:13	108:6 120: <i>14</i>
prior 18: <i>14</i>	35:11 36:16	102:23 130:13	Pursuant 4:11	169: <i>1</i> 185: <i>9</i> , <i>11</i> ,
30:24 119:19	37:7.25 42:18	131:25 148:16	<b>push</b> 11: <i>18</i>	13
125.25 126.2 3	48.13 49.22	149.7 22 23	99·23 103· <i>11</i>	quality 26.7.9
priority 112:17	50:2 51:0 12	150.12	110.24 144.16	72.22 72.22
124.21 141.16	$16 \ 52 \ 17 \ 22$		110.24 144.70	12.22 13.23
134.27 141.70	10 53.17,23	property 9.7	155.13 165.10,	95.17 99.17
private 106:18	55:2 57:16	26:21 62:10	12 177:11	177:27
problem 15:14	70:25 71:11	71:8 75:18	pushed 12:3	quarrels 25:22
17:22 24:4, 19	74:22 82:7	100:22 102:19	15:1 26:17	135: <i>10</i>
28:15 32:4	90:23 91:6	109: <i>10</i> , <i>14</i>	45:16 144:7	question 4:15
39:9 56:17,22	93:7, 17 95:20	111:6 115: <i>4</i>	161:2	5:6 13:12 20:2
57:22.24 84:9	96:3.9.20 97:5	118:16 137:13.	<b>pushes</b> 163: <i>13</i>	51:4 90:9
99.3 101.8	6 10 102.8	18 142.1	pushing 87.23	106.24 168.5
109:1 114:10	113.22 117.0	152.12 156.6 8	104.11 165.11	171.1
109.7 114.70	16 04 110.45	16 150.14	104.77 $103.77$	nu actionad
131.5 144.72,	10, 21 110.15	10 130.14	<b>pul</b> 0.24 9.2	questioned
23 147:11	119:22 120:16	162:19 164:7	10:3, 7 11:27	121:15
148:2 <i>1</i> 179: <i>4</i>	122:18 132:23	165:3 166: <i>4</i>	23:15 35:19	questions 3:11,
180:13 189:13	133:22 135:8,	176: <i>4</i> , <i>5</i> , <i>10</i>	36:23 38:16	<i>1</i> 3 91:9 133:23
problems 14:5	<i>19, 20</i> 136: <i>6, 21</i>	178: <i>11</i> 183: <i>19</i>	40:7, 11, 13, 17,	168:2 182: <i>1</i> 2
17:13 46:14	138:1 141:2, 3	185:9 190: <i>18</i>	23 41:10, 15	192: <i>15</i>
60:22 84:7	144:3 155:11	propulsion	53:17 62:10	auick 81: <i>19</i>
85.1 89.19	158.1 159.5	102.24	65.11 71.5 8	108.7 110.2
105.21 100.12	165:5 180:5	prosocution 5.2	12 81.5 6	135.2 175.2
103.27 109.73	101.14	protect 24:1	02.11 12 20	133.2 173.2 guigkly 20:7
121.2 121.14	191.14	protect 24.7	03.11, 13, 20	<b>QUICKIY</b> 20.7
138:79 141:23	professional	protection	84:24 87:13	48:12 50:3
171:7 176:20	5: <i>16</i> 194: <i>4</i>	174:2 <i>3</i> , 24	89:22 101: <i>19</i> ,	67:4 80:25
178:6 180:12, 18	profit 63:21	protocols 71:9	21 102:7, 9	95: <i>16</i> 127: <i>19</i>
procedural 3:19	74:12	proud 173:6	105:23 108: <i>14</i>	134: <i>19</i> , 22
procedure 13:9	program 111:17	prove 186: <i>11</i>	109:2, <i>4</i> , <i>9</i>	quit 24:20
78:23 145:17	programming	proven 45:21	122:8 123:17	169: <i>12</i>
176:7. 18	90:3	46:4 65:18.19	126:16 130:4.7.	auite 24:10
procedures	project 6.4.14	provide 50.5	8 13 145.3	48.9 116.25
145.11 12 20	0·13 11·8	54.2 22 56.11	148.3 4 150.9	157.24
procoodings	12.24 22.9	115.7 145.0	16 152:10 22	137.24
	15.24 25.0	115.7 145.9	10 155.19,22	- <b>D</b> -
4.19,25 194.5	25.15 20.5	provided 47.79	154.1, 10, 20, 23	< R >
process 6:9	34:8 35:9 44:7	132:4 172:9	167:16 168:19	race 63:4
10: <i>4</i> 16:22	47:16 63:18	providing	173: <i>4</i> , <i>8</i> , 9	racetrack 62:25
17:10 35:2	73:13 74:14	147: <i>18</i>	174: <i>10</i> , 23	<b>radio</b> 11: <i>1</i>
56:11 64:25	83:24 90:20	public 3: <i>9</i> , <i>18</i> ,	177:3, 8 184:23	49: <i>16</i> 144: <i>11, 15</i>
97:21 101:12	94:3 96:22	21 4:12	185: <i>1</i> 192: <i>5</i>	radios 159: <i>9</i>
117:9 126:7	98:5 99:21	<b>puck</b> 154: <i>10</i>	194:7	<b>RAIL</b> 1:6 66:7
131:19 143:16	106: <i>14</i> . <i>15</i>	pull 35:23	<b>puts</b> 163: <i>15</i>	69: <i>14</i> 70:7
150.20 155.8	108.23 117.11	37.13 55.3	putting 40.5	104.17 19 167.1
processes 145.3	119.16 20	80.19 103.25	42.20 53.12	railcar 66.5
produced 06:2	120.5 122.10	115.22 174.0	$91 \cdot 1  15  126 \cdot 5$	
	120.0 132.19	nulling 172.6	120.11 146.22	
5		pulling 172.0	129.11 140.22	Taise 74.0, 11,
producing 51:76	projects 4/:15	pump 108:3, 9	148:10 192:10,	13
production 6:6,	104:17, 19	163:24 164:25	12	raised 22:18
13, 15, 18 7:8, 9	106: <i>12</i>	purchased		random 174:7
8:22 9:4, 12	promoted 35:13	62:19 65:19	< Q >	175: <i>4</i> , 22
10: <i>4</i> , <i>1</i> 7 12:5,	pronounce	purchasing	qualifications	Randstad 7:10,
17, 18 13:10	122:1	125:12	186:6	18, 22 8:3, 10
16:15, 18 18:9	propel 156:12	purpose 3:3.6	qualified 20:15	9:25 19:12
19:7 20:12	••	38:8 191:25	39:10 72:2	24:10 72:10

73:5, 14, 17, 21	reapplying	refused 29:6, 25	renew 136:21	108:24 109: <i>14</i> ,
74:3, 7, 9	108:21	refusing 22:13	rep 17:17	20, 23 187:25
122:15, 22	reason 34:16	regarded 52:14,	repair 42:6	research 25:12
144: <i>19</i>	43:16 58:3	18	repetitions	64:9 160: <i>15</i>
rapport 125:4	87:8 112: <i>19</i>	Registered	78:24	researched 65:2
173:1	178:4 190:23	194:3	replace 116:3	reservoir 107:9
rate 45:15	192:3	regular 22:23	187:9	re-setup 187:11
168:9 169: <i>10</i>	reasons 68:10	92:12 104:1	replaceable 76:9	<b>resign</b> 17:9
rates 48:18	188:18 190:11	relate 105:21	replaced 105:16	resignation
49: <i>4</i>	rebuild 185:22	related 117:18	125:5 156: <i>1</i>	23:15
ratio 44:14	rebuilding 53:11	relationship	160:3 180:2, 9	resigning 19:25
reach 115:19	rebuilt 53:15	7:22 23:6	replacing 51:20	resistance 190:3
153:2	recall 47:4	relatively 134:22	report 27:14	resisted 119:8
reached 114:19	66:8 106:6	relaxed 82:16	28:20 29:7	resolved 179:13
