BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

In re Application No. 96-1

of

OLYMPIC PIPE LINE COMPANY

For Site Certification

PREHEARING ORDER NO. 29
COUNCIL ORDER NO. 730

PREHEARING CONFERENCE ORDER;
ORDER DECIDING MOTIONS;
NOTICE OF PREHEARING CONFERENCE

Nature of the Proceeding: This matter involves an application to the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (the Council) for certification of a proposed site in six Washington counties for construction and operation of a pipeline for the transportation of refined petroleum products between Woodinville and Pasco.

Procedural Setting: The Council convened a thirteenth prehearing conference session on March 30, 1999, pursuant to due and proper notice, to discuss procedural matters in this adjudication. The conference was held before Ernest Heller, Senior Administrative Law Judge, Council Chair Deborah Ross, and Council members David Black (Kittitas County), Ed Carlson (Department of the Military), Jim Cherry (Franklin County), Helen Fancher (Grant County), Ellen Haars (Department of Health), Dean Judd (Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development), Gerry Prior (City of North Bend), Jenene Ratassepp (Department of Fish and Wildlife), Gary Ray (Department of Transportation), Donna Smith (Port of Royal Slope), Matt Stone (City of Snoqualmie), Walter Swenson (Department of Agriculture), Maxine Taylor (Port of Othello), C. Robert Wallis (Utilities and Transportation Commission), and Stephanie Warden (King County).

After the conference, the Council convened a deliberative session and reached decisions on various pending motions.
Appearances:  
Appearances were entered as follows:

**Applicant**
Joshua Preece, Karen McGaffey, and Charles Blumenfeld, attys., Seattle; 
Claude Harshbarger, Olympic Pipe Line Company, Renton; and Katy 
Chaney, Dames & Moore, Seattle

**Counsel for the Environment**
Mary McCrea and Thomas C. Morrill, Asst. Atty. General, Olympia

**State Agencies**
Dept. Of Ecology, by Kurt Peterson, Asst. Atty. General, Olympia, and 
Brenden McFarland, Dept. of Ecology, Olympia 
Olympia 
Olympia 
Parks & Recreation Commission, by Joseph Shorin, Asst. Atty. Gen., 
Olympia

**Counties**
Grant County, by Stephen Hallstrom, atty., Ephrata 
King County, by Pete Ramels, atty., Seattle 
Kittitas County, by James Hurson, atty., Ellensburg 
Snohomish County, by Dawn Findlay, atty., Everett

**Water Districts**
Cross Valley Water District, by Patricia A. Murray, atty.

**Federal Agencies**
Dept. of the Army, by David McCormick, atty., Arlington, Virginia

**Tribes**
Tulalip Tribes, by A. Reid Allison, atty., Marysville 
Yakama Nation, by Meredith Bruch, atty., Toppenish

**Businesses or other organizations**
Cascade Columbia Alliance, by David Bricklin and Claudia Newman, 
attys., Seattle 
Tidewater Barge Lines, Inc. and Tidewater Terminal Company, by 
Jay Waldron, atty., Portland, Oregon 
Washington Environmental Council, by Anne Taylor, atty., Seattle

Discussion:

**A.  Procedural Matters**

1. **Statements of Council Members.**  Dave Somers, Council Member from Snohomish 
   County, provided a written statement in response to Olympic’s continuing objection to 
his participation in this proceeding. Any comments, objections, or responses to Mr. 
Somers’ statement must be filed with the Council no later than Friday, April 9.
2. **Stipulation between the Yakama Nation and Olympic.** The Council acknowledged receipt of the stipulation and indicated its intention to convene a stipulation hearing early in the hearing. Counsel for the Yakama Nation indicated that if the stipulation were accepted, the testimony of Mr. Stephen Parker, on fish habitat and water quality, would likely be withdrawn.

