











2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 425, Seattle, WA 98121 • 206.389.9321 • Toll Free: 855.329.0919

2208 North 30th Street, Suite 202, Tacoma, WA 98403 • 253.627.6401 • Toll Fee: 800.649.2034

ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

Digital Transcripts • Internet Realtime • HD Legal Video • Picture-in-Picture Depositions Remote Depositions • Designation Editing • Nationwide Scheduling • HD Videoconferencing

In the Matter of:

Horse Heaven Wind Farm

VS

VOL 1 HORSE HEAVEN WIND FARM

March 10, 2023

Thank you for choosing BA Litigation Services for your court reporting, legal video, and deposition technology needs. It is always our goal to provide you with exceptional service. If there is anything we can do to assist you, please don't hesitate to let us know.

Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR Vice President



The Premier Advantage™
PDF transcript bundle contains:

- Full-size and condensed transcripts
- Printable word index
- Hyperlinked selectable word index
- Embedded printable exhibit scans
- Hyperlinked selectable exhibit viewing
- Common file formats: txt, lef, mdb accessed via *paperclip* icon

STRATEGY • TECHNOLOGY • DESIGN • DEPOSITIONS

2	ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL
3	
4	Horse Heaven Wind Farm
5	Pre-Hearing Conference
6	
7	
8	March 10, 2023
9	held via Teams Video Conferencing
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Reported by: ANN MARIE G. ALLISON, CCR
25	Certified Court Reporter #3375

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	TIM MCMAHAN, Stoel Rives
4	CRYSTAL CHASE, Stoel Rives
5	EMILY SCHIMELPFENIG, Stoel Rives
6	KENNETH HARPER, Benton County
7	AZIZA FOSTER, Benton County
8	JEFF ALTMAN, Benton County DPA
9	JON THOMPSON, Assistant Attorney General
10	SARAH REYNEVELD, Counsel for the Environment
11	ETHAN JONES, Yakama Nation
12	SHONA VOELCKERS, Yakama Nation
13	RICHARD ARAMBURU, Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.
14	ANDREA GRANTHAM, EFSEC
15	LISA MASENGALE, EFSEC
16	JOAN OWENS, EFSEC
17	SONJA SKAVLAND, EFSEC
18	SARA RANDOLF, EFSEC
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



2.2

BE IT REMEMBERED that on Friday, March 10, 2023, 9:00 a.m., the following proceedings were held before Ann Marie Allison, Certified Court Reporter residing in Pierce County, Washington.

(All parties present via Teams)

>>>>> <<<<<

JUDGE TOREM: Good morning, everyone. This is Judge Adam Torem. I'm an administrative law judge appointed by the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council of Washington, or EFSEC, to preside over the application filed by Scout Clean Energy LLC on behalf of the Horse Heaven Wind Farm LLC and the adjudication that's going to go forward in the months ahead on this matter.

Today we are doing our first pre-hearing conference since we issued the order commencing adjudication back on December 15th of 2022. We've also had a chance for people to file their petitions for intervention and yesterday issued a preliminary order on intervention that will cover as the second agenda item for today.

Again, for the record, today's date is Friday,
March 10th, 2023. It's now 9:02 a.m. We were scheduled to
begin at 9:00, and I hope all parties were online as I was
talking with the court reporter during that opening minute

of the hour. We'll plan, per the court reporter, to take breaks every 45 to 50 minutes and take a five- to ten-minute break as needed for comfort. So plan for that at about 9:50 today and during the second hour, if we go that long, again at about 10:50.

We have a number of parties that I want to take a roll call on, but again, I want to state for the record, if you're a member of the public or the press or just an interested person wondering what does EFSEC do, today's matter with the Horse Heaven Wind Farm Project, as proposed, is simply to get scheduling done and talk about disputed issues. It's really an organizational meeting.

So if you will, understand that this is not an opportunity for public comment. It's not the sort of meeting where we invite people that were not parties to the upcoming trial or hearing -- formally known as an adjudication -- to participate, so please don't expect for a public comment opportunity. That opportunity will come at a later date, and we'll be giving well advance notice about when that will be.

Let me start with the roll calls for the applicant. Mr. McMahan, are you on the line?

SPEAKER MCMAHAN: Yes, I am, Your Honor. Can you hear me?

JUDGE TOREM: I can hear you, Mr. McMahan,

1 good morning. Who else from your team at Stoel Rives is on 2 the line? SPEAKER MCMAHAN: Again, Tim McMahan with 3 Stoel Rives, and with me is Crystal Chase. She is the 4 natural resource litigator who will be working on the 5 proceedings, along with Emily Schimelpfenig -- tough one for 6 me still. Emily will be assisting us throughout the 7 8 proceedings as well. 9 JUDGE TOREM: All right. And are both of 10 those colleagues on the line with you today? 11 SPEAKER MCMAHAN: Crystal -- Ms. Chase is, 12 and I believe Emily is on the line from afar. 13 JUDGE TOREM: All right. And will you be 14 taking a speaking role today on behalf of the applicant? 15 SPEAKER MCMAHAN: Your Honor, thank you for 16 that. I believe Ms. Chase will take the lead for the 17 morning. I may jump in here and there, as you will tolerate, perhaps, particularly if there's any history 18 relating to land use issues and the like, but I will 19 20 certainly take your guidance on whether or not I should be 21 participating. 2.2 JUDGE TOREM: It's fine. I don't think we 23 need to have a one-lawyer/one-witness type of rule for today, but I'm just looking for who I should call on for 24

each party. Thank you very much, McMahan.

25

SPEAKER MCMAHAN: And that will be Ms. Chase. 1 2 Thank you, Your Honor. 3 JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Chase, let's test your microphone and see if we can hear you. 4 SPEAKER CHASE: Good morning, Judge Torem. 5 6 This is Crystal Chase. 7 JUDGE TOREM: We can hear you loud and clear. For Benton County, the law firm of Menke Jackson 8 9 Beyer LLP is representing them. Do we have Kenneth Harper? 10 SPEAKER HARPER: You do, Your Honor. Good 11 morning. 12 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Mr. Harper. 13 And is it Aziza Foster, or did I butcher the name? 14 SPEAKER FOSTER: No. You got that perfect, Your Honor. 15 16 JUDGE TOREM: Which of you will take the lead 17 for Benton County? 18 SPEAKER HARPER: I will. 19 JUDGE TOREM: And that's Kenneth Harper? 20 SPEAKER HARPER: Yes. 21 JUDGE TOREM: And the court reporter's going 22 to have a hard time knowing who is speaking if we don't 23 identify ourselves. So it's a little bit burdensome, but 24 when you first start jumping back in, if there's a back and forth, it will be helpful if you identify yourself. 25

will make a cleaner record of today's proceeding when we go 1 2 back. 3 Mr. Harper, I note that Ryan Brown was the Benton County prosecuting attorney who participated in previous 4 5 proceedings prior to your notice of appearance. Mr. Brown on the line or participating today? 6 SPEAKER HARPER: Mr. Brown will not be 7 participating. I think we may have Deputy Prosecuting 8 9 Attorney Jeff Altman on the line for Benton County as well 10 though, Your Honor. 11 SPEAKER ALTMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. 12 This is Jeff Altman. I'm going to be attending this. 13 don't think I'll have any substantive participation in this. 14 Mr. Brown had a family emergency, so he, 15 unfortunately, can't be here. 16 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Mr. Altman. 17 sorry to hear that on behalf of Mr. Brown, but appreciate 18 that someone from your office is monitoring what's going on, 19 and I'll defer to Mr. Harper when I call on Benton County. 20 Our next statutory party is the Counsel for the 21 Environment. Assistant Attorney General Sarah Reyneveld 2.2 should be on the line, I hope. 23 SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Yes. Good morning, Judge 24 Torem. This is Sarah Reyneveld. 25 JUDGE TOREM: Good to hear your voice,

1 Ms. Reyneveld. Anybody else from your office participating 2 today? 3 SPEAKER REYNEVELD: No, it's just me. 4 Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: All right. Turning now to our 5 interveners, the Confederated Tribes and Band of the Yakama 6 Nation, there are three attorneys from the Yakama Nation 7 Office of Legal Counsel, who filed their notice of 8 9 appearance. Do we have Ethan Jones? 10 SPEAKER JONES: Yes, Your Honor, good 11 morning. Ethan Jones on behalf of the Yakama Nation. 12 JUDGE TOREM: And I don't know if it's Shona 13 or Shauna Voelckers. 14 SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Good morning, Your Honor. 15 Shona Voelckers on behalf of Yakama Nation, and I will be 16 taking point for our team this morning. My colleague, 17 Jessica Houston, is also joining us today. 18 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Ms. Voelckers, 19 thanks for the help on the pronunciation. I appreciate it. 20 Please correct me if I defer back to my initial error. 21 And, Ms. Houston, I take it you don't have a 22 speaking role, but let's check your mic to make sure, in 23 case there's something you need to pipe in on. 24 SPEAKER HOUSTON: Good morning, Your Honor. 25 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Good morning,

1	Ms. Houston. Thank you.
2	Our final intervening party is Tri-Cities
3	C.A.R.E.S. It's an acronym C.A.R.E.S. And for the record,
4	I understand it to mean Community Action for Responsible
5	Environmental Stewardship. Their attorney is Jay Richard
6	Aramburu.
7	Mr. Aramburu, are you on the line?
8	SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Yes. Good morning,
9	Your Honor and parties. Richard Aramburu representing
10	Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.
11	JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you, sir.
12	Were there any other attorneys or parties on the
13	line whom did I not call?
14	Hearing none, I wanted to identify what other
15	EFSEC staff are on the line, and then perhaps, just so
16	everybody's aware, if there are members of the EFSEC
17	council, I'll ask them to identify themselves as well.
18	Do we have John Thompson, our Assistant Attorney
19	General?
20	SPEAKER THOMPSON: Yes, I'm present.
21	JUDGE TOREM: Excellent. Thank you.
22	And a couple of key members who are monitoring
23	things, Lisa Masengale.
24	SPEAKER MASENGALE: Good morning, Your Honor.
25	JUDGE TOREM: Good morning.