reaction 154:3	115:3	relay 176:5	30: <i>15</i> 31: <i>15</i>	respect 114:3
reactive 134:19	receivable 4:23	relaying 9:7	97:25 100:25	respond 29:6
175: <i>1</i>	receive 75:12	release 107:22	192:2	89:6
read 76:2, 17	84:10	released 34:10	reported 31:3	responded
132:3	received 128:15	107:25	192:6	22:16
readable 76:5	131:25	re-level 111:14	<b>Reporter</b> 194: <i>4</i> ,	response 89:7
readily 54:17	receiving 8:4	reliability 88:6	22	169:24 170:19
ready 8:21	134: <i>11</i>	179:6 181:2	reporter's	171:5 172:2 <i>1</i>
38:19 84:11	RECESS 90:14	relied 39:23	192: <i>19</i> 194: <i>1</i>	responsibility
128:16 133:18	recognizing	reluctant 50:5	reporting 27:16	172:15
164: <i>13</i>	182:25	remain 37:8	192:3	responsible
real 60:1	recommended	remanufacturing	reports 28:14	7:16
139:2 <i>1</i> 191:6	170:9	51:22	98: <i>1</i>	rest 34:8 167:8
realistically	reconnect 187:7	remember 9:15	represent 15:23	restriction 39:5
58:22 66:5	record 14:9	12:2 <i>1</i> 14:22	16: <i>1</i> , <i>5</i> , <i>12</i> , <i>14</i>	result 44:22
reality 120:17	15: <i>10</i> 17:24	15:2, 5 17: <i>1</i> 8	represents	49: <i>11</i> 71:5
realized 122:23	166: <i>18</i> 192:6	18:7 21:3	15:20	97:8 149:6
really 8:10	recorded 194:11	23:23 25:10	request 54:15	<b>résumé</b> 168: <i>19</i> ,
10:25 11:8, <i>1</i> 3	recreate 51:14	32:20 33:16	58:6	21, 23
13:23   14:22, 24	re-creating	36:21 43:16	requested 17:2	RESUMING
19: <i>15</i> , <i>20</i> 23:9	96:14	44:5 45:6 48:1,	20:10 23:13	90: <i>15</i>
24:6, 18 32:7	recruited 73:18	8 61:15 69:21	43:25 62:19	<b>retain</b> 73:4
37:5 39:12	recruiting 73:25	70:20 78:3	requesting	138:20 185: <i>1</i> 7
46:25 48:19	122:4	117:6 122:20	124:25	<b>retrofit</b> 10: <i>15</i> ,
56:3 58:3	recruitment 73:5	127:7 129:17	require 80:8	19 85:9, 12, 19
59:25 60:15, 20	red 42:8	133:13 136:16	155:4	87:1, 4 90:22
61:2 67:4	redo 114:9	143: <i>15</i> 158:22,	required 5:4	91:14 93:17
68:2 <i>0</i> , 21 69:8	reduce 65:7	24 160:5 165:4	13: <i>18</i> 41:2 <i>4</i> , 25	109:1 111:17
73:11 75:5, 6	redundant 176:7	169:12 170:7	45:23 72:13	retrofits 46:10
77:13 81:9	reengineer	175:20 177:6	74:21 97:11	86:17, 22 88:4
83:3 93:10	84:18	184:10 188:21	107:24 108:9	97:10 106:11
96:17 110:15	reengineering	189:23	154:20	107:4 110: <i>10</i>
114:2, 25	51:2 <i>1</i>		requirement	111:3
117:16 127:2	referring 6:6, 8	remotely 1:13	52:24	retrotitted 97:19
130:3 136:23	56:7 67:3	remove 31:19	requirements	return 23:10
142:13 160:11	reflective 133:10	3/:11 53:1/	45:12 59:2, 15	reuse 180:10
101.77 102.4, 5	re-riush 187:10	50:5 83:73	60:76, 79 120:2	Kev 44:22
100:10 1/0:4		121:9	requiring 120:2	revamp 101:4
100:77 192:8	refuse 29:27	removed 68:9	rescue 92:23	revamped 56:76
reaim 88:13	172:1	removing 129:9	107:18, 19	5/:0
	I	I	I	revenge 25:24

rovonuo 99.7	121.5 166.10	cohool 5:19	corial 02:15	abad 26:19
105:05 100:10	131.3 100.19		Serial 93.75	Sileu 30.70
125:25 138:70	179:77 180:75	10:0, 24, 20	95:20 96:3, 9	49:8 58:14
reverse 156:27	192:9	139:25 140:27		59:22 60:5, 11
review 4:3	running 47:18	141:2, 4 163:23	series 155:4	158:25 159:15
<b>Revision</b> 44:12,	58:16 106:2	schooling 141:3	serious 162:6	188:23
13 46:22 85:22	116: <i>19</i> 138:3	scope 110:14	seriously 60:23	sheet 127:7
94:7	<b>runs</b> 67:5	scramble 135:2	service 13:15	189: <i>15</i> , <i>16</i>
revisions 154:18	rushed 99:21	scrambled 33:2	31:24 33:16	<b>shift</b> 21:5
rewarded 92:10		scrap 157:23	57:12, 13 88:7	<b>shock</b> 157:25
rewrite 28:4	< S >	scratch 35:7	104: <i>1</i> 7 106: <i>11</i>	<b>shop</b> 12:8
rid 35:5 122:25	sacred 106:20	42:8	107:4 110: <i>6</i> , <i>11</i> ,	17: <i>11</i> 41:8
178:8	safe 9:9 174:11	scratched 42:7	<i>24</i> 113:9	67:7 93:23
ride 92:11	safely 39:9	Screw 67:23	114: <i>19</i> 116:3	shorthand
188: <i>17</i>	145:18	163: <i>10</i> , 25	125:25 128:12	194: <i>14</i>
ridership 115:6	safer 67:12	173:6, 9, 13	131:21 132:1	shorting 40:21
rides 59:21	safety 28:25	174:1	136:11 137:20	shortly 31:6
180.18	39.6.8 57.18	screws 173.5	138.16 158.17	shot 166.14
ridiculous	68.10 71.9 13	seal 154.23	178.5 185.6	shoulders 164.5
29.10 123.7	16 88.24 89.8	sealed 163.12	set 13.17 14.6	show 5.25
136.23	98·13 126·14	searching	33.15 45.1	6.22 76.1
rightfully 24.17	145.12 14 15	168·10	48·0 15 40·6	160.21
rigid 118.3	17 151.12	season 62.4	50.14 73.11	showed 23.25
ring 153:21	171.16 187.1	soat 87.7	75·17 77·1 <i>1</i>	21.5 28.18
rada 160:21	101:5 7	Seal 07.7	10.17 11.14	24.0 30.70 150.2 167.0
role 0:21 12:12	191.0, 7 coko 45:6	Secterly 05.72	00.10, 10, 22 01.24, 05.2, 21	109.3 107.9 chown 20:14
101e 9.21 12.12	Sake 45.0		91.24 95.2, 21,	Shown 29.74
14:18 91:0, 13	120:2 148:2	5:4, 0 54:5	22 96:20, 25	shrapher 178:20
106:7	salary 24:11	91:7 154:5, 14	97:2, 4, 14, 15	snrugged
roles 7:5 9:24	salt 178:14, 15	161:12	124:12 125:18	162:12
119:3	sand 57:8, 9, 23	sections 165:20	135:8 159:13,	snunned 143:14
root 10:5 41:7	58:5 174:9	selection 64:23	14 163:9, 18, 25	shut 89:2
67:13, 14 178:13	sander 111:12	sell 11:24 12:2	165: <i>13</i> 166: <i>4</i>	<b>sic</b> 14: <i>10</i>
room 22:25	<b>sanders</b> 28: <i>15</i> ,	84: <i>17</i> 191: <i>19</i>	173:5, 6, 9, 13	side 9:4 15:21