3. **Marking of Exhibits.** To minimize time spent during the hearing, the Council will number exhibits outside the hearing sessions and provide weekly updates to the parties. The master list of exhibit numbers will also be posted on the Council’s Internet site ([www.efsec.wa.gov](http://www.efsec.wa.gov)). To this end, the Council has numbered the exhibits received to date, using a system that groups exhibits by witness and sponsoring party and allows for later insertion of exhibits to be used on cross of particular witnesses.

   The Council distributed the first edition of this list and asked parties to confirm that their witnesses had been accurately listed.1

4. **Officially noticed documents and other excerpts.** All documents referenced in cross-examination must be marked and offered into the record. If a portion of a larger document is used, the relevant excerpt should be placed in the record, and the entire document should be available at the hearing for reference. If the DEIS is used on cross, it must be properly offered into the record.

5. **Thursday rule.** All exhibits to be used on cross-examination must be filed with the Council on or before the Thursday of the week prior to the week in which they will be used. For example, all exhibits to be used during the opening week of the hearing, the week of April 26, must be filed on or before Thursday, April 22. This will allow Council staff to mark the exhibits and distribute them to Council members in a timely fashion. On Thursdays when the hearing is in session, such exhibits may be delivered to the Council at the hearing in lieu of delivery to the Council’s Olympia office.

   If, during cross examination of a particular witness, a party intends to use an exhibit of another witness, the Council requests notification under the “Thursday rule” so that Council members can review the exhibit and bring it with them to the hearing. Documents not yet offered into the record but scheduled to be sponsored may be used subject to correcting motions.

6. **“Batting order” for cross-examination.** Per the Council’s March 19 request, parties should coordinate their cross-examination of each witness. If one party intends a more comprehensive cross examination, that party is encouraged to proceed first, followed by parties whose cross is narrowly focused on a specific topic. The information the parties provide on April 7 will assist the Council in formulating a schedule. Depending on the effectiveness of the parties’ coordination, some limitations on the time allotted to each party for cross-examination of a witness may be necessary.

---

1 Additional copies may be downloaded from the Council’s web site or requested from Sarah Blocki, EFSEC staff, at (360) 956-2170. The Council requested clarification of the numbering of Olympic’s Felton/Gallagher exhibits. Olympic noted that the testimony of Katy Chaney incorporates the Revised Application and certain Technical Reports as exhibits. These will be added to the next edition of the Master Exhibit List.
7. **Evidentiary motions.** The Council prefers to deal with as many evidentiary matters as possible prior to the opening of the hearing. Following discussion at the conference, the Council extended the due date for evidentiary motions related to Olympic’s rebuttal testimony, filed March 26. These motions are due on April 23, and Olympic’s response is due on April 30.

8. **Written Opening Statements.** Some parties have suggested and the Council concurs that brief opening statements, summarizing the critical issues and conclusions to be addressed through particular witnesses, would be helpful to the Council. Parties may, but are not required, to submit written opening statements up to twenty pages (double-spaced) by Friday, April 16. The Council does not contemplate hearing oral statements.

9. **Draft Schedule.** The comments of the parties at the conference, together with the written comments received March 29, will be used to formulate a second draft of the hearing schedule. It will be distributed promptly to the parties.

**B. Motion to Strike Washington Environmental Council’s Prefiled Testimony**

**Procedural background.** Washington Environmental Council (WEC) submitted testimony of Mr. Rhys Roth, captioned “purpose and need.” It summarizes recent technological advances in the automotive industry, which, he argues, will reduce the demand for gasoline within the lifetime of the pipeline.

On March 4, 1999, Olympic Pipe Line Company (Olympic) filed a motion to strike this testimony. WEC, People for Puget Sound (PPS), and Counsel for the Environment (CFE) filed responses on March 15, and Olympic replied on March 19.