1	Andrea Grantham?
2	SPEAKER GRANTHAM: Andrea Grantham is
3	present.
4	JUDGE TOREM: And Andrea and Lisa are busy
5	monitoring the microphones here on Microsoft Teams this
6	morning. They're going to be muting folks that they might
7	see active microphones when it's not appropriate. So if
8	your dog starts barking, or as the hazard in my home is,
9	cats start rioting, they'll do their best to minimize the
10	background noise so Ms. Allison, our court reporter, can
11	keep a clean record here.
12	Do we have any EFSEC council members?
13	Excuse me. Ed Brost?
14	SPEAKER BROST: Yes.
15	JUDGE TOREM: And, Mr. Brost, you're
16	representing Benton County. Right?
17	SPEAKER BROST: Yes, sir.
18	JUDGE TOREM: All right. Welcome. If you
19	have any questions along the way or afterwards, feel free to
20	reach out to me, and we can clarify anything you need to
21	take back to your folks there at Benton County on behalf of
22	your time at the council.
23	Any other council members?
24	All right. Hearing none, any other staff members
25	from EFSEC who want to identify themselves? I know I don't

Moon. JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you both for being here. SPEAKER SKAVLAND: And Sonja Skavland. JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	1	have any responsibilities assigned to any of you, but is
Moon. Moon. JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you both f being here. SPEAKER SKAVLAND: And Sonja Skavland. JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	2	anybody else listening?
Moon. JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you both for being here. SPEAKER SKAVLAND: And Sonja Skavland. JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	3	SPEAKER OWENS: Joan Owens.
JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you both for being here. SPEAKER SKAVLAND: And Sonja Skavland. JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	4	SPEAKER MOON: And, Judge Torem, this is Amy
being here. SPEAKER SKAVLAND: And Sonja Skavland. JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	5	Moon.
SPEAKER SKAVLAND: And Sonja Skavland. JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	6	JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you both for
JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	7	being here.
SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	8	SPEAKER SKAVLAND: And Sonja Skavland.
JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry? SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	9	JUDGE TOREM: Sonja, welcome.
SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf. JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	10	SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf.
JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right. Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	11	JUDGE TOREM: I'm sorry?
Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	12	SPEAKER RANDOLF: Sara Randolf.
at the council soon. SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	13	JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Randolf. All right.
SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you. JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	14	Sara, you're new to me. I'm sure I'll find out what you do
JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members? All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	15	at the council soon.
All right. That takes care of the roll call, unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item o your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	16	SPEAKER RANDOLF: Thank you.
unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item o your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	17	JUDGE TOREM: Any other staff members?
tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today. All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item o your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	18	All right. That takes care of the roll call,
All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item o your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	19	unless there's anybody else who wants to speak up now and
advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item of your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	20	tell me they need to be counted in our attendance today.
your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention. (No audio)	21	All right. Ms. Masengale, I'll ask that you
24 (No audio)	22	advance the agenda to page two. The second agenda item on
	23	your screen now is our preliminary order on intervention.
25 SDEAKED CHASE. Good morning this is Creek	24	(No audio)
DELAKER CHASE. GOOD MOTHING, CHIS IS CLYS	25	SPEAKER CHASE: Good morning, this is Crystal

- 1 | Chase for applicant. I'm not able to hear Judge Torem.
- 2 SPEAKER REYNEVELD: I'm not either. This is
- 3 | Sarah Reyneveld from Counsel for the Environment.
- 4 | SPEAKER MASENGALE: This is Lisa Masengale of
- 5 | EFSEC. Judge Torem, it appears we have lost your audio.
- 6 And I will go ahead and send Judge Torem a message letting
- 7 | him know we have lost his audio as well, in case he's having
- 8 trouble hearing us.
- JUDGE TOREM: This is Judge Torem. Am I back
- 10 | in the meeting by phone now?
- 11 | SPEAKER MASENGALE: This is Lisa Masengale of
- 12 | EFSEC. Yes, we can hear you Judge Torem.
- JUDGE TOREM: I don't know. Mid-sentence,
- 14 Teams just dropped off my screen, went blank when I asked
- 15 | you to switch to page two of the agenda. So I apologize to
- 16 | everybody for doing a quick disappearance there.
- We will pick up with that Agenda Item No. 2. I
- 18 | have my own copy of the agenda on my computer screen here,
- 19 | so I will follow along with you. I think I was about to say
- 20 | that we issued our preliminary order on intervention last
- 21 | night. Unfortunately, came out after 5:00, so I apologize
- 22 | for the late breaking news on that. My intention,
- 23 originally, was that it would come out earlier in the week
- 24 and things got ahead of me. So I'm human, too. There's
- 25 only 24 hours in a day, but you have the decision

2.2

preliminary order on intervention granting the petition filed by the Yakama Nation.

There was no objection to the Yakama Nation's petition or its requested scope of intervention. Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S., also, their petition is granted.

There is the matter of the applicant's indication that they had some limited objections regarding the scope. I held a reservation in that order that we would deal with any scope of intervention questions following today's proceeding and perhaps after another pre-hearing conference, if necessary. Really was dependent on how the discussion went today and how I can see, Mr. Aramburu, on behalf of your client, how to best figure out exactly what issues you'll be focusing on and other issues you might not be participating in.

So we'll address those things later, perhaps in today's conference and perhaps in an additional one.

Mr. Aramburu, did you have any questions, because I know you responded to the applicant's opposition as well?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Judge Torem, we have responded. I believe you have a copy of that response, and it's been provided to the applicant.

Just this morning we sent to you and the parties a bit of an update with some more information concerning our issues, and so we're prepared, when you're ready, to discuss

2.2

additional intervention issues. As you know, we're requesting full party status, yeah, in these proceedings.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Mr. Aramburu. I'll confirm, I did get the email this morning, and frankly, I wanted to give you props for actually listing issues that were specific to some things raised in the application and the environmental studies so far.

I want to assure you that Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. is a full party intervener status. It will just be a real question as to what topics you might or might not be participating in.

For all parties, there may be some focuses that you say, Oh, that's an issue that I won't be presenting testimony on or our clients just is -- simply, that's not what they are worried about or concerned about as we process this application.

If those items come up when we get to that part of the agenda, in my experience with these wind farm hearings or generally with complex litigation, knowing which parties don't want to comment is helpful for scheduling, as,

Mr. Aramburu, you have some dates of unavailability. It might be that the hearing proceeds on a topic that's not of concern to your client on days when you're not available if we feel that time constraints require us to keep going without all the parties present.

2.2

But again, that would be by agreement and hopefully not by anything just dictated by Judge Torem out of what he thinks is the right thing to do. But we'll have a full discussion before we do anything like that.

Mr. Aramburu, any questions about what I said about full party status in dealing with those things?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: No, Your Honor. We're prepared to participate in further discussions about scope of intervention at your convenience.

JUDGE TOREM: Perfect. We may get to some of that today.

All right. The next item on the agenda is the venue for this adjudication. When I asked the parties — before intervention was granted and when I asked the parties through Mr.— Mr. McMahan at Stoel Rives — to round up everybody while petitions for intervention were pending and have some collaborative discussions with the county and with Counsel for the Environment, I got a letter on March 1st that's posted on the EFSEC website, and I think it's input on procedural considerations for our adjudication.

There's a number of things addressed in there regarding prefiled testimony and some of the items for exhibits and briefing schedules. What I wanted to start with was the venue. Our chair of the EFSEC council had indicated that this was going to be a virtual proceeding.

Personally, I'm not a fan.

2.2

As you can see, with my interaction with Microsoft Teams, technology can be, through no fault of your own, tweaky, depending on your equipment, your broadband connection or what the weather might be doing that day. So I wanted to at least survey everybody today, and I'll call on each of you to tell me your preference for your client on how we go about conducting this proceeding.

I'm the presiding officer and not the deciding officer on this matter, but I can take your inputs back to Chair Drew and let her know what our clients at EFSEC really want to do on this matter.

So, Ms. Chase, let me turn to the applicants. How would the applicant prefer this adjudication be held? And the options that I put on there were in-person, virtual or some kind of hybrid.

SPEAKER CHASE: Thank you, Judge Torem.

This is Ms. Chase on behalf of applicant. Applicant would prefer to stay with EFSEC's preliminary determination of a virtual hearing, with our second preference being a hybrid hearing for flexibility of witnesses and parties.

Thank you.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. And for the county, Mr. Harper.

SPEAKER HARPER: Ken Harper for Yakima --

2.

2.2

excuse me, for Benton County. Your Honor, I share some of the concerns you've raised. I, frankly, would prefer an in-person hearing. There's some appeal to perhaps splitting the difference and saying hybrid. I don't feel strongly about that, but the county does have an interest in a significant in-person component.

JUDGE TOREM: If I heard you correctly,

Mr. Harper, the county would prefer in-person, but perhaps
some blend of a hybrid could also be worked in.

SPEAKER HARPER: That's correct, Your Honor.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Ms. Reyneveld, how would the Counsel for the Environment think it best conducted?

SPEAKER REYNEVELD: The Counsel for the Environment would prefer a virtual hearing, but we are open to a hybrid hearing to accommodate the preference of Yakama Nation and other parties that would like to present testimony in person.