36:10 38:11	16, 23   32:3, 5,	send 48:23	174:1 188:21	24:25   35:20, 23,
114:2, 6 126: <i>1</i> 2	10 55:15 56:13,	84:22 101:23	194:6	24 50:20 60:13
142:7, 10	22, 25 57:6, 12	183:4	setback 135:16	82:5 91:20
rotors 108:21	111: <i>13</i> 179:20	sending 55:25	sets 132:16	159:2 <i>0</i> 160:22
rough 125:24	sanding 22:9	seniority 13:22	152: <i>11</i>	162: <i>10</i> 163: <i>10</i>
roughly 11:23	55:14 58:19	22: <i>1</i> 117:8	setting 17:11	168:6 171: <i>10</i> , <i>1</i> 3
45:8, 10 52:12	134:20 151: <i>15</i>	124: <i>16</i>	126:8 145: <i>16</i>	sides 171:11
175:23	179:22 190:16	sense 27:3, 4	setup 50:19	sideways 106:23
<b>RPR</b> 194:2 <i>1</i>	sat 13:4 99:10	57:16 62:9	severity 173:18	<b>sig</b> 145:22, 24
<b>RTG</b> 113:8	126: <i>1</i> 2	68: <i>16</i> 75:9	shadow 76:1	signed 24:17
<b>RTM</b> 124:5	save 63:22	81:11 98:13	shadowed	significant 24:9
145:2 181:2 <i>1</i>	saving 167:19	99:2, <i>19</i> 109:17	126:24	<b>silly</b> 51:3
rubber 180:22	scary 184:22	111:5 118: <i>1</i> 7	shadowing	similar 152:13
rules 7:20	scenario 82:17	145:8 178:3	128:21	simple 58:2
20:13, 18, 19	188: <i>4</i>	186:5	shaft 48:24	112:19
21:17, 19 22:11,	scenarios 61:11	sensible 65:9	148: <i>10</i> , <i>11</i>	simply 94:20
17 26:22 28:25	174:3	separate 18:21	152:7 153:23	simulate 142:10
29:15 30:6.14	scenes 27:25	166:6	154:7, 14	single 11:21
60:9 180:4	schedule 103:2	separation	155:2 <i>1</i> 156:8.	33:1 34:5 36:3
186: <i>19</i>	123:16. 18 169:2	155:18 166:22	15, 21	43:7 143:4
run 40:19 58:7	scheduled	September	share 106:21	180:9
10. 11. 12 64:13	111:25	155:14 161:23	shared 3:24 4:4	single-unit 34:7
99:11 104:16		sequence 156:5	shattered 114:8	

aistar 199,14	100.1 5	102.1 125.20	150.01 167.0	otogoo 110:11
Sister's 72:0	109.7, 0 cmooth 124:7	103.7 123.20	100.27 107.3	stayes 112.14
sister 5 75.9	Silloulii 124.7 Snan on 50:12	120.7 134.3	specifically	stand 22:11
SIL 10.4 02.10	<b>Shap-on</b> 50.75,	140.70 100.70	5-22 16-6 22-1	Stalla 23.11
102.72 109.3	10 spow 60:12	107.14 170.7	0.22 10.0 22.1 07.1 11.11 05	40.7 92.1
142.7, 10 100.7	SILOW 00.73	1/0.13, 10 191.2	31.1 44.11,23	//.//
103./0 10/.23	100.19, 20, 24	<b>SOIT</b> 20.9 41.9	09.0 02.1,0	stanuaru 90.2
1/3:/ 1/4:8	Snowball 184:4	42:2 49:72	117:78 140:5	standards 180.8
191:79	snowballing	62:7 68:72	107:0 100:7	standing 120:23
Site 84:7 98:70	80:77 183:20	86:70 98:23	162:22 164:75	standpoint
SITS 153:27	snowpiow	103:23 109:77	186:22	62:78
154:73 158:0	180:27	116:20 119:2	specifics 88:72	stands 14:14
180:27	snowstorm	123:5 133:9	speculation	<b>start</b> 3:2 5:14
sitting 49:8	5/:1/	137:10 164:8	68: <i>19</i>	23:2 31:24
58:14 190:2, 7	soaking 147:12	168:5 176:13, 20	sped 80:5	40:5 55:11
191:13	software 95:3	sound 40:21	speed 135:22	73:13 96:8
situation 23:25	sold 59:20 86:6	46:15, 16 92:14	159:21	97:1, 17 104:23
38:2 76:13	solely 64:19	118:6 182:21	speeded 116:20	108:16 116:25
77:8 85:13	solemn 3:8	187:16	speeds 103:5	123: <i>11</i> 126: <i>5</i> ,
94:14 130:21	solid 41: <i>15</i>	sounds 12:13	<b>spend</b> 59: <i>9</i>	13 127:4 137:19
132:3 142: <i>17</i> ,	solution 148:21	13: <i>14</i> 19:3	81:13 145:16	<b>started</b> 6: <i>13</i> , <i>15</i> ,
19 157:5 183:7	175:2 178:10	33:22 54:9	spending 86:10	20 9:12, 14
188: <i>10</i>	solutions	63:25 73:22	spent 54:20	10:8 12:25
situations 5:20	177:14 179:1, 3	74:18 84:9	81:3 127: <i>1</i> 2	22:18 36:22
120:24 138:13	somebody	131:24 143:10	136:5	50: <i>12</i> 57: <i>13</i> , 14
148: <i>13</i>	11: <i>16</i> 19: <i>14</i>	185:8	<b>Spirit</b> 39:23	81:25 93: <i>18</i>
<b>size</b> 116: <i>16</i>	20:14, 21 25:18	source 67:8	65: <i>18</i>	96: <i>19, 20, 21</i>
165:22 170: <i>4</i> , <i>14</i>	70:22 71: <i>1</i>	106: <i>17</i>	spite 148:14	97:3, 5 104:22
sizes 50:17	72:24 76:11	South 43:12	spoke 23:22	117:9 122:25
skeleton-type	80:9 81: <i>15</i>	spanking 125:6	116:24 119:15	124:15 128:12
48:13	87:11 92:22	speak 12:17	144:8	129: <i>1</i> 7 131:2 <i>1</i>
<b>skill</b> 13: <i>1</i> 7	122:13 128:5	19:4 20:25	spoken 18:3	132: <i>1</i> 158:7
73:11	134:2 141: <i>11</i>	38:11 48:4	151:8	178:5 179: <i>18</i>
skills 136:12	142: <i>14</i> 143:7	75:6 124:5	sports 147:14	182: <i>4</i>
skip 21:25	147:8, 20 150:5	136:2 147:3	spot 110:20	starting 13:15
skirt 174:12	171:22, 25	160:7 161:9	170:2, 15	35:7
skirts 35:20, 24	182:2, 7, 16	163:5 164:5	<b>spots</b> 95:7, 8,	starts 57:4
skits 126:15	183: <i>4</i> , 8 186:8	167:19 169:16	14 105:15	108: <i>16</i> 156:20
<b>slide</b> 153:13	191: <i>10</i> 192:8	172:23 177:18	170:25 171:5	187:2 <i>1</i>
slightly 41:24	something's	190:8 191: <i>11</i>	189: <i>18</i>	state 98:24
sling 154:22	183: <i>8</i> , <i>15</i>	speaking 182:9	spotting 185:8	statement 6:16
<b>slow</b> 161:15	somewhat 25:7	190:16	spray 42:10	22:10
small 25:14	<b>soon</b> 192:21	speaks 167:3	130:8 174:21	States 33:12
41:16 108:8	sooner 34:14	<b>spec</b> 177:18	178:15	48:7 96:24
139:22 145:15	105: <i>1</i> 2	speciality 42:12	sprinkled 117:12	static 8:16, 18
153: <i>1</i> 2 170:8	soot 178:24	specialized	square 170:17	9:6, 22 40:19,
185:3	Sorel 43:19	41:24.25 42:25	190: <i>18</i>	25 41:1 42:19.