**Olympic’s argument.** Olympic argues that the testimony is outside the scope for which WEC was granted intervention in this proceeding. In Prehearing Order No. 3, the Council limited WEC’s intervention to the effect of the project on marine tanker traffic and resultant effects on the environment. Mr. Roth’s testimony is unrelated to tanker traffic. The Council did not grant WEC the right to present evidence on “purpose and need.”

2 Parties may address (without limitation) issues related to admissibility, qualifications of witnesses, authenticity of exhibits, and the scope of testimony vis-a-vis scope of intervention.

3 The Council is aware that its rulings on potential motions related to Olympic’s rebuttal may affect the parties’ need for further discovery. Nonetheless, to assure the effective use of time without signaling any future Council action, the Council encourages the parties to develop a discovery schedule that will allow them to take full advantage of the time remaining prior to the opening of the hearing.

4 In addition, the parties at the conference indicated their intention to provide a joint response through Counsel for the Environment by April 2. The Council will consider this response as well.

5 Prehearing Order No. 3, August 15, 1996, p. 6, states, “WEC/PPS may intervene, limited to the following issues: (1) whether tanker traffic on Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca would be affected by certification of the proposed site, and if so, (2) the environmental impacts of changes in tanker traffic resulting from the pipeline.”
Arguments of the respondents. WEC argues that the testimony is within the scope of intervention expressly granted in Prehearing Order No. 3. Although the testimony is captioned “purpose and need,” it presents one effect of increased marine tanker traffic. Specifically, increased tanker traffic will supply additional crude oil to refineries; in turn, the increased availability of refined products will delay the state’s conversion to alternative fuels and technologies, with detrimental effects on air quality.

Further, WEC, PPS, and CFE (the respondents) argue that, whether or not WEC was expressly granted the right to present evidence on “purpose and need,” WEC should be allowed to address the issue. The respondents argue that the determination of need is one of EFSEC’s fundamental charges in this proceeding. Chapter 80.50 RCW directs EFSEC to balance need against the impacts of a project as it formulates its recommendation on a project. If the need for a project is minimal, even “lesser environmental impacts” may outweigh “need” in the balance.

In footnote 10 of Prehearing Order No. 17, the respondents argue, EFSEC indicated that all parties may address such common fundamental issues. Information regarding need is particularly important in light of the paucity of information regarding need in the DEIS.

Council’s response. The Council agrees that a determination of need is relevant to its recommendation and believes that this testimony is relevant to that determination. However, the testimony is neither within the narrow scope of intervention expressly granted to WEC in Prehearing Order No. 3, nor within the intent of footnote 10 of Prehearing Order No. 17. The footnote suggests that parties may address “common issues” only insofar as they are inherent in the narrow issues for which they were granted intervention.

Accordingly, the Council rules that WEC may not sponsor the testimony of Mr. Roth in the hearing. The Council notes that CFE has indicated that it believes this testimony should be included in the record and would like time to adjust if WEC is denied the right to sponsor it. The Council will allow CFE to sponsor the witness. CFE and counsel for WEC may determine who will handle the witness during the examination.

C. Motions for Reconsideration of Order Denying Intervention to AT&T and WNSI

Procedural background. In Prehearing Order No. 25, dated March 8, 1999, the Council denied late intervention to AT&T Corp. (AT&T) and Worldcom Network Services, Inc. (WNSI), stating that the interests of the companies can and will be adequately

6 The effect of the project to increase marine tanker traffic is presented in the testimony of Mr. Fred Felleman, which was prepared in cooperation with People for Puget Sound (at EFSEC’s direction in Prehearing Order No. 3), sponsored by PPS, and adopted by WEC.

7 Prehearing Order No. 17, December 8, 1998, footnote 10, p. 4, states, “As noted in the Conclusion below and elsewhere in this order, Cascade as an intervenor, may present evidence on issues common to all parties in this proceeding. Our reference… to “intervention” on behalf of specific property interests refers only to Cascade’s ability to present evidence specifically on behalf of and in relation to the interests of individual property owners…”
represented by the Parks and Recreation Commission (Parks) in this proceeding. The Council found no justification for late intervention because the companies appeared to have had knowledge of the project during the summer of 1996 and made no inquiry of EFSEC at that time. On March 18, 1999, the Council received timely motions for reconsideration from both AT&T and WNSI. Oral argument was requested and denied. Parks also filed an objection to Prehearing Order No. 25.