It was our understanding that this was going to be a virtual hearing, and so therefore, you know, I live in Seattle and I'm not prepared to travel back and forth to the Tri-Cities. And I just wanted to state that it would be burdensome for many of our team to do so, but we also would be in favor of a hybrid model to accommodate the preferences for in-person testimony.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. 1 Thank you, 2 Ms. Reyneveld. 3 Ms. Voelckers, on behalf of the Yakama Nation, let me hear from you. 4 5 SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. Shona Voelckers, Counsel for Yakama Nation, strongly 6 advocates for an in-person hearing, due to the nature of the 7 issues that are -- we have already identified, as well as 8 others, the sensitivity of the information that we hope to 9 10 share with the full council and the need to have that 11 happen, if at all possible, while we're all sitting in a 12 room and while -- so that our witnesses can -- can bring the 13 information that they have in a way that is sensitive to 14 what they have to share. If the --15 16 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Ms. Voelckers. Go 17 ahead. 18 SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Your Honor, if the 19 decision is to have a hybrid proceeding, as I'm hearing 20 others advocate for, the Yakama Nation would still intend to 21 participate fully in person, to the extent that you allow. 22 JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Voelckers, I'm looking at 23 page two of the letter that came from Stoel Rives on 24 March 1st and signed by Ms. Chase and Mr. McMahan. There's 25 a paragraph there where they represented the following:

2.2

Concerning live testimony, the Yakama Nation is requesting the ability to bring direct oral testimony by Yakama Nation members during the hearing, and the testimony would be limited to cultural resource impacts of the proposed project.

Can you share with me just a little bit more what you see, in your mind, of how that would occur?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Yes, Your Honor.

Thank you. This is Shona Voelckers again on behalf of the Yakama Nation.

So first, during that conversation with counsel and as captured above that paragraph in Ms. Chase's letter, the Yakama Nation does intend to participate fully through the written testimony process when we can, and it's just asking to have the ability to bring direct oral testimony by Yakama Nation members, like elders, during the hearing, rather than being limited to the oral testimony or the live portion of the hearing, rather than being limited to just rebuttal or supplemental testimony. So that the request is that the Yakama Nation members, elders with knowledge of the oral traditions of the nation that are not comfortable engaging in written testimony, still be able to bring that direct testimony in the hearing itself.

And outside of that -- outside of that scope, we would -- we would be -- you know, for any other witnesses,

certainly, we're prepared to engage in the written testimony process outlined in Ms. Chase's letter.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Ms. Voelckers. If I'm understanding you correctly -- and again, please correct me if I'm wrong -- you have members of your client, Yakama Nation, who are elders, feel that it's best for them to avoid any written format or technological means to transmit their feelings, opinions and knowledge to the energy siting council, and they would like to do it by standing, personally, in front of someone, to hear what they have to say using the oral tradition of transmitting that knowledge. Is that correct?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Yes. That is, I think, a fair summary, and I would say the knowledge, that the knowledge is carried orally.

And we understand that there are -- that this is still a public proceeding, and we are just asking for the most protections possible and the most sensitivity to the sacredness of information that may be shared.

JUDGE TOREM: Yes. And I have great respect for that and want to make sure that I'm understanding what you're asking for. So if I can provide that type of venue for those elders to give their testimony and transmit that knowledge for the council's consideration, we can.

Would there be a need, in that presentation, for

an interpreter, or would the Yakama elders be speaking in a language that the council could understand?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Your Honor, Shona

Voelckers again. I would anticipate that our witnesses

would speak both in English and in their own language, but
that we would not be requesting an interpreter.

JUDGE TOREM: In my experience as a judge and working with court reporters over the years, the record that's created would only be in English. So that portion of the oral history and knowledge that's given in any language other than English, particularly if not using an interpreter, would be lost to the record for appeal in this matter, unless you can come up with some other way and recommendation for it to be captured.

In my creative mind, I could see a video being made; however, I understand that capturing live images of some first nations or tribal members might be seen as offensive. I don't know the traditions of the Yakama tribe, and I can't pretend to guess what they might be, so I will need your help in trying to determine if in-person testimony is permitted and if an oral presentation from a Yakama elder is permitted, how that can be captured for all that may not be present for the original talk and may not be able to review a video or a transcript of it if it's done in a language other than English.

Ms. Voelckers, do you understand the dilemma that an ALJ trying to put together a record has with this sort of request?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. Shona Voelckers again. I do understand the dilemma. I think if it's helpful to explain it a little more, I think that where a witness wants their words translated onto the record, they will do so in English as well, and where they do not, they will choose not to translate it for us.

I am not currently working with any witnesses that cannot translate their own testimony into English if they choose to do so and would need additional time, in as we are working with folks to follow up on your question about a video recording, because each member has a different level of comfort with this process.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you. I think that's all the questions I have about the Yakama Nation's request for the reason behind the in-person testimony.

Was there anything else you think you needed to tell me and to be captured on today's record?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. Shona Voelckers again. We also anticipate that the use of exhibits will be, if not significantly, at least measurably impacted by having a remote hearing. And that's based upon our experience with these types of proceedings over the last

number of years before the pollution control hearings board and the growth management hearings board.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Understood. Fair enough. Thank you, ma'am.

I'm going to turn now to Mr. Aramburu on behalf of Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. and come back to the original question. We're still on Item No. 3 on our agenda.

Mr. Aramburu, how would your client like to see this proceeding and adjudication go forward?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Thank you, Your Honor. Richard Aramburu for Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.

We strongly support an in-person hearing for several reasons. First of all, this gives the opportunity for the public who are interested in this matter to attend without having to use all of the electronic materials and see the council in action as they are reviewing this.

The second issue, which is equally important is -is the ability to understand drawings, maps, diagrams and
other things on a limited screen. We're all, this morning,
looking at a small screen and, Judge Torem, I can read your
material, but this is a very, very large project. There
will be multiple maps. There will be multiple pictures.
There will be multiple drawings. And it is very hard to
address those issues if it is done on the small screen.

And in addition, it will be difficult for council

2.

members to pose questions of witnesses, which they are entitled to do and often do, based upon this kind of format. In prior experience in the Whistling Ridge matter, we had a large room. We had, oh, probably a 12-by-12 screen that we could put up maps, photos, even some text, pictures. And everyone could see them at the same time and the parties could ask questions about them, can use a pointer to use these materials.

So in something that is as visual as a hearing like this -- and this is a really, really big project, so just trying to portray the whole project on the screen presents its problems.

So for those reasons, we think that the in-person hearing, somewhere in the project vicinity, is appropriate and, I think, useful to the council members.

I know there's concern about travel, there's concern about time of individuals, but I think the parties would be able to get together and finely tune a schedule -- and this will be principally cross-examination -- a schedule so that time can be used efficiently during that cross-examination period.

So I've gone on a bit longer than I should, but we very much strongly support the in-person hearing.

And we also want to reserve the possibilities that maybe one or more witnesses might be able to give, on an

2.

2.2

in-person hearing, kind of a brief statement. We are -we're talking here about pre-filed direct testimony and
we're in support of that, but on certain issues -- and
there's no question that visual issues are important to
us -- it might be good -- we might ask that a witness be
allowed a presentation during the course of the hearing to
show the photographs and other visual materials as a
supplement to the testimony. So that -- that's kind of a
second reason to have an in-person hearing.

So, sorry I went on so long, but these are important concerns.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Mr. Aramburu. I thought about interjecting when you got to the testimony question, but I see how you tied it in to the overall answer on venue and what's appropriate. I do understand that for some witnesses the pictures really are worth a thousand more words, so I will take that under consideration.

So I have a tally voting of three parties wanting in person, two wanting virtual, but open to hybrid. Again, it's above my pay grade here as what's delegated authority to me to choose the venue. I know what I will lobby for is to be in person and/or have a hybrid for those that choose or are not able to travel. I want this to be as open as possible.

I personally made a promise that I hope I can

2.

follow through on, to the people of Benton County to bring the council to the county where this project is proposed, back at the informational meeting and land use hearings that, believe it or not, were at least two years ago or --well, at the end of the month it will be two years since we held those proceedings. But if you check the transcript, you'll find me having some words I may have to eat about promising to be next in Benton County.

I will talk to the chair. I will see what Chair Drew wants to do, and her decision will be final. I don't know that there is any interlocutory review once the chair of the council makes the decision, so we've created a record today. I've given all parties an opportunity. I will ask the chair to review the transcript, and then I will lobby accordingly and we'll see what we get. I'll report back when I can.

Are there any questions? I'll go around the table again about the venue question. Ms. Chase.

SPEAKER CHASE: Good morning. This is

Ms. Chase. The only comment that I would offer, Judge

Torem, is that there may also be an opportunity, and as we discuss the different issues later today, to have some of the testimony held in person; for example, the items that

Ms. Voelckers was discussing, in order to accommodate those concerns and schedule other portions of the proceeding

1 virtual or hybrid. So I'm just flagging that we may have an option 2. for some -- depending on if we stagger -- end up with 3 staggered portions of proceedings, as to how this is venued. 4 5 Thank you. 6 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Ms. Chase. 7 And I do believe that some days of hearing will better be suited for a different type of venue. Some may be 8 9 suited simply for virtual; if we have, like, opening 10 statements or some kind of arguments or a motion practice, I think we've all gotten used to, over the last two or three 11 12 years, doing things by phone, by Zoom or even by Microsoft 13 Teams when I can make it work. 14 For the county, Mr. Harper, any last comments on 15 the venue question? 16 SPEAKER HARPER: Ken Harper for the county. Thank you, Your Honor. 17 No. 18 JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Reyneveld. 19 SPEAKER REYNEVELD: I don't have anything 20 further. I agree with Ms. Chase's comments though. 21 Thank you.

JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Voelckers, anything else from the Yakama Nation?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

Nothing else at this time.

24

25

1	JUDGE TOREM: Mr. Aramburu, a last bite.
2	SPEAKER ARAMBURU: I think there are certain
3	witnesses in certain parts of the proceeding that could
4	be that could be virtual, but we think most of the
5	hearing should be in person. Thank you.
6	JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you. You've
7	been clear on that.
8	Let me give staff a chance, if they want to, to
9	chime in on anything that I may not be aware of.
10	Mr. Thompson, anything from your perspective that
11	I didn't cover on the venue question?
12	SPEAKER THOMPSON: No, nothing I can think
13	of.
14	JUDGE TOREM: All right. Anybody else from
15	staff for EFSEC that wants to jump in with a consideration
16	that I may not have brought up to the parties?
17	All right. You're going to let me go before the
18	chair myself. I appreciate that, EFSEC staff.
19	Let's move on to No. 4. We have about 15 minutes
20	before our first break.
21	If you had a chance to get today's agenda and
22	I'll read it for those who may not have it on the screen or
23	have received it:
24	Back on September 27th, the applicant for this
25	project filed what was a second extension request. And they

2.