smaller 90:22	48:21 132:12	specialty 42:11	staff 185:7	23 94:13
150:9 153:12	173:1.2.21	specific 6:17	staffed 138:15	101: <i>16. 19</i>
166: <i>10</i>	sorry 10:22	16:10 30:21	Stage 6:4.6	102:10
smashed	13:12 17:21	43:25 44:1	33:24 40:17	station 38:18
159:16 163:3	21:5 23:19	54:3, 6 76:12	42:19 57:19	40:6, 11 75:22.
smashing	24:13 31:15	81:22 88:24	70:14 84:4	25 81:11
159:17	32:25 43.9	91:13 130:20	101:19 102.8	101:20 115:18
smell 188.24	44:21 88:2	147:19 149:10	10 183.14	22 117.23 25
	96:1 100:2			,,,

stationary	68.4 18 25	25 187 3 191 9	structure 114.5	suitable 35.16
102.12	69.13 70.3 16	193· <i>1</i>	stuck 168.24	37.21
stations 81:3.10	19. 24 71:7. 20.	stepping 135:17	student 55:19.	suited 61:23
statistics 141:8	23 73:7 74:1	<b>Steve</b> 134:2. 5.	22 56:13	120:20 123:25
<b>stature</b> 147:21	75:14 76:19	10 143:21	<b>studio</b> 144:15	summarize
stav 14:18	78:6. 9. 13. 19	162:12 189:14	stuff 6:21 8:12	164:8
89:2 100:12.17	80:16.24 81:21	steward 17:11	13:7 17:2 20:2	summons
107:25 122:19.	83:8 84:13	stick 12:17	25:13.17 27:8	182:11. 13
21.23 141:15	85:5. 11. 18	100:6	30:1 31:22	sunny 66:7
189:14	86:18.25 88:8.	stickler 20:18	38:18 40:9	supersedes
staved 10:14	22 89:12.14.18	sticks 154:7	42:22 49:9. 15.	140: <i>19</i>
13:9 155:20	90:19 91:16	stigma 50:24	16 52:2 55:6	supervisor
staving 183:14	93:16 94:4	144:2	57:3 60:9	30:22 31:8
stealing 24:16	95:21 96:4, 10	stinger 66:23	61:12 63:16, 23	54:14, 15
steel 153:8	97:12,22 98:10	67:2, 8, 16	65:12 68:8	133: <i>14</i> 150:22
Stenographer/Tra	99:9. 22 100:23	stingers 66:25	69:4. 5. 6. 24	187:4
nscriptionist	101:13. 18	stinking 188:3	70:12 72:13.19	supervisors
2:15	104:18 105:7,	stone 77:14	77:21 83:9	26:14 27:7
stenographically	10 106:3, 13	stood 26:24	86:11 90:3, 5, 6	151:5
194: <i>11</i>	107:6, 13	47:1	91:2, 5 93:2	supervisor's
step 8:10 59:4	109:19 110:12	stop 32:21	99:15, 16 104:9,	26:16
112:8	111: <i>1</i> , 23	34:19 69:7	10 105:13, 15	supplier 47:5
STEPHEN 1:7	112:13 113:11	93:13 94:22	111:24 120:20	suppliers 47:22,
2:9 3:5, 14 4:6,	114:21 115:10	98:17 103:22	123:24 126:14	23
10 5:13, 17 6:5,	116:22 117:5	104:3 115:25	127:8 129:14	supply 48:2, 10
12 7:7 8:6, 17	119: <i>4</i> , 7, <i>11</i>	131:7 135: <i>14</i>	130:9 136:9, 21	supposed 20:13
9:16,23 10:24	121:24 122:7	180: <i>16</i> 188:2	138:5 143:3	29:12 33:13
11:12 12:15	123:12 124:9	191: <i>18</i>	145:10, 21, 23	34:10 36:25
13:16 14:12, 15,	126:1 127:24	stopped 32:22	155:17 161:7	37:1 83:16
20 15:6, 15, 21	128:17,20	71:12 125:13	162:7 163: <i>4</i> , 17	85:20 86:3, 5,
16:2, 6, 16, 25	131:12, 16, 22	150: <i>17</i>	165:3 169:14	13 108:3 111:9
17:7, 16, 20	132:2, 11 133:7,	stopping 175:1	171:1 172:17	113:4 126:7
18:1, 9, 12, 22	12 134:6, 8, 15	stops 27:17	174: <i>1</i> 179: <i>17</i> ,	132:3 134:17
19:7 20:1	136:1, 14	31:2	18, 21 181:6, 17	139:6 153:17
24:12 25:3	137:15, 21, 24	storage 59:25	185: <i>1</i>	161: <i>12</i> 163: <i>15</i>
26:6, 10 27:7	138:17 139:2	<b>store</b> 178: <i>10</i>	stuff's 61:18	174: <i>16</i> 178: <i>1</i>
28:13 29:8	142:25 143: <i>1</i> 3	stored 59:21, 24	<b>sub</b> 112:21	182: <i>19</i> , 23
30:16, 21 31:12,	145:5 146: <i>16</i>	60: <i>15</i>	submission	185:2 186: <i>1</i>
14 32:1, 19	148:22 149: <i>9</i> ,	story 50:9	170: <i>12</i>	189:3
33: <i>10</i> , 25 34: <i>3</i> ,	<i>13</i> , <i>19</i> , <i>24</i> 150: <i>4</i> ,	<b>straight</b> 99:11,	submitted 12:23	surface 166:25
23 35:17 36:15	<i>15</i> 151: <i>14</i>	<i>1</i> 2 178: <i>1</i>	success 82:20	surgery 76:22,
37:19, 23 38:9,	152:6 155: <i>10</i> ,	strayed 62:15	successful	25
24 39:2, 15, 18	15 157:12, 19	street 66:6	64: <i>13</i> , <i>14</i>	surrounding
40:2 41: <i>10</i> , <i>1</i> 3	158:20 160: <i>11</i>	76:17 143:23	sucks 169:2	60: <i>10</i>
42:5 43:6	161:25 162: <i>4</i> ,	streets 175:5	sufficient 45:3	swapped 45:18
44:10, 24 45:20	18 164:10	strength 147:15	80:23 81:2	switch 9:21
46:9 47:6, 17,	167:23 168:8	148: <i>1</i> 2 153: <i>11</i>	137: <i>1</i> 3 145:3	94:20 161: <i>1</i> , <i>4</i> ,
24 48:3, 6	169: <i>19</i> , 22	stretch 137:7	sufficiently	8 177:15
49: <i>13</i> , 22 51: <i>6</i> ,	170: <i>1</i> 171:9	stretching 137:6	138: <i>15</i>	switched 13:11,
8 52:5, 9 54:11	172:16, 22	stringent 59:14	suggested 59:17	15 94:6
55:12 56:15	174:6 176:22,	strong 5:21	suggesting	switches 160:25
57:15 58:9, 24	25 177:17, 23	6:23 10:13	73:23	<b>system</b> 31:4, 16,
59: <i>16</i> 61: <i>4</i>	178:8 179: <i>8</i> , <i>14</i>	178: <i>18</i>	suggestion	20 37:12, 15
62:8 64:2 65:1,	181:5, 24	strongest 148:7	58:25	67:11 84:3, 7,
20 66:10, 24	185: <i>11</i> 186:2 <i>1</i> ,		I	10, 18   86:14, 17,
22 00.2 5 00.1	75.24 77.2 6	tomporaturos	theory 115:10	67.10 60.7
---------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------	---
22 00.3, 5 09.1,	15.24 11.3, 0,			07.10 09.7
4, 11 103:22	16 81:14, 25	57:3 59:22	thick 154:11, 12	71:12, 14 74:17