Arguments of the companies. AT&T and WNSI (the companies) argue that (i) their interests cannot be adequately represented by Parks, (ii) Parks has indicated that it does not want to represent the interests of the companies, and (iii) without intervention in the EFSEC proceeding, the companies have no forum to protect their interests.

The companies assert three reasons that Parks cannot adequately represent their interests. First, Parks’ interests may be in conflict with the companies’ interests during the proceeding. Parks has broad duties under its statute and must balance such competing interests as the protection of park lands for recreational use, the protection of easements on park lands, and the need to avail itself of revenue-producing opportunities. In balancing these multiple interests, Parks may take the position that the pipeline does not unreasonably interfere with the companies’ easement rights. The companies may take the position that it does.

Second, the companies contend that even without a direct conflict of interests, Parks may have reasons not to represent the companies vigorously in this proceeding. Parks may take the position that vigorous representation of the companies’ interests in these proceedings may prejudice the Commission in future proceedings between Parks and the companies involving their easements.

Third, they argue, Parks lacks the expertise to present technical information on how an oil pipeline affects a fiber optic system.

Council’s response. The Council is not convinced that the interests of the companies cannot be adequately represented by Parks in this proceeding. Since petitioning for intervention in June 1996, Parks has indicated its intention to protect the John Wayne Pioneer Trail in this proceeding. Consistent with its obligations under its easements with AT&T and WNSI, it has submitted prefiled testimony regarding the effect of the pipeline on those easements. If further testimony of a technical nature is required, Parks may confer with the companies to identify competent experts, including representatives of the companies, to explain the unique technical impacts of the pipeline on the fiber optic systems. Pursuant to Prehearing Order No. 24, additional testimony related to public lands must be filed on or before June 25, 1999.

---

Iron Horse State Park, John Wayne Pioneer Trail, AT&T Fiber Optics Easement, December 15, 1989, Section 10 states, “Parks agrees not to construct any structure or conduct any activity within the easement area that might interfere with the maintenance and operation of AT&T’s facilities without prior approval from AT&T.” Iron Horse State Park, Worldcom Network Services, Inc. Fiber Optics Easement No. 96-0404, September 13, 1996, Section 18(c) states, “…new facilities…upon, across and under the use area, … or within the use area…shall not impair or require [Worldcom] to relocate [existing] facilities.” “The proposed route traverses lands encumbered by these two easements.” Figueroa Testimony at 7-8.
The Council never contemplated that Parks act as the attorney or the surrogate for either AT&T or WNSI. Rather, it has stated an expectation that the existing parties to this proceeding would submit all information relevant to the siting of the pipeline. If the Agencies...have laws...and rules...that they would consider in determining whether the pipeline should be sited on public land, EFSEC’s rules require the Council to consider these... [t]he Council directs parties with relevant information on public lands within the study corridor to place that information before the Council so that the Council will have the most complete record possible for its deliberation. Prehearing Order No. 24, March 8, 1999, p. 5.

The Council does not believe that this direction puts Parks in an untenable position or requires it to do anything it would not otherwise do.

As indicated previously, the Council does not believe that the companies have provided reasonable justification for late intervention. Accordingly, after due consideration, the Council continues to deny intervention to AT&T and WNSI.

D. Motions for Reconsideration of Order on Tidewater Contributions

Procedural background. In Prehearing Order No. 28, dated March 15, 1999, Judge Heller granted Olympic’s motion to compel Tidewater to disclose the total amount of its contributions to another intervenor, Cascade Columbia Alliance (Cascade), stating that discovery of evidence that may be used for impeachment purposes is proper. On March 24, 1999, both Tidewater and Cascade filed motions requesting reconsideration of this ruling. Olympic responded on March 29.