2.2

obtained EFSEC's agreement that the processing time for their project for the Horse Heaven Wind Farm be extended out to July 8th, 2023.

That date is important, and it's important because EFSEC, under RCW 80.50, particularly section 100 -- and I'm going to say this is a notional deadline. It's when we are supposed to complete all of the review and make a recommendation to the governor within a 12-month time period, and if that doesn't occur, applicants can ask for an extension.

I'm not certain that in the history of EFSEC, any project has ever gotten through in the 12 months if it required an adjudication. Some that got expedited processing and some that had very easy-to-determine environmental impacts that had, maybe, a mitigated determination of non-significance in the SEPA review may have. But in my experience, if there's an environmental impact statement, a full EIS required under SEPA, the 12-month statutory deadline is, frankly, a legal fiction.

Nevertheless, it's important that an applicant should be able to expect EFSEC to act vigorously and promptly to get the review done. So with that in mind, once we saw that the Draft Environmental Impact statement was getting ready to be finalized and published at the end of 2022, I asked that staff survey the council members,

2.

2.2

including Mr. Brost, who is on the line today, to provide us their calendars and when they were absolutely unavailable, for the spring of this year.

Once we figured out the timeline about when this pre-hearing conference would be held, we figured the rest of March we wouldn't be holding a hearing. We asked them for April, May and June and all the way up to that July 8th notional deadline that exists now, for the application to be considered and a recommendation made to the governor.

I can't say whether July 8th is the absolute deadline. The applicant has a lot of say in that and so does the council, but that's why I have presented No. 4 in the fashion it is on your agenda.

If you look at the bullet points listing out five separate weeks, you'll see, starting in the middle of May, we have a full week and we have the following several weeks, except for the holidays of Memorial Day and Juneteenth, which fall on Monday, May 29th, for Memorial Day and Monday, June 19th, for Juneteenth, those weeks were available for most of the EFSEC council members. If an EFSEC council member is not able to attend a hearing session, we require them to read the transcript of that proceeding so that they can get the full record before we get to the part of the adjudication where the council will deliberate on all the evidence they've heard, make their evaluations and then,

2.2

ultimately, that recommendation to the governor.

Ms. Chase, can you speak a little bit to what we'll be talking about more in Item No. 6 about the schedule for pre-filed testimony and just to know what the applicant has been thinking about gathering its evidence in support of the application and when you think, realistically, the first possible date, after today, that pre-filed testimony could come in from the applicant, which would trigger some of the other -- I think 28 days later, the other parties might file responsive testimony?

So a starting point, if it's -- if it's past
May 15th for filing the testimony, clearly, the hearings
couldn't occur on or before that date.

Ms. Chase, is that clear what I'm asking, if you know?

SPEAKER CHASE: Good morning, Judge Torem.

Thank you for that framing of the issues. This is Crystal

Chase for applicant.

I think it would be -- I'm happy to answer those questions, but I think one clarification that would be helpful would be to understand the expectation of the scope of the initial round of written testimony to be presented by applicants; in other words, if that pre-filed direct testimony would be limited to sponsoring relevant sections

2.

2.2

of the application and qualifying witnesses or if you intend a greater scope.

And I ask that question only because it will help inform the answer that I give you in terms of a realistic deadline.

JUDGE TOREM: Well, Ms. Chase, as you might expect someone with a legal background: It depends. I'd like to say that the scope of what I'm asking you is at least what you said, the sponsoring various portions of the application and having the relevant witnesses. Once we really get to the end of today or maybe an additional pre-hearing conference and we've got the list of disputed issues established and either agreed to or at least ordered by me, when those are done, then we'll know what the scope of testimony supporting all of the list of disputed issues is.

So I won't hold you to your answer today, but at least as a starting point, as you said, the applicant should be prepared to sponsor testimony explaining various portions of the application and as updated, what the currently proposed project will be and all of those other environmental issues that we are pretty certain are going to be disputed or need some further testimony.

Perhaps there are some portions of the application that will stand on their own, without any testimony, and can

come in by some sort of stipulation, but for all of the statutory and regulatory rules requirements on how the record is created on which the council makes their recommendation to the governor, I'd expect the applicant to be ready to put some sort of testimony forward.

And I know Mr. McMahan has done that when I've been the judge in the Kittitas County -- two different wind farms here, and I've watched him do it in other proceedings in other parts of the state.

So with that in mind, Ms. Chase, I think you know at least a minimum of what you're going to be putting forward; when would that be ready?

SPEAKER CHASE: Sure, Judge Torem. So I would say the week of April 3rd we could certainly have that ready. I was thinking about the prior week, but I know that it is spring break for some folks and I want to be cognizant of witness availability and not imposing on pre-scheduled vacations for others.

JUDGE TOREM: Well, I'm gratified to hear that the month, at least, of April, and you gave me an early time in April for that. Thank you.

Do you think that anybody else will be filing materials in support of the application along with the applicant? Are there any other parties, Ms. Chase, that you're aware of that you'll be having, or is the applicant

2.

2.2

essentially carrying the water on this and it would be all of their witnesses and the other four parties will be in response to varying issues per their own interests?

SPEAKER CHASE: So, Judge Torem, this is

Ms. Chase, and I anticipate that applicant would likely be
the only party that needs that category. I don't want to
preclude any other party that may have a different view from
speaking for themselves, but that's what I would anticipate,
given our discussions today.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. And when I come around to each party, when they have an issue they're proponent of, I'm sure they'll let me know. But I'm certainly not expecting necessarily, given what I've read in the petitions for intervention and the notices of party participation.

All right. April 3rd. If we look at that -Ms. Chase, can you call my attention back to where the time
intervals were in the letter? I think it's on the top of
page two of the March 1st letter from your office.

SPEAKER CHASE: Yes, that's correct. So the proposed intervals were 28 days for reply testimony and 21 days for rebuttal testimony. And I'll just add that I think the parties -- I know that, um -- and be included in the March 9th letter, as well, that I think the parties would appreciate clarification on when a party who is a proponent

of a specific issue, but perhaps not in support of an application, at what point in time in that three-tiered process they would be expected to submit their testimony.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you,

Ms. Chase.

2.2

So for the other parties that are keeping score at home here, as I look at my calendar, if April 3rd is a Monday and notionally, if we set that as a deadline for submission of pre-hearing and pre-filed testimony from the applicant, based on whatever list of disputed issues we can get done, 28 days later would be May the 1st and 21 days following that would be May the 22nd.

So we go back to our agenda and the time period, the May 1st deadline, I think -- Mr. Aramburu, I'm looking at your notice of unavailability. Yours would have started on May 8th to 18th, and you requested that -- not having to respond to anything during that period.

If I can keep the reply testimony deadline on or before May 8th, then perhaps we won't have to worry about that first block of time when you can't respond to things, Mr. Aramburu. Is that correct?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Yes. We have some other concerns about the schedule, but yes. And I apologize; we have preset times to be out of the office here on the dates we have, so if something came in before my schedule --

- scheduled time out of the office, then I think the problem I
 have with that is that if something comes in -- so
 April 3rd -- so May 1st would be the time schedule then for reply?
 - JUDGE TOREM: Yes, Mr. Aramburu. I'm just doing the math on the 28 days that was set out in that letter from Stoel Rives dated March 1st.

What I'm frankly thinking, sir, is that the April 3rd date, early as it is, may not be realistic. That might even slide by seven days or thereabouts. Maybe it only slides by four days, to the end of the week. If we have to conduct another pre-hearing conference in this matter, which I fully expect, depending on the timing of that and the finalizing of the disputed issues list, the applicant's filing of the testimony would then trigger response or reply need from all the other parties, including Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.

So I'm just thinking about all those issues out loud here; always dangerous. But it gives us something to work with today. Understood?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: If you're still speaking with me, Mr. Torem, yes, that timing is understood. We have some very serious concerns about the schedule though.

JUDGE TOREM: Correct. I'm just getting the notional things out there, so then we have, probably after

the break, Mr. Aramburu, all those other issues can be aired out. And I'm not pretending those are going to be simple, whatsoever.

All right. So, Ms. Chase, on my notepad here I've got April 3rd to May 1st, to May 22nd interval, and in more full answer to your other question, what does that mean for the other parties, my thought is if the applicant were to file first on whatever interval date we choose, then 28 days later, if it's acceptable to all, on this calendar, May 1st, reply testimony would come in on the issues for each party on which they want to respond to any or all of the applicant's testimony. And then in the next interval, 21 days later, it would simply be the applicant responding to all of the reply testimony and, perhaps, other parties responding to each other if they differ.

For instance, Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. may take a different position on something than Benton County and they only see each other's testimony on that second filing date. Perhaps the Yakama Nation files their testimony, knowing also that it's going to be supplemented, if allowed, by oral testimony and oral history, and they may be able to give us a preview of what that is, but when they see other parties' reply testimony, they may also wish to file the rebuttal testimony to other parties.

So it gets a little bit convoluted, but for a full

2.

due process in this kind of complex litigation, that's the kind of thing that may happen once we open this can of worms and let the first round of testimony come in. We know who is expected in the second, but the third round can typically be a little unpredictable. Sometimes that results in motion practice to strike things that may not be seen as relevant by another party, and that's where my job gets a little bit more difficult. But that's why I love this stuff.

So it is now 9:51. I promised to break. Hold all the thoughts you have, please, on scheduling and the intervals, and I'll ask, Ms. Allison, if we come back at 10:00 on the nose and do a quick roll call, will that be satisfactory to you?