104:7, 13 139:5	82:11 85:19	61:2 <i>4</i>	thing 5:8 6:1	76:14 77:1
142:9 145:23	87:1, 4, 12, 18	temporarily	7:13 12:18	78:3 79:1 80:5,
148: <i>4</i> 157: <i>16</i>	88:9 90:22, 25	45:18	19:20 25:24	12 81:15 82:18,
158:3.9 165:2.	91:4. 10. 14	tend 4:17.18	27:10 29:21	25 83:1 86:9
19 187.6 11	92.17 21 93.17	term 80:18	31.17 35.14	23 24 87:3 5
102.5	10 01.5 00.21	terms 24:18	38.6 20 42.6	$15 \ 17 \ 02.4 \ 5$
192.0	19 94.0 99.24		30.0, 20 $42.0$	10, 17, 92.4, 0,
systems os.7	100.23 101.2,	40.7 00.4	47.3, 7 40.73,	11, 15, 23 93.12
89:17 98:14	22 111:5, 7, 8,	terrible 9:18	14 53:6 54:25	95:16 96:15
111:18 142:11	<i>15</i> , <i>18</i> 112: <i>16</i> ,	124: <i>10</i> 160: <i>18</i>	56:24 57:21	98:17, 23 100:1
184:25	20, 23 113:3, 15	<b>test</b> 7: <i>4</i> 8: <i>18</i> ,	59:24 65:22	102: <i>1</i> 105: <i>16</i>
	116: <i>1</i> 2 117: <i>1</i> , 3	<i>19</i> 9:8 41: <i>1</i> , 3	66:18 67:7	106:20 110:13
<t></t>	122:8 123:16	42:19,23 58:4	68:12 70:11	111: <i>5</i> , <i>14</i>
table 10:4	127:20 128:21	67:18 69:4	71:10 76:20	114:15 118:19
takes 86.8	131.17 23	72.24 88.17 23	80.3 89.5	125.12 13
111·2/ 11/·11	135.6 120.1	02.27 00.17, 20	03.02 00.0	120.72, 10
111.24 114.77	100:44 475:0	92.10, 17, 18	93.23 90.22	129.7 130.3, 73
145:17 153:3,	169:14 175:9	94:13, 21 95:5	100:27 106:25	138:12 139:1,
10 182:2	189:4 190:25	99:24 100:4, <i>13</i> ,	109:1, 15	17 140:18
talk 142:2	teams 146:3	<i>17, 24</i> 101: <i>1, 19</i>	110: <i>16</i> , <i>22</i>	141:2 <i>4</i> 142: <i>1</i> ,
144: <i>12</i> , <i>17</i>	tear 87:8	102: <i>13, 15, 16</i> ,	112:5 113: <i>1</i> 7	12 143:19
150:2 <i>1</i> 159: <i>8</i> ,	105: <i>11</i>	<i>21</i> 103: <i>6</i> , <i>14</i> , <i>16</i> ,	114:8 123:2	148: <i>1</i> , <i>16</i>
20 172:20	tease 106:25	23. 24 104:4. 16.	126:15 127:9	153:25 157:4
191.5 7 192.17	tech 71:3	21 123.16 137.9	129.22 130.10	159.11 12 13
talked 8:14	143.2 150.12	tested 58:3	133.21 25	162.21 167.17
10:15 61:12	technical 160:17	06.16 117.10	134.17 10 20	162.27 107.17
49.15 01.12		90.70 117.79	134.17, 19, 20	100.0 171.77,
162:25	technicality	testimony 194:9	135:79 136:2	18 172:11
talking 46:17	136:19, 25	testing 8:15, 16	137:4, 11 143:1,	177:3 179:22,
87:16 91:3	technically	9:6, 22 40: <i>19</i>	5 144:6 145: <i>15</i> ,	25 180: <i>10</i> , <i>11</i>
120:24 121: <i>18</i>	18:17 20:15	57: <i>19</i> 58: <i>1</i>	<i>24</i> 146:9	181: <i>9</i> , <i>11</i>
125:8 136: <i>12</i>	21:14 30:25	59: <i>1, 4, 14</i>	147:2 <i>1</i> 148:8	182:2 <i>4</i> 183: <i>1</i>
162: <i>1</i> 190: <i>9</i>	91:10 107:16	66: <i>19</i> 69: <i>9</i>	150: <i>10</i> , 23	185: <i>1</i> , <i>19</i> 192:20
talks 160:16	Technician 2:16	86: <i>1</i> 88: <i>9</i>	151:22 155:25	thing's 189:22
tank 107.9	6.15 19 10.17	90.25 91.13 17	156.22 157.14	thinks 183.22
109.2 3 4	14.16 19 89.23	18 92.15 17 24	158.1 2 162.5	187.15 18
tack 22.9 92.2	109.4 5 120.17	$02.1 \ 15 \ 04.2$	164.2 19	third party 7:11
107.0	108.4, 5 130.17	93.1, 13 94.3,	104.3, 70	Themes 40:24
107:3	151.4, 9	19 95:19 96:8		Inomas 49:24
tasks 87:25	technicians	98:9 99:20	1/1:76 1/2:3, 5,	tnought 14:5
117: <i>18</i>	16: <i>15</i> 41: <i>18</i>	100:2, <i>3</i> , 23	7, 8 175: <i>1</i>	51: <i>15</i> 80: <i>11</i> , <i>12</i>
task-specific	62:12 68:7	101: <i>10</i> , <i>17</i> , 22	178: <i>1</i> 7 181: <i>14</i>	119:23 123:8
21:24 22:9	103: <i>11</i> 122: <i>19</i>	102:2, <i>10</i> 118:5	182: <i>1</i> 184:22,	131:2 139: <i>19</i>
taught 55:18	126: <i>11</i> 132:23	123:20 169: <i>14</i>	23 185:4 186:2	140:8 144:3
136:22 143:2	137:13 149:23	190:3	187: <i>15. 21. 22</i>	191: <i>4</i>
teach 137:5.13	162:24 189:2	tests 77:1	188:3 189:19	thousand 83:11
143.8	technician's	102.14 103.7	191.17 22	184.14
teaches 1/0.2	167.16	Thales 83:7 8	things 7.2 11.5	thousands
teaches 140.2	technology	0 10 16 10 21	10 21 12.5 10	10030103
10.15 10 10.5		3, 10, 10, 13, 21	13,21 13.0,10	121.13 throw 01.0
10.10, 19 12:0,	39.24 00.4	04.2, /, /ð 85:/,	20.11,24 34:17	uiiow 91:0
6, 76, 20 13:20	147:24	15 86:14, 17, 19,	36:23 37:6	116:11 161:19
16:7, <i>10</i> 18: <i>11</i> ,	techs 68:5	20, 22 87:20	38:16 41:6	throws 187:24
21 19:2, 25	146: <i>14</i>	88:3, 5, 11, 16	42:2, 17, 20, 25	thunder-like
37:2, 25 42:23	tee 130:24	89: <i>11</i> 104: <i>5</i> , 6	45:15 54:2, 21	178:2 <i>1</i>
45:23 52:1	telecommunicati	157:16	55:6 56:1, 2, 19	ticking 108:16
53:25 55:21	ons 5:21	theirs 24:23	59:9 62:10	tie 81:6 110:21
69:9 72:24	tells 25:18		65:7, 15 66:4	

	100.0	10 10 00 10		
ties 42:20 81:4,	166:3	46:18 60:10	70:5 92:19, 22,	88: <i>4</i> , <i>15</i> , <i>16</i> , <i>17</i> ,
16	timely 109:21	61: <i>13</i> , <i>16</i> 67: <i>18</i>	25 94:14 98:8,	19, 22, 23, 24
tie's 110:20	timer 108:15	70:8, 10 74:4	11, 20 99:12, 13	89: <i>3, 4, 5</i> 90:24
tiaht 38:2	times 28:19	114:5 154: <i>4</i>	103:3. 4. 13	91:18 92:1.11.