Arguments of Tidewater and Cascade Columbia Alliance. Tidewater and Cascade (the movants) argue that neither the fact nor the amount of Tidewater’s contribution is relevant for impeachment purposes. They contend that impeachment is a process of discrediting individual witnesses. An individual witness’s knowledge of the identity of a funding source may have relevance for impeachment purposes. However, they argue, when a funding source is confidential and a witness has no knowledge of it, the witness cannot possibly be biased by that source. Notwithstanding the issue of relevancy, Tidewater points out that it has stipulated that it does contribute to Cascade. Given the fact of Tidewater’s monetary support, the amount of that support has no additional relevance in discrediting a witness.

Moreover, the movants argue, Olympic has shown no indication that it intends to use the information to impeach individual witnesses. They contend that if Olympic had intended to impeach witnesses during the hearing, it would have laid the groundwork for impeachment through questions at deposition. It did not do so. The movants surmise that Olympic may attempt to use the information to draw unjustified conclusions about the relationship of Tidewater and Cascade.

Finally, the movants contend that discovery (i) would prejudice Cascade by providing insight into its litigation budget and strategy and (ii) would violate Tidewater’s right to free association.

Olympic arguments. Olympic responds that the amount of Tidewater’s contributions to Cascade is relevant for impeachment of the “positions” of both parties. Olympic submits that Tidewater’s intervention is not motivated by the alleged desire to protect Tidewater employees, but by its previous owner’s desire to receive a sizeable payment from new
owners (Sterling Ventures), contingent on the defeat of the project. Olympic asserts that Tidewater created Cascade to oppose the project.

Council’s response. The Council affirms Judge Heller’s ruling that the amount of Tidewater’s contribution to Cascade is a proper subject of discovery and must be provided. The Council can envision reasonable impeachment arguments that are not based on the knowledge of individual witnesses. Given that Cascade’s total budget is a matter of public record through the Secretary of State, the Council is not convinced that the requested information will provide Olympic with further information regarding Cascade’s litigation budget or strategy. Nor has the Council seen any indication that Tidewater’s association with Cascade would be chilled by this disclosure.

Accordingly, Tidewater is directed to disclose to Olympic the amount of its financial contributions to Cascade from 1995 to the present, no later than April 23, 1999.

E. Motions for Reconsideration of Prehearing Orders Nos. 24 and 27

The Council received objections and/or motions for reconsideration of Prehearing Order No. 24 (Public Lands Issues) from King County, Grant County, Cascade Columbia Alliance, North Bend, Snoqualmie, Counsel for the Environment, the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Parks & Recreation Commission, and the Department of Transportation. The Council received objections and/or requests for reconsideration of Prehearing Order No. 27 (DEIS Issues) from King County, Grant County, Kittitas County, Cascade Columbia Alliance, North Bend, Snoqualmie, Counsel for the Environment, the Yakama Nation, and the Tulalip Tribes.

The Council has found no new information in the pleadings that causes it to change its earlier decision, and accordingly affirms its rulings in these orders.

F. Notice of Prehearing Conference

The next prehearing conference will be held April 26, 1999, beginning at 1:00 p.m. at 10507-23 Gravelly Lake Dr. S.W., Lakewood, Washington 98499. A map and driving instructions are enclosed. The purpose of the conference is to discuss procedural matters.

DATED and effective at Olympia, Washington, this 7th day of April 1999.

/s/ Deborah Ross
Deborah Ross, Council Chair

Notice to Participants. As to issues addressed for the first time in this order, this prehearing order, unless modified, will control the course of the hearing. Objections to this order may be stated only by filing them in writing with the Council within ten days after the date of this order. As to matters submitted on reconsideration of previous rulings of the Council or ALJ, this order is not subject to further requests for reconsideration.