COURT REPORTER: That's fine.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. So we're going to take a brief recess. Please mute your phones so that no undue noise comes through, and we'll come back on; I'll make sure everybody's back at 10:00. Thank you.

(Recess 9:51-10:00 a.m.)

JUDGE TOREM: I'm now going to do a quick roll call as we come back from the second hour of our first pre-hearing conference and just put those that identified for the parties as a speaking role; see if they're still here.

Crystal Chase.

SPEAKER CHASE: Good morning. This is 1 2 Ms. Chase. I'm still here. 3 JUDGE TOREM: Kenneth Harper for Benton 4 County. 5 SPEAKER HARPER: Ken Harper for Benton County 6 is present. Thank you. 7 JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Reyneveld, Counsel for the Environment. 8 9 SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Sara Reyneveld, Counsel 10 for the Environment present. Thank you. 11 JUDGE TOREM: Shona Voelckers for the Yakama 12 Nation. 13 SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Shona Voelckers for the Yakama Nation present, as well as my colleagues. 14 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. And for Tri-Cities 15 16 C.A.R.E.S. is Mr. Richard Aramburu. 17 SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Your Honor, Richard Aramburu here for Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. 18 19 JUDGE TOREM: All right. And I'm not going 20 to call all of the staff members again for EFSEC. I've been 21 kind of communicating with them offline. 22 Let's pick up where we were on the scheduling 23 questions. I think where we left off was just trying to 24 sort out what would have to be built in before we could 25 possibly do the adjudication, and that would be the filing

2.2

of testimony, maybe some motion practice and some other things, and at a minimum, it looked like that could be done by May 22nd. That would be the earliest possible date, maybe by May 30th, if we shifted the testimony filing dates out or expanded them some. But it sounds like no hearing time could possibly be scheduled until, at least, the week of May 22nd, more likely after Memorial Day.

And, Mr. Aramburu, I do note that you have a conflict immediately of that Memorial Day week, so not saying anything will be scheduled, just saying those are the notional things and there are many more factors to take into account before we pick any more hearing dates.

I want to go, at this point then, and talk,

Ms. Chase, with the applicant on its thoughts and concerns,

other issues that I should be taking into account as we set

up the hearing dates, and then I'll do the same for all

other four parties.

So, Ms. Chase, what are the applicant's thoughts on scheduling, given what we've just talked about for the other requirements?

SPEAKER CHASE: Sure. Thank you, Judge. This is Ms. Chase.

I think, first -- I think Mr. McMahan and I were conferring during the break, and we realized we had inadvertently lined up all the potential deadlines to be on

2.

2.2

Mondays and that it may be more humane for everybody involved to have those in the middle of the week or at the end of the week. So I'll just flag that, and I think that was reflected maybe in some of your comments about how those were the earliest possible dates, but it may be that we adjust them by a few days here and there.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay.

SPEAKER CHASE: So with that, I think for applicant, we would like to make sure that there is a deadline built in by which parties would need to file motions, strike any testimony to which we objected and time for resolution of that prior to the pre-hearing conference -- or, I'm sorry, prior to the hearing itself. I think that's similar -- or I was looking at the Kittitas order that you cited in your agenda for that -- that concept, and that's where I'm drawing that from. So I think that's one consideration.

And then another consideration that the applicant would like to discuss is whether it makes sense to tier consideration of some of the issues in terms of the hearing date or the filing deadlines; specifically, whether it makes sense to have a separate set of deadlines for a land use adjudication, as opposed to the other issues that the parties may raise.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. So I think I understand

1	fully the second portion about maybe separating the land use
2	and then the conditional use permit issues from the other
3	items.
4	Restate for me that first concern again and you
5	referenced the Kittitas Valley order.
6	I'm going to ask the staff to see if they can
7	solve that echo.
8	Ms. Chase, let's see if we can get you unmuted and
9	answer about that first item that the applicant was raising.
10	SPEAKER GRANTHAM: Judge Torem, this is
11	Andrea Grantham with EFSEC staff. I went ahead and muted
12	both of the phone numbers that called in, but I believe
13	Ms. Chase was one of those. If they want to, they can
14	unmute using star 6 or pound 6.
15	JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Ms. Grantham. Maybe
16	we'll hear Ms. Chase's voice here shortly.
17	SPEAKER CHASE: Are you able to hear me now?
18	SPEAKER GRANTHAM: Yes.
19	JUDGE TOREM: Yes.
20	SPEAKER CHASE: Great. Thank you.
21	So, Judge Torem, I apologize for any confusion
22	there. I can answer your question about that first concern.
23	JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Go ahead.
24	SPEAKER CHASE: It is it's simply that the
25	case schedule should include a deadline by which parties who

2.2

wish to file a motion to strike any pre-filed testimony would have the opportunity to do so and an opportunity for a response. And so what I'm proposing is similar to what's laid out on page nine of the Kittitas scheduling order.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. I think, honestly, in my multi-tasking, my ears just didn't pick up some of what you were putting down there.

SPEAKER CHASE: No problem. I think I explained it more clearly the second time.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. Mr. Harper, let me come around to you at Benton County and see, just generally, where you are, having heard my comments and discussion with Mr. Aramburu to some extent and now from Ms. Chase, on scheduling for the county's needs.

SPEAKER HARPER: Right. Thank you, Your Honor. Ken Harper for Benton County.

On scheduling issues, Your Honor, I guess I want to split my comments into two categories. One, I think the county is likely to share what you're probably going to be hearing from Mr. Aramburu when we turn to sort of more of a date-setting range sort of concept, because we do have some serious concerns about the viability of a set date right now.

Setting that aside, not trying to go too much further afield into that area, the other concern I've got

2.

with the proposal from the applicant is that when we were coordinating earlier on these topics in our letter, I think the expectation of the county, at least, was that it would be likely that the sort of sequence of events would be worked backward from the actual set date of the hearing.

That isn't to say that it isn't perfectly viable to do it this way, but what it does lead to is just simply the reality of a set of materials coming in possibly as soon as April 3rd.

And to Ms. Chase's point regarding availability, I can tell you that at least in some parts of the state, the first week of April is spring break and so that makes it very difficult to imagine coordinating what could be a very intensive effort in a very short period of time and, in fact, perhaps even shorter than the 28 days might nominally suggest.

And I'm very concerned about that, Your Honor, because it wouldn't just be a matter of spring break on the calendar. It would be a matter of the existing workflow obligations of witnesses and counsel and party representatives, which can be much more easily managed and kind of integrated with new expectations if those things are all set somewhat out.

But if these things are likely to be occurring as soon as the first week of April, I can just foresee that

2.

that 28-day period is not -- is not functionally usable as a 28-day period. It may actually turn out to be a 20-day period or 15-day period, and that starts to seem like it's not necessarily consistent with what the parties were thinking with the 28-day interval when we collaborated in our earlier letter to you. And certainly, it does start to raise questions about the fairness and the ability, at least of my client, to respond. That being said, if that April 3rd date shifts, then I think some of those concerns are significantly ameliorated.

So, Your Honor, I'd like to speak to, sort of, the setting date in general terms. So I'm going to hold that, because that's not what you're asking about right now, and if you have any further questions about our concern about the specific April 3rd date, I'd be happy to take those.

As to Ms. Chase's point regarding potential interim events within that initial period, motions to strike, possibly tiered presentations, I think I'm agnostic on that. I understand some benefit to that. I don't think I have a strong position one way or the other there, Your Honor.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you, Mr. Harper, and I appreciate all that you said.

I wonder if somewhat, you know, many of the concerns would persist even if we had April 10th be the date

and then a 28-day period from there. So we'll see what we can do about the start date.

As far as working backwards from a set hearing date and working the calendar from there, in my experience, not only in scheduling matters like this, but just 20-some years of being an administrative judge, I like to know what I'm trying to fit into the five-pound bag, and if I have ten pounds' worth to put in it, picking a set date and then putting two bags in front doesn't seem to help.

So right now I'm just trying to figure out what kind of interval has to occur before the hearing date and today's date, and it sounds like, at the very least, I've got nearly two months for testimony to -- once it's -- the first round comes in, for the last round to come in. And I need time ahead of that for the first round to be filed.

That may be a month from now, so we're talking about a 90-day period or so for evidence development and then a round of motions. So that's where my complication is. Before I pick a date, I've got to pick it far enough out.

And as I mentioned earlier, the concern where Scout Clean Energy has the application extended for consideration only to July 8th. As we sit here today, if we count back from July 8th three months, that gets us to about April 8th and these are the dates we're talking about

starting the filing of pre-hearing testimony.

So once again it looks as though the July 8th date, if that's the end date, if we were going to stick with that -- and Ms. Chase and Mr. McMahan are certainly gritting their teeth wondering what they have to tell their client about EFSEC's ability to meet this 12-month schedule which is now already at, I think, probably 24 to 36 months, that July 8th date, if it has to move, they only want to move it the smallest possible amount out to the right on the calendar.

And that's why, Mr. Harper, I'm trying to get a realistic discussion of all of the things that need to be packed into that five-pound bag I mentioned before I pick a date for the hearing, that tries to comply with the July 8th deadline for -- imagine this -- even after a hearing, having deliberations and writing an order that has to be reviewable by the Supreme Court of this state; so to give this a quality and thorough evaluation, all the things I'm trying to consider and recognize today for all the parties as we just talk about the scheduling, let alone everybody's sincere concerns about the issues presented by the proposed project.

Mr. Harper, anything further, having heard that little spiel?

SPEAKER HARPER: No. No, Your Honor. In

2.2

fact, what you just said is exactly what I was sort of thinking as I was making my comments, because I appreciate what you're trying to accomplish and the way you're going about it.

And I don't mean to throw us in a different direction, and that's why I said, if it -- if it is important, as obviously you've indicated, to work forward from essentially present day, we'll make it work. I would just appreciate some consideration for trying to manage this -- again, this fairly intense series of events on a very short time frame, far shorter than at least I was anticipating.