tighten 81.6	30.2 50.2	161· <i>1</i> 170·7	104.9.16	24 94.9 11
tightened 1/3.2	58:13 66:17	topic 100:10	107:17 109:21	Q5·2 10 13 21
tightness 143.2	77.16 70.2 5	106:25 110:14	115:20 119:6 7	95.2, 10, 15, 21,
tigniness 143.4	11.10 19.2, 5	100.25 119.14	115.20 116.0, 7	22, 24 90.11, 13,
time 3:11 8:9	98: <i>18</i> 113:9	torn 87:10	129:4 143:5	19, 25 97:2, 4,
9:18 10:10	114:23 136:20	Toronto 16:20	145:2 <i>1</i> 160: <i>13</i> ,	14, 15, 18  99:10
11: <i>16</i> 13:2, 22	168: <i>16</i> 171: <i>12</i>	47:18 83:24	21 161:2, <i>4</i> , <i>5</i> ,	101:5   102: <i>3</i> , <i>7</i> ,
14:22 15: <i>3</i> , <i>15</i>	184: <i>14</i>	torque 54:2, 22	10, 12, 20 163:6	<i>9</i> , <i>21</i> 103:2 <i>1</i> , <i>22</i>
16:17 17:14	tiny 87:5	75:15, 16, 17, 18	173:23 176:13	104:2, 8 106: <i>4</i> ,
19:21 22:2	tip 37:24	80:2 118: <i>19</i>	177:20, 22, 25	6, 20 107:15, 17,
23:23 25:5	<b>Tire</b> 177:7	136:15, 18, 19	179:11 184:24	19. 20. 21 108:1.
27.21 35.3 10	tired 10.25	137.3 5 14	185.7 14	4 6 10 15 17
27:27 00:0, 70	title 0:25 10:17	1/3:1 1/7:5 10	186.24 187.23	24 100.14 20
17.7 10.01	17:17 01:0	10 149.2 5	100.24 107.25	27 103.17, 20,
41.7 49.24	17.17 91.9	19 140.2, 3	100.2, 0	22, 23, 24
50:10 55:10, 12	today 3:2	149:5, 14, 15	track-related	110:78 111:3,
58:25 59:11	today's 3:6	150:5, <i>6</i> , <i>8</i> , <i>9</i> , <i>13</i> ,	177:16	11, 14, 25 112:2,
65:21 66:12	told 11:22	<i>19, 21</i> 151: <i>11,</i>	tracks 67:7	3, 15, 20, 22
67:20 70:22, 25	12: <i>19</i> 16:2 <i>1</i>	<i>19</i> , <i>22</i> 152: <i>10</i> ,	98:2 <i>4</i> , 25 99:5,	115: <i>17</i> , 22
80:5 81: <i>14</i>	21:5 22:19	<i>12, 24</i> 153: <i>1, 2,</i>	8, 18 160:18	116: <i>10</i> , <i>11</i>
82:12, 14, 17	30:2 37:2	<i>4</i> 154:2, 6, 19	173:23 177:24	117:20 122:9
85:2, 3 86:20	38:12 68:20	155:5 156: <i>8</i> , <i>9</i> ,	186: <i>19</i>	126:5 128:7, 8
88:14 90:8, 11	73:10 83:23	14, 21	trailer 132:15	129:3, 12
93:20 94:21	93:11 95:3	torgued 147:2	train 6:21 8:9,	130:12 133:1, 2
95:25 96:16	113:15 120:8	149:7 152:9	18 10:6 11:22	134:13 138:23
97.7 99.10	14 122.18	154.17 156.2 5	24 25 12 2	139.17 140.2
100.16 103.2	130.14 160.7	16	20.10 14 26.17	141.2 7 25
100:70 100:2 104:15 107:14	172.24 25	torque-marking	27.0 13 17	142.15 143.0
109.6 110.10	172.27,20	152.2 <i>1</i>	27.3, 73, 77	146:17 20
100.0 110.70, 15 111.04	173.2 177.27	100.24 torouing 126:12	20.2, 7, 10, 29.1	140.17,20
10 111.24	100.15 109.0	107:0 110:05	31.2, 332.4, 21,	151.7, 15 154.5,
114.27 115.70,	191.75	137.9 140.25	22 33.8, 11, 15	13 155.1, 3, 6,
21, 25 116:10,	tomorrow 151:5	149:23 152:5, 13	35:16, 19, 20, 21,	18, 20, 22 156:8,
14 120:15	ton 72:13	total 27:19	23 36:1 37:3,	20 157:15, 16
123:1, 6, 12	tons 83:23	32:24	14, 15 39:23	159: <i>13, 14, 23</i>
124:11 125:1	143: <i>16</i>	totally 50:8	40:3 41:2, 3	160:2 <i>4</i> 161: <i>1</i> , <i>2</i> ,
126: <i>6</i> , <i>10</i> 127: <i>6</i> ,	tool 49:23	170:25	43:1, 3 44:3	5, 10, 16, 19
17 129:20	124: <i>1</i> 8 127: <i>11</i>	touch 50:25	48:16 49:6, 8	162: <i>10</i> 163:2
130:3 131:23	toolbox 50:13	126:23 138:8	50:18 51:11, 17,	164: <i>16</i> 165: <i>6</i> ,
133: <i>14</i> , 23	124:18 125:3, 5	146:20 164: <i>16</i>	20 52:12 53:11	<i>14</i> 170:2, <i>10</i>
134: <i>13</i> 136:5,	tooling 41:25	189: <i>8</i>	55:7, 23 56:5, 8	171:23  174: <i>9</i> ,
25 140:17	49:20	touched 33:21	57:18 58:11	11 175:13
149:2 150:25	tools 42:11.12	70:6. 10 166:17	59:19.20 60:13	176:2 178:22
151:3 154: <i>1</i> 8	50.1 3 10 22	touching	61.1 62.13 19	180.17 182.3
160.17 165.22	51.4 79.23	119.13 138.6	64.1 6 8 14	183.7 185.3
170.11 171.10	81.13 118.20	146.17 167.1	65:4 66:5 67:5	187.10 13 25
12 172· <i>A</i>	121.12 11 17	touchy 101:2	0 10 12 14 18	188.0 1/ 16 21
176.11 170.10	10 21 22 22 25	tow 107:25	69.7 60.2 5 20	22 25 190.20
10.11 113.10	105.15 160.0	100.10 16 100.0	70.4 6 10 25	20,20 100.20, 22 100.7 101.1
100.9 101.4	123.13 109.3	100.10, 10 100.3	10.4, 0, 10, 20	23 190.7 191.4
102.0 104.74	101.2U		11.1, Z 01:70	192.11 trained 00:05
192:19,20	toonie 170:14	Track 9:10	82:2, 5, 12, 23	trained 96:25
194:6, 7, 10	tootn 118:8	27:17 28:9	83:12, 20 84:3,	122:14 123:4
timeline 161:22	top 12:22	58:13 61:18	15, 21 85:25	128: <i>1</i> , 3 131:4
	17:20 19:13	66:7 69:22, 25	86:5 87:7, 10	141:9   167: <i>4</i> , <i>1</i> 2

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

23

474.40.00	100-10-00			54.00
171:19, 22	186:18, 20	108:14, 15	unexperienced	<b>Value</b> 54:23
185:10	191:20	144: <i>11</i> 150:8,	/8:1/	74:14 101:11
trainer 141:6	train's 103:13	18 152:25	untinished 14:3	147:1, 2 149:5,
167:4	105:20	165:12 177:11	unfortunately	8, 14, 15, 23
training 70:14	transcribed	turned 6:25	25:5 140:18	150:8, 13, 19, 21
75:11, 14, 15, 17,	3:16 194:12	8: <i>19</i> 41: <i>4</i> 63:6	union 7:13	151:22 152:25
21 76:3 77:7, 9	transcript 3:17,	69:3 93:20	15: <i>18</i> , <i>19</i> 16: <i>17</i> ,	153:2 154:19
80:22 81:22	20, 23   4:3, <i>4</i> , 9	122:22, 24	19 17:5, 6, 7, 17	values 54:2
82:8 104:23	194: <i>14</i>	170: <i>17</i>	18: <i>8</i> , <i>16</i> 19: <i>3</i> , <i>6</i> ,	80:2 118: <i>19</i>
118: <i>1</i> 2 127:25	transfer 54:17	turning 184:10	8 20:13, 24	151: <i>19</i>
128: <i>15</i> 131:25	133: <i>10</i>	<b>turnover</b> 168: <i>6</i> ,	21:1, 2, 6, 14	valves 85:23
136: <i>11, 15, 18</i> ,	transferred	10 169:10	22:11 25:7, 8, 9	146:22
20 137:4, 11	51: <i>13</i>	<b>type</b> 20: <i>11</i>	26:4, 13, 15, 19,	variables 58:18
139: <i>15, 16, 21</i>	transformed	30: <i>10</i> 31:23	24, 25 34:18	various 42:2
140: <i>4</i> 141:6, 7,	53:7	35:13 57:9	175:6, <i>11</i> , 21	43:3
<i>14</i> , <i>21</i> 142:5, <i>8</i> ,	transition 12:12	77:9 80:3	unionize 25:2	vast 29:13
<i>15, 23, 24</i> 143: <i>1</i> ,	124:5, 8 128: <i>11</i>	100:2 <i>1</i> 113: <i>1</i> 7	unionized 16:21	vegetable
12 171:24	transitioning	120:20 139:6	<b>unit</b> 11:2 <i>1</i>	153: <i>19</i>
180:5 181: <i>11</i>	120: <i>15</i>	146:9 150: <i>10</i>	18:2 <i>1</i> 41: <i>15</i>	vegetable-based
trains 6:24	translates	180:23 186: <i>1</i>	units 32:14, 24	153:2 <i>0</i>
8:14 13:2	117: <i>17</i>	188: <i>18</i>	33:1, 3 34:5	vegetable-grade
18: <i>17</i> , 25 19:22	<b>Transpo</b> 15:20,	types 61:10, 11	36: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i> , 7 156: <i>1</i> 2	154:2 <i>1</i>
27:6, 19, 20, 21	24 16:1 18:17	62:5	unnecessary	<b>vehicle</b> 14: <i>16</i> ,
28:12, 17 29:13	104:22 106:7	typos 4:3	116: <i>19</i>	18 20:5 21:2 <i>1</i>
30:12 32:9, 12,	126: <i>4</i>		unqualified	50:14 64:23
17 33:14, 18, 23,	transport 173:3	< U >	186: <i>4</i>	65: <i>18</i> , <i>19</i> 119: <i>9</i>
24 34:7, 12	transported	Uh-huh 3:5, 14	unsafe 71:12	121:23
35:3, 5 36:6, 19	33:12	unable 33:4	100:8	vehicles 8:3
47:17 49:12	trap 108:8	148: <i>15</i>	unscrew 154:9	68:24 75:13
50:25 52:15	travelled 61:9	unaccessible	updates 46:11	80:23 85:6
56:17, 21 60:24	trays 40:9	36:1	upset 19:16	97:10, 21
61:7, <i>10</i> 62: <i>4</i> , 6	treated 26:20	unautomated	21: <i>14</i> , <i>16</i> 29:9	114: <i>19</i> 178:5
64:12 65:13, 23	trial 4:24 77:12	104: <i>13</i>	56:8 130:22	vents 61:13
71:2 <i>1</i> , 22 72:9	106:2 142: <i>4</i>	unaware 30:6	upside 40:7	VERITEXT
84:11 88:6	tricked 21:16	71:15 121:25	146:22	194:2 <i>0</i>
96: <i>4</i> 104: <i>16</i> , <i>21</i> ,	trickle 141:13	175:25	upstairs 120:6	versa 112:4
24 105:1, 2, 5	trouble 55:16	unbolt 85:23	upwards 123:13	version 133:18
107:5, 7 111:22	83:23	undeniable	<b>USB</b> 53:21	versus 45:12
112: <i>1</i> 2 113:5, <i>9</i> ,	true 194:13	79:11	useless 127:11	105: <i>18</i> 182:25
<i>15</i> , 23 114: <i>1</i>	<b>trying</b> 17: <i>1</i>	underneath	<b>uses</b> 175:7	vibrates 129:4
115: <i>1</i> , <i>3</i> , <i>8</i> , <i>12</i> ,	25:11 34:18	59: <i>1</i> 190:6		161: <i>16</i>
<i>14</i> , 20 116: <i>1</i> 9	38:14 46:24	understand	< V >	vice 112:4
117:19 126:25	62: <i>10</i> 63: <i>17</i> , <i>21</i> ,	16:20 30:8	vacation 23:13	<b>video</b> 159:4
127: <i>4</i> , 21, 22	22 66:2, 3	36: <i>12</i> 41:6	validating 95:24	Videoconferenci
128: <i>12</i> 129:6	82:11, 12 84:5	42:4 132:8	97:15	<b>ng</b> 1: <i>12</i>
138: <i>18</i> 139:2 <i>4</i> ,	112:2 128:2 <i>4</i>	139: <i>10</i> 157: <i>14</i>	validation 13:19	<b>view</b> 56:11
25 141:11	140:22 142:4	164:3 171:8	88:23 92:21	59:13 76:16
142:22 143:8	153: <i>13</i>	185:6	93: <i>15</i> , <i>17</i> 94: <i>3</i> ,	143: <i>11</i> 144:23
156: <i>11</i> 159: <i>1</i> 7	Turkey 43:15	understanding	5, 18 95:19, 23	177:2 <i>1</i> 185:9
162:19 164:13	turmoil 29:3	39:22 96:7	96:2, <i>8</i> , <i>20</i> 97:3,	Virtual 2:16
169: <i>18</i> 170: <i>3</i> ,	121:5	106: <i>10</i> 161:22	5, 6, 9 99:11	<b>visual</b> 159: <i>11</i>
24 177:9	turn 50:21	175:11 176:20	113:2 <i>1</i> 135:6	visually 9:6
178: <i>16</i> 179: <i>6</i> ,	63:10 84:16	understood	160: <i>17</i>	92:18 99:13
10 180:15	85: <i>1</i> , 25 102:3	89: <i>15</i> 105: <i>1</i>	valuable 75:9	Voices 22:18
181:3 185:8	107: <i>19</i> , <i>20</i>	underway 95:20		

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

void 115:21	washer 154:20	whoop-de-doo	63:19 64:10	176:8 182:20
vomited 157:23	180:6	181: <i>16</i>	66:2 68:7, 23	185: <i>4</i> 187: <i>9</i> , <i>1</i> 2
	watched 143:22	willing 20:25	69:6   75:12, 25	workplace 13:8
< W >	watching 77:6	21:15 27:2 29:2	80:10 83:9	works 84:16
Wabtec 43:8, 10	water 178:14,	willingly 13:8,	85:17 87:23	90:13 139:18
45:22 46:3	15, 16 182:25	25 21:7 22:3	88:25 98:3	165:19 170:10
47:5, 7, 8, 9, 11,	ways 94:13	59:8	101:6 102:25	185:2 <i>4</i>
12, 13, 15, 20	weak 173:24	wiiiingness	104:6 110:7, 74,	<b>WORID</b> 11:4
171.2 189.3, 9		11:73 win 62:2	20 112:11	35:4 61:0, 10
waye 79.74	ZZ woaknoss 164.8	windows 12.22	110.7 110.73	04.12 14.10
151.2	wear $105.11$ 13	NILLOWS 42.22	17.2 124.7	1/18·7 168·12
waited 98.6	weather 180:16	windrow 60.13	135·1 140·19	170.7
walk 49.23	website 3.21	winter 32.8	142.12 143.8	worried 18.25
76:7. 17. 24	73:14.16	56:18 58:8.10	144:11.14	59:5
82:4 122:9	weeks 11:23.25	59:14.20 62:1.	147:22 157:10	worse 34:25