JUDGE TOREM: I think it was the lyrics in a song from Smokey and the Bandit back in the day about a long way to go and a short time to get there. So we're going to do what needs to get done with all due respect to those things.

All right. Mr. Harper, you can tell, as I moved to Ellensburg five years ago, in this town we say, It's not my first rodeo.

Ms. Reyneveld, what does CFE think about all the scheduling?

SPEAKER REYNEVELD: I think we're generally agreeable to the scheduling outlined. I think we would share Mr. Harper's concerns with coordinating expert

2.

2.2

testimony or potential expert testimony and response to the applicant's testimony in such a short window of time without sufficient notice to coordinate if the clock kind of starts ticking on April 3rd. And that's particularly true if we have another pre-hearing or multiple pre-hearing conferences in which we're still working on finalizing the disputed issues, because I think it's important to establish those sufficiently kind of before we start the schedule, and it is March 10th.

So that being said, in terms of the specific hearing dates that were proposed, I am not available on May 15th or on June 20th, so that's just something to note for the record on those weeks.

And then I would also agree with the affirmation in regards to -- I believe it was the Yakama Nation that expressed, kind of, a preference for maybe separate adjudication of land use and conditional use and then other issues -- or no, I'm sorry. That was Ms. Chase for the applicant.

So I guess those were -- those are generally our thoughts.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Well,
Ms. Reyneveld, I was hoping, as Counsel for the Environment,
you would use your statutory powers to select experts who
didn't have any other personal life and could just be at the

1 beck and call of the council.

SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Unfortunately, that is not the case. I do not have that sort of power. I wish I did.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. I will pull my tongue back from the cheek and we will continue with the realities that we're faced with in scheduling.

Let me come around to the Yakama Nation and Ms. Voelckers. Speaking to what you've already heard and, kind of, the outline of dates we have, what are the Yakama Nation's thoughts on scheduling?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. Shona Voelckers for Yakama Nation.

A couple thoughts. First, with fully understanding the timing constraints that you are working with and -- candidly, I do not believe we can give this project its full due by scheduling a hearing on such a tight schedule.

I would say that we, I think as a group, discussed in our first meeting last week, and I think it still, to me, is a live question and would appreciate direction. I hear the discussion with what sounds like an assumption that the direct testimony that Ms. Chase says that she will be prepared to file in just three weeks would all be on the applicant to bring that direct testimony. And that was a

question that we raised, as a group, in the letter on whether the other parties who are bringing specific disputed issues, whether they would be the ones to bring direct testimony with regard to those specific issues.

And so it's a little hard for me to speak on the -- on that proposed schedule without that clarification. And if it is the applicant that's only responsible for bringing their testimony in three weeks, then that would be helpful to know. It feels hard to fully respond without having the issues in front of us, and I understand that that is something that we're going to work through, but especially if we may be having a second hearing to do that, again, I just respectfully -- this seems really ambitious.

The last thing I would say, and we raised this and I know -- I'm sure that Your Honor is planning to address this, but we raised this with Benton County in our joint issue statement that we filed yesterday, and I think that the question of the schedule is tied to the special procedural question on whether this adjudication can really proceed without further progress on the SEPA process.

So I will just mention that for now, since I know that that's not the direct question to me at this time.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Thank you,

Ms. Voelckers.

First off, again, I want to say I wasn't a part of

the collaboration, obviously, between the parties. I appreciate that they followed my direction and everybody did get together and hash things out as far as was done before today's pre-hearing conference. That helps to crystalize everybody's mind around just how ambitious this project is and just how complex an EFSEC adjudication can be when there are so many, at least as I anticipate, disputed issues.

As to the filing schedule, the reason I've taken it today from applicant and everybody else responding is maybe just from my personal experience with this in the past and my looking at this as a burden of proof and a burden of production question, it's the applicant that is making this proposal to the council to have a recommendation made to the governor. And I would think -- again, I'm open to other ideas -- that the applicant carries the water first, and then everybody knows what they need to respond to.

The Yakama Nation will raise its own issues and be treated as though it's direct testimony, not necessarily all having to be responsive to the applicant, but you'll see what issues the applicant raises. And certainly, independently, you'll set your own scope, based on the scope of your intervention, to file direct testimony that can just be on behalf of the Yakama Nation, and that would apply to any of the other three parties that are not the applicant.

I hope that clarifies a little bit what's going on

2.

2.2

there. Everybody has independent, full-party status, but the burden of proving that the applicant -- application should get favorable recommendation and that all of the appropriate mitigation that might be recommended through the course of SEPA and other adjudicative processes really falls on the applicant. They're the reason we're here, and frankly, they're the ones that are funding most of this. So they don't get any extra points because they're in that position, but it's just another factor I and the council need to take into consideration as we go forward.

Ms. Voelckers, does that help on that point?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Your Honor, this is Shona
Voelckers. Thank you. That's very helpful, and I would -I appreciate the clarification.

I would add then that our request is that this be framed in the same way that it was framed in Order 790 so that it's clear the applicant's pre-filed testimony is the first one due.

I would also just again, given that our group's discussion on the 28 deadline was last week, before we knew when the project applicant was going to propose bringing their testimony. I would advocate for more time as is reflected in that Order 790, which was a smaller project than this one and has a -- more than a month between the applicant's pre-filed testimony and other parties' pre-filed

2.2

testimony deadlines in that case.

JUDGE TOREM: All subject to discussion and consideration. Thank you.

On the question you raised about SEPA -- and I want to invite a full discussion with the other parties on this, so I'm not asking for anybody that speaks after you to come back on the SEPA question. I will say that WAC 463-47-060 addresses some of the typical concerns where folks don't understand, typically, or are not familiar with because it happens so infrequently. EFSEC adjudications are not about SEPA questions. The adjudication is a separate parallel track to what's going on with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the comment period on that that recently closed.

I'll admit that starting the adjudication, in my mind, would be premature if not informed by at least a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and that's why I pushed in the background to wait for this day and the petitions for intervention until there was something more in the public sphere than just the application for site certification. Having a Draft Environmental Impact Statement out after a full comment period and investigation by the contractor hired by EFSEC to do that work helps flesh out a number of issues that weren't immediately obvious in the original application for site certification.

2.2

That said, SEPA's a separate track, and if you look at 46-347-060 (2), the administrative code that's been adopted and been essentially the law, for lack of a better word, for years says the council may initiate an adjudicative proceeding required by 80.50.090 prior to completion of even the draft EIS. Environmental Impact Statement, quite frankly, is not going to happen in this case and it has not happened in past adjudications, including the Kittitas Valley case. That horse has left the barn and I think that the Supreme Court has already ruled on that.

If there's motion practice to be had on that to create a record for purposes of preserving that issue for further appeal, I have no problem with that. I understand that clients have legal interests that need to be raised at the trial level if they're to be preserved for appeal, but I want you to expect that given what the law is and EFSEC's previous experience and what the Supreme Court has said the law at 80.50 is, we're not going to spend an undue amount of time on that creating a record. It may simply be by written brief and a brief order that tells you again, in writing, what the law is.

But as you'll see, on Item -- I think it's No. 7 on our list, under Civil Rule 11 you've got to have a really good reason to file something and a good explanation if you

2.

2.2

think you're going to move to change existing law. And I will hold you to that, even if the civil rules don't directly apply in an administrative procedures act adjudication, as this will be held under RCW 34.05. I'll give you some -- some slack, some leeway on raising issues even if they're not currently permitted under the current state of the law of the State of Washington, but we'll raise them and we'll dispense with them quickly.

I'm not empowered, as an ALJ, to change the law and counsel's bound by the law. The governor, up to you on what you want to raise for Governor Inslee to consider. So take a look at that and also take a look at 80.50.090(4), paragraph A, which lays out that the purpose of this adjudication is to hear from persons in support or opposition to the application on specific issues. And then again, we'll have a public hearing for those members of the public that want to comment outside of what we're going to adjudicate as parties.

So, Ms. Voelckers, I hope that answers the mail a little bit on the question of where we are with the SEPA process. And I'm sure you will have opinion that I will let the tribe and the Yakama Nation get those in writing in more detail. Today's not the day for us to litigate it, but I did just want to tee up where I'm coming from as the presiding officer from this. And I'm sure there will be

2.

2.2

disagreements, perhaps, with the substance of what I said and maybe the tenor of it, but for today, that's where I'm coming from and I just wanted to be fully transparent and clear with you and your client and all of the parties that might have SEPA concerns, that the adjudication is a separate process, outside of SEPA.

Ms. Voelckers, I guess it's only fair after that rant to give you a chance to respond.

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

Shona Voelckers with a brief response. We really appreciate that the adjudication is moving forward separately from the SEPA. Given WAC 463-47-020's express incorporation of the SEPA regulations that we put in our letters, as well as others, we request that there be a briefing schedule set on this issue. Thank you.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. And again, a briefing schedule is probably what's going to be appropriate, as I said, to raise all these issues at the hearing adjudication or trial level, however you want to look at it. Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Aramburu, on the scheduling question that we started here at the top of the hour and ended at the last session, what does Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. want to bring to my attention?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Judge Torem, Rick Aramburu

for Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.

Three issues here; first, the question of whether the adjudication can proceed in the absence of a final Environmental Impact Statement. That's an issue we're concerned with as well.

JUDGE TOREM: Yes, Mr. Aramburu. I'll just ask you to be brief on that.

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: We will follow the -- we will follow the briefing schedule as it's set, but we believe that's a motion that needs to be heard.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. You had two other points.

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: So secondly, this question about who submits testimony and when, there may be circumstances in which a party who seeks to carry a burden of proof on an issue needs to present testimony, original direct testimony, not in rebuttal, and I will just give you a brief example which will probably play out here.

Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S., as the applicant knows, is very concerned with esthetic issues here and believes that conditions should be set regarding the esthetic impact of this project. And we will argue that certain things should happen with regard to this project as a result of that testimony.

So the testimony coming in would really be kind of

direct testimony from us, not necessarily in rebuttal to the testimony from the applicant. And so it may be appropriate in certain circumstances that direct testimony be submitted on those issues, because the testimony on visual issues, we don't know what they're going to say, but it may not be strictly rebuttal testimony. It may be testimony that is original testimony not going to rebuttal, and that may be true for other issues as well. So I think we need to kind of address that issue as well in terms of the scheduling.

We also have a concern, and I just want to express it now, as well, that the draft impact statement did not consider the amended ASE that came in -- it's a little unclear when it came in. Counsel seems to think it came in on January 3rd. So that is another SEPA issue probably subject to a briefing schedule. So I guess my suggestion on that score would be that you set up a briefing schedule for the SEPA issues, and we can get those aired out at this point.

The third question is whether there would be a separate proceeding on the land use issues. I know that's occurred in other cases. I don't necessarily have a strong feeling about that, but that has occurred in other matters.

So those would be our three comments.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Mr. Aramburu. I am definitely open -- maybe not to calling it a separate

proceeding, but on having topic-specific dates scheduled for the various issues that are going to be raised so that perhaps -- I wouldn't call it bifurcating the hearing in any way, shape or form because it will all be going under the umbrella of the adjudication, but having topic-specific or issue-specific dates or perhaps a series of dates makes sense to me for segregating out those witnesses that have nothing to do with environmental impacts, but are simply there for the land use aspects or some other example that's bound to come up.

And again, as I think I said to Benton County on the scheduling issue, as well as the Yakama Nation, I share your view that as much as the applicant has the burden of proof and persuasion on getting the project to a favorable recommendation to the governor, it can be direct testimony that comes in from the other parties. Just because we've talked about direct reply and rebuttal, I think again, as lawyers, we appreciate the technical meaning of those terms and it's -- in this context, I'm not trying to imply any granular meaning on those, other than everybody gets the chance to present their case and, as parties, has a chance to present their full case. And that's how I'm going to approach it, Mr. Aramburu, regardless of, kind of, the labels we've kicked around informally this morning.

I hope that addresses at least some of the

concerns on that topic. What do you think?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: I think that would be perhaps a good idea. Certain issue would be considered at certain times and witnesses and all the witnesses who presented on that subject would be heard at one time. That might help focus the council in its deliberations and not have an extended time between subject matter for the council's review.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Sounds good.

Ms. Chase, I think it was you -- maybe it was somebody else -- that referenced Order 790 and a particular part of that order that you found potentially transferable to this case. And I thought someone said page 11, but I'm -- maybe I do have 11 pages.

Call my attention back to where we were looking at that.

SPEAKER CHASE: Sure. Judge Torem, I was looking at page nine -- I apologize if I misspoke -- and paragraph 4, motions to strike pre-filed testimony.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. I have that in front of me now.

SPEAKER CHASE: And then I also think that paragraph 2 is helpful in terms of the schedule for pre-filed testimony, in the sense of addressing some of the issues that Ms. Voelckers and Mr. Aramburu raised of having

other parties who want to submit pre-filed direct testimony have a deadline by which they are required to do that.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. See, my memory of what happened many years ago in Ellensburg was right, but I had not been able to find that page with all the other multi-tasking going on. Thank you for helping me with that.

So for all the other parties that haven't had a chance, having just got the agenda this morning and my reference of Order 790 somewhere -- I think it was on page three of the agenda for -- under item 7. That order gives you an idea, at least, of how I've done this in the past. I'm open to suggestions for improvement always.

But that should also, Mr. Aramburu, answer some of the mail that you and other parties that are not the applicant have raised this morning.

So let me sum up where we're at. We're at 10:35. We've talked a little bit about the challenges of trying to get things scheduled with an existing July 8th deadline for the extension of the application at this point to that date. As well as your calendars, we've also talked a little bit about the desire for pre-filed testimony and how long it takes to get things to work and to have a good, substantive presentation ready for the council members to review, to hear and otherwise. And we've talked a lot about how that should be done, whether in-person, hybrid or the preferences

2.2

for virtual as currently stands with the direction from our chair.

Let's -- I can't tell you -- I don't want to set a date today, but I do want to, at this point, do what I think is maybe some low-hanging fruit. Our filing requirements, as I shift to No. 5 -- and we're not done with No. 4; we're going to circle back when we're under No. 6 and 7. On Item 5 about filing requirement, the EFSEC procedural rules, as they still stand from pre-Covid, require a lot of things to be filed and copies made in paper.

And I know that helps for some. I've resisted printing out a lot of things today, for lack of printer ink and also environmental sensitivity, I'm not sure in which order. As an old-school lawyer, paper's still great, but only to a certain extent, and the burden of filing pre-filed testimony with 12 or 14 copies would clear forests, I think, in a case like this.

Do any of the parties feel strongly that we must require service with paper copies from you to all of the other parties, knowing that if I do, the burden will be equal on all of you if you have to file multiple copies with the council and multiple copies with the parties?

I'm going to start with the applicant and just ask about the question about electronic versus paper. And before I do, I want to see if Ms. Masengale is available to

talk a little bit about the electronic filing and the requirement for using the specific EFSEC email box that we set up for this and, frankly, her experience that not everybody has been doing that so far in the process.

Ms. Masengale, are you available?

SPEAKER MASENGALE: I am. Thank you, Judge Torem.

So again, this is Lisa Masengale for EFSEC. I would just remind everyone and respectfully request that any email communications, whether it's filings, letters to Judge Torem, et cetera, that they please copy the adjudication email that was laid out in the order commencing agency adjudication.

We are having instances where copies are maybe going to other EFSEC staff, but are not actually -- or going just directly to Jon Thompson and the judge, but are not actually going to the adjudication email. And in order for us to officially receive and process those as records, it's really important that you please copy that adjudication email.

So thank you very much.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you,

Ms. Masengale. And I think you actually sent me an email on
the call here. I'm wondering where one of the letters is,
one of the parties we've been talking about today.

So I'll send that over to you as soon as I can identify it, and that way you'll have a copy. But again, formally, parties sending it to everybody else on an all-party email and sending it to me, I certainly appreciate, but please put this EFSEC -- or adjudication@EFSEC.law.gov email together, and that will guarantee that Ms. Masengale knows what's going on, as well, and we go from there.

All right. Let me come to you, Ms. Chase, and see if there is input on that as well as the electronic versus paper copies.

SPEAKER CHASE: Thank you, Judge, and thank you, Ms. Masengale, for that clarification on how the parties are to address correspondence. We'll be sure to do that going forward, to use that adjudication email box. That was really helpful for us to hear that from you.

In terms of your question, Judge Torem, about email copies, we're fine with dispensing with paper filing requirements and using email copies. I think what we would propose is if the parties confer and settle on a firm list serve of whose emails for each firm should receive those, including if there's, for example, a designated support staff person who should be included and --

JUDGE TOREM: Pardon me just a second,

Ms. Chase. Whatever you said after that "firm list serve,"

2.

2.2

at least on my end, came out garbled. I want you to repeat that, if possible, so the court reporter has it fully clear. I'm not sure if her audio had the same problem as mine.

SPEAKER CHASE: Happy to do so.

So we're happy to dispense with paper filing requirements on behalf of the applicant. In terms of electronic requirements, our proposal would be that the parties confer and applicant is happy to leave these discussions to generate an agreed upon list serve of who all the lawyers at the firm and any support staff at the relevant firms may be who should be copied on any particular filing. And then we'll have one uniform set of addresses that everyone can work from for all filings, which will, of course, include the adjudication filing address.

JUDGE TOREM: I'm going to ask if Joan Owens from EFSEC staff is still on the line. Ms. Owens?

She might be on mute. She might not have been able to stay for the whole conference.

The reason I called for Joan just now, because in the lead-up today, Ms. Chase, we were trying do the same sort of question about, where are we sending out, like, today's pre-hearing conference agenda, what kind of list did we need. So she had developed a listing, as well, for the applicant for Benton County for Counsel for the Environment, for the Yakama Nation and for Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.

2.2

And so, like, Mr. Aramburu has two different email addresses that she has listed, and Counsel for the Environment has not only Ms. Reyneveld's address, but also a Julie Stoloff (phonetic) and a couple of other -- well, one other email address there.

I think working with Ms. Owens as the parties develop their own agreed list of who gets served if we go with electronic service will help make sure who else on EFSEC's staff should get served those documents in addition to the copy that's going to be required for the adjudication address. So I will let Ms. Owens know, if she's not listening now, that I'm dragging her into the midst of this establishing the filing list. And if she's not the correct point person, we'll establish who is to work with the parties.

SPEAKER MASENGALE: Judge Torem, this is Lisa Masengale at EFSEC. I actually compiled that list, so -- and that was based on the email addresses that were provided by the parties in their initial filings.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you,

Ms. Masengale. I wasn't sure -- I think I got that from

Joan last night when we were getting ready to send out the

pre-hearing conference -- or the preliminary order on

intervention. So thank you for the clarification. You may

very well be the person monitoring those things, so if you

are, excellent. 1 2 All right. Turning to the next party, Mr. Harper, 3 you're up on this question of paper and electronic copies. SPEAKER HARPER: Your Honor, Ken Harper for 4 5 the county. We would be happy to facilitate and coordinate in any way electronic filing and service and dispense with 6 7 paper. JUDGE TOREM: All right. 8 Thank you. 9 Ms. Revneveld on behalf of the Environment. 10 SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Yes. So we are in 11 Counsel for the Environment has a preference for agreement. 12 electronic, both because it is less burdensome and also 13 because it is more environmentally friendly. And as Counsel 14 for the Environment, we are particularly concerned with the adverse environmental impacts of an in-person hearing that 15 16 would require the parties to produce written copies and also 17 to travel long distances just because of the climate impact. 18 So I'm definitely in favor of establishing an 19 agreed list. 20 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. For the Yakama Nation,

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. For the Yakama Nation,
Ms. Voelckers.