145:18 146:20	23:13 78:8, 9,	4, 7 64:13	168: <i>1</i> 169:7	55:13
182: <i>5</i> , <i>18</i> 188:23	11 172:6	178:9, 11 180:24	171: <i>13</i> 175: <i>9</i> ,	worst 38:5
walked 79:10	weight 93:6	winter's 56:20	13 178:22	62: <i>4</i> 187: <i>19</i>
84: <i>1</i> 120:7	weighted 153:12	wintertime 32:6,	181:23 188:7	worth 181:20
walking 165:4	weird 163:16	8	189:7 191:23, 24	wrap 192:20
168: <i>1</i> 7 183: <i>1</i> 2	welded 41:7, 14,	wire 83:15	worked 7:18, 22	wrench 50:15
189:2	17	wires 69:21	19: <i>14</i> 22:21, 23	75:18 152:25
walks 182:17	welding 42:1,	83:11 84:21	23:5 30:6, 23	153: <i>4</i> , <i>14</i>
183:7	13, 14	101:25	36:25 47:15	wrenches 50: <i>15</i> ,
walls 40:13	well-suited	wiring 10:5	55:10 61:25	21
41:7, 15 60:6	119:5	40:8, 11, 20, 21	67:20 73:10	write 28:22, 23
wanted 10:24	wet 57:23	69:19 81:5	74:6 79:15	written 55:20
11:2 12:9 19:5,	147:12 182:23	83:17 89:23, 24	81:25 86:7	wrong 15:19
9 21:8 25:8, 14,	<b>WNEEI</b> 37:4	118:3 withhold 26:1	111:0 142:22	21:13 29:21, 22
20 20.23 30.23	95.9 100. <i>19, 22</i> 110:4 116:17	withnoid 20.7	143.7 143.24	30.10 33.0,23
39.4 40.2 10.22 51.11	128.2 7 151.16	4.73, 17 22 10/.7 0	168·21	04.7 09.0 117.7 121.1 20
52.20 25 53.4	152.8 155.16	wonderful 193.4	worker 117.24	127.4 167.15
72.18 90.17	19 21 22 25	wondering	168:5	182.8 183.3 8
91:8 92:11, 13.	160:19.20	124: <i>4</i>	workers 16:1.5	25 184:15
14 99:23 100:6	161:6. 25 162:6.	won't 100:12	18:8 19:4.5	186:8.9 191:16
104:23 119:17	22 165:17, 19	113:23 171:13	24:25 26:4	,
121:7, 8 140:7	166:5, 20, 23	14 188:17	71:18 127:20	< Y >
188: <i>14</i>	167: <i>1</i> 169:20	word 85:12	174: <i>11</i>	yard 157:11, 23
wanting 53:5	170: <i>17</i> , <i>18</i>	93:6 128: <i>4</i>	working 6:20,	158: <i>17</i>
65:25	171:4, 7, 11, 19	178: <i>18</i>	24 7:2 8:2, 14	<b>yeah</b> 8:17
wants 119:12	173: <i>3, 4, 15,</i> 25	wore 7:19	12: <i>13</i> , <i>14</i> 18:25	10:24 13: <i>16</i>
warm 58:11	174:13, 18	work 5:23 8:5	28:16 29:17	14:12 15:24
66:7	180:1, 3	10:8 14:3	33:3 64:7	27:7 40:14
warning 162:11	wheels 37:11	19:22 20:8, 11,	80:11 86:14	41:10, 13, 20
warranty 51:7	95:7, 8, 11, 13, 17, 105:16	13 23:0 24:20	88:19 89:11	44:10, 11 45:20
93.10, 19 100.0	1/ 103.70	20.9 21.2 32.0	91.22, 23 92.2 02:4 0 12 05:2	40.3 49.13
112.1 5 7 10	100.22, 24	$33.20 \ 30.10$ $37.4 \ 14 \ 21$	33.4, 0, 12 33.2 102.13 101.12	50.16 66.10 16
15 16 23 112.2	152.13 172.20	38.1 41.22	112.73 104.72	71.7 $72.7$ $71.1$
6 138.8 189.2	wheel's 162.13	44.18 49.21	126.24 135.25	78.6 10 13
10	white 42.9	50:22 52.24	140:11 150.17	79:17 83.8
wash 178:13	whoever's 108:5	55:15 57:1	171:7 172:6	84:13 85:5 11
washed 174:22		62:2, 6, 11		12, 18 89:12, 15

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

90.19 96.5	57.11 58.7.21	187· <i>1</i> 191·3		
105.7 107.6	50:13 60:25	102.1/ 17 22		
112.11 122.7	62.5 62.25	102.14, 17, 22		
113.77 122.7	02.0 03.20			
124:3 126:1	64:27 65:17	72:5, 14 147:11		
131: <i>12</i> , <i>13</i>	66: <i>8</i> , 22   68: <i>1</i> ,			
133: <i>13</i> 136: <i>14</i>	22   69:11   70:1,	< Z >		
148:3 149: <i>19</i>	<i>13</i> , <i>18</i> , <i>23</i> 71: <i>4</i> ,	<b>zero</b> 165: <i>10</i>		
162:2, 4 169:22	17, 22 73:4, 22	<b>zip</b> 42:20 81:4,		
172:3 177:17	75:11 76:16	6. 15 110:20. 21		
181.24 25	80.14 21 81.17	<b>Zoom</b> 1.12		
186.21 187.3	83.5 84.8 85.3			
180.5	6 16 86:16 21			
109.0 Noor 6:12 14	0, 10, 00, 10, 21			
<b>year</b> 0.73, 74	00.1,20 09.10,			
9.13, 15 12.25	13, 10 90.7, 12,			
15:5, 7, 8, 16	16 91:12 93:14			
56:18 77:20	94:2 95:19			
90:21 124:11	96: <i>1</i> , 6   97: <i>8</i> , 20			
125: <i>8, 19, 23, 24</i> ,	98:7 99:7, 19			
25 126:2, 3	100:2 <i>0</i> 101: <i>9</i> ,			
128:10 143:25	15 104:15			
149:25 150: <i>1</i>	105: <i>4</i> , 8 106: <i>1</i> ,			
168: <i>12</i>	9 107:2, 11			
vears 14:21	109: <i>17</i> 110: <i>9</i> .			
22:22 29:16	23 111:20			
61·8	113.7 114.18			
velling 23.2	115.6 116.18			
yon 30.16	$2/1 \ 110.1 \ 5 \ 10$			
<b>yep</b> 50.70	100.0 100.0			
100.70	122.3 123.0			
yeses 91.27	124.3 123.20			
yesterday	128:14, 18			
129:22	131: <i>10, 14, 18,</i>			
Young 2:3 3:2,	24 133:4, 9			
6, 15 4:7, 11	134:5, 7, 9			
5:14 6:2, 8 7:5	135:23 136: <i>10</i>			
8:2, 13 9:11, 20	137: <i>12, 18, 22</i>			
10:20 11:10	138: <i>14</i> , 25			
12: <i>11</i> 13: <i>13</i>	142:2 <i>1</i> 143: <i>10</i>			
14: <i>8, 17</i> 15: <i>4</i> ,	145:2 146:13			
13. 18. 25 16:4.	148: <i>18</i> 149:6.			
13. 23 17:4. 15.	11. 16. 21 150:2.			
18.22 18.4.11	11 151.11			
20 19.1 24	155.7 13 157.9			
24.7 24 26.3 8	17 158.16			
27.7, 27, 20.0, 0	160.0 161.21			
20:5 20:11 10	162:2 16 161:27			
23.0 00.11, 13	102.2, 10 104.0			
31.0, 13, 23 20,47 20.7 04	107.20 100.4			
32:17 33:7,27	109:10,20,23			
34:1, 20 35:15	1/1:0 1/2:14,			
37:16, 20 38:7,	19 1/4:4			
21 39:1, 13, 17,	176:19, 23			
22 43:2 44:20	177:15, 19			
47:4, 14, 21	178:3 179:5, <i>10</i>			
48: <i>1, 4</i> 49: <i>10</i> ,	181:2, 21 185:5			
19 52:3, 6 54:7	186: <i>15</i> , 23			
55:9 56:10		l	l	