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. Yakama Nation strongly supports electronic service and filing.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Mr. Aramburu for

21

2.2

23

24

25

Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Electronic service and filing is fine with us.

On Mr. Thompson, as our assistant attorney general and the one that I conferred with about this last night. I think, Jonathon, that we are going to have to take a look at what the EFSEC rules are and maybe get a stipulation to the parties to differ from what the written WAC might be. So we probably just need to make sure if all parties agree -- as a judge, I'm just thinking about getting burned later if we deviate from the established WAC and some party then criticizes EFSEC for doing so, even though we might have all agreed to do so; I don't want to be accused of ultra vires activities later. But I do want to make sure that we have some mechanism, without having a formal APA rule-making, to deviate from the rules we have.

Mr. Thompson, any ideas on how we can move toward an electronic service and filing requirement and minimize or dispense with paper altogether? And if I'm putting you on the spot too much, Mr. Thompson, we can take this discussion outside the pre-hearing conference, but I'd just like your initial thoughts on the mechanism.

SPEAKER THOMPSON: Yes. Thanks, Judge Torem.

I don't think there's anything that would be

2.

2.2

required, other than what you've already heard today, which was the parties' agreement on the record of this pre-hearing conference that electronic filing is sufficient for their needs and service.

So there may be more details that would need to be worked out, I'm not sure, but I wouldn't have any concerns from deviating from the procedural rules just based on the discussion you've had today.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. As you've told me, I have to think a little bit more inside the box from time to time so I want to make sure I'm not too far outside the lines when I'm trying to be creative and do what I think is right, despite what the rules might say.

With that in mind then, I think we'll work with Masengale and EFSEC staff to develop that list that Ms. Chase first referenced, and maybe I'll have Ms. Masengale send a copy of that list to all of you today. And by the time we get around to our next pre-hearing conference, which I'm sure is going to be necessary, we can formalize that. And I might still draw up -- being a little old-school on the cover your -- well, "Cover your six" as we said in the military. I think that's acceptable in this conversation. Make sure that we have a stipulation and that representatives from each party can formally sign off on it.

So those are the ground rules for going forward in

2.

2.2

this adjudication. They may differ in another adjudication, so I just want to be specific.

We'll have the transcript from today, but if I summarize it into a quick, one-page stipulation on filing rules, I think that will give everybody a quick reference to make sure that they know what they're doing. We can append the approved service list to that stipulation and everybody will be on the same page or pages, literally, even if they're electronic.

All right. I see we are coming up on our second break. We still have a little bit of work to do, and frankly, it's the hardest part is going to be this development of disputed issues. But it may not take a lot of time today because I've read what the parties have submitted and we're nowhere near the degree of specificity and we're nowhere near the neutral tone that I'm hoping for that might be set out in orders like No. 790.

So with that in mind, I just want everybody to refresh what their thoughts on disputed issues lists are and how we're going to come up with one by agreement, between now and the next pre-hearing conference. And we'll come back at the top of the hour, at 11:00. I'm going to try to have us wrapped up by 11:30. If we need to run longer -- I know I put this on my calendar to run up until noon, but I'd prefer if we didn't. I'd rather give you the other

half-hour back, before the lunch hour, so that those of you 1 on the line can call and confer with each other about how it 2 3 went today. But we'll also be selecting another date for a 4 5 second pre-hearing conference. I think I have time the afternoon of Monday, March 20th in the afternoon, and I may 6 also have some time coming Tuesday morning, the 21st, in 7 that week. And it's possible I can also make time on 8 9 Friday, March 24th, depending on how I juggle some other 10 parts of my schedule. 11 So take a look at those dates. I may also be able to give you March 22nd. I'm just, frankly, juggling another 12 13 case there that I'm not sure how it's going to go on my 14 other job. 15 So here we are, 10:49. Ms. Allison, if we take a 16 break until 11:00, is that good for you? 17 COURT REPORTER: Yes, that's fine. Thank 18 you. 19 JUDGE TOREM: All right. With that preview 20 of issues, we'll go off the record and take a recess until 21 11:00. 2.2 (Recess 10:50-11:00 a.m.)

JUDGE TOREM: It is now 11:00. We're back

for a third hour -- hopefully, not the full hour -- with our

Horse Heaven Wind application before EFSEC.

23

24

25

1	Do we have Crystal Chase back?	
2	SPEAKER CHASE: Good morning, Judge Torem.	
3	Yes, this is Crystal Chase.	
4	JUDGE TOREM: And Kenneth Harper?	
5	SPEAKER HARPER: Ken Harper for Benton County	
6	is present.	
7	JUDGE TOREM: Sarah Reyneveld.	
8	SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Sarah Reyneveld for	
9	Counsel for the Environment is present.	
10	JUDGE TOREM: Shona Voelckers.	
11	SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Shona Voelckers on behalf	
12	of Yakama Nation is present.	
13	JUDGE TOREM: And Richard Aramburu.	
14	SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Rick Aramburu present for	
15	Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S.	
16	JUDGE TOREM: All right. I'm hoping that one	
17	of my cats is not going to make a noticeable appearance as	
18	well, but she's looking like it.	
19	Let's proceed with a question we've got here about	
20	the disputed issues. All right. Well, this is where Judge	
21	Torem puts on a little bit of a scold disappointed hat. I	
22	was really, really hoping for a better set of disputed	
23	issues by the parties today by agreement.	
24	As you can tell by the way the agenda reads, I	
25	don't think we really got that. We got some fairly vague	

2.2

ones. We got some very, very biased towards the interest of the parties' presentations. I'd love to save that kind of argument for briefing with our oral argument or written briefing. And I know everybody's passionately involved in their perspectives and the issues for which they're going to spend a lot of money and a lot of time adjudicating these issues, but when we're developing an issues list, the council has yet to form their impressions and they need to be given a clean set of issues and then evidence on which to base their opinions.

So I'm just going to ask, when you go back to collaborate further, that you keep that in mind and find those common points of agreement or just the basics of a topic so we can say, as Mr. Aramburu pointed out -- and frankly, if you look at his email -- I'm not sure, Mr. Aramburu, who all you sent it to. I think it was all parties -- that identified environmental impact issues that Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. is concerned with. That's the kind of issues we need to -- at least as a nugget to start with, and not some of these tilted questions that only have one answer. That's for a legal brief. That's not for a set of disputed issues.

So most of what I read in the submissions that came in on March 9th didn't meet the standard that I want to set out here in No. 7 on our agenda and sort of what you've

2.

already seen in Order 790 from the Kittitas Valley case from a long time ago. I still think that case carries some lessons and that the parties here will get some insight if they don't have the experience with EFSEC on how to present the issues at this stage of the proceeding.

Plenty of time for opinions and strong feelings later; I'll deal with that. But right now, as we collaborate and try to frame the issues, we need a little bit more neutrality and a little bit more common ground on just what the council needs to consider.

And I know all five parties have different approaches, different interests, and will be advocating strongly. Put off your advocacy hats for the moment, take a look at what I've recommended here, and go back to the drawing board. And hopefully, on the next round I'll get from you what I need, and we'll be able to work on the substance of them at the next pre-hearing conference.

If I don't get what I need from the parties, then I'll consult with EFSEC staff, based on your inputs, and I'll draw up a list of disputed issues and I will present it for your review. But after I take your comments on what I would draw up, that will become the ordered list of issues and subject to your interlocutory review to Chair Drew, that will be the list of issues.

So I'd much rather have the parties control the

procedures than me as the judge. I want to be much like a sports referee, where maybe I'm throwing the flag, but I don't want to influence the outcome of the game. I just want to be the gatekeeper of the evidence that comes in, and I want to make sure we all play with the agreed set of rules, and I'll call the penalties accordingly.

So I'm sure I've mixed up about 12 different analogies, but I think I've told you where I'm coming from. Let me now see what the parties think about that.

Ms. Chase, from the applicant's development of this list of issues, is there something that you want to draw my attention to that the applicant wants to present today as, yes, this is -- clearly, although you have the application, everything might be at issue. Is there something, specifically, the applicant sees and knows is going to be in dispute that should be on the issues list?

SPEAKER CHASE: Thank you. This is

No, Judge Torem. Applicant is prepared to meet its initial burden as to the application itself, but really sees this as a process by which the other parties to the proceeding identify what specific issues might be disputed. So I don't have anything specific to draw your attention to today.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Fair enough.

Ms. Chase.

2.2

1 Mr. Harper, on behalf of Benton County.

SPEAKER HARPER: Ken Harper on behalf of Benton County.

Yeah, it's been helpful to hear your remarks, certainly, Your Honor, because I did not perceive the issues list in Order 790 to be, frankly, particularly specific or targeted in a way that, I guess, seemed to track what the county thinks the actual disputed issues in this case will be.

JUDGE TOREM: I will defer to you,

Mr. Harper. That list is not as specific -- at least
identifies which portions of the environmental impacts by
name, but it doesn't have the degree of specificity the
county was filing with the tribe in its letter yesterday.

We could have more detail than 790 as long as the tones are
neutral.

So I don't mean to say you can only go as far as 790 on detail. Like I said, I've learned some things since then, and a little more specificity up front on that proceeding would have helped. So let's build on that, but it's a good starting point.

SPEAKER HARPER: Thank you, Your Honor. Ken Harper again.

I guess what I was getting at, Your Honor, is we're just trying to calibrate this as we were going, and we

1	didn't find a WAC that specifically identified how to			
2	formulate issues. And our concern was that if issues are			
3	not expressed in a way that we think captures what we want			
4	to demonstrate, then we might have boxed ourselves out in			
5	some respect.			
6	But again, Your Honor, I appreciate your comments,			
7	and we can certainly collaborate and go back and try to			
8	refine the statement further.			
9	JUDGE TOREM: All right. Well, thank you,			
10	Mr. Harper, and that's really all they are is my comments.			
11	And I don't believe there is an EFSEC rule that develops,			
12	kind of, a model standard. This is all Judge Torem flying			
13	by the seat of his pants and prior experience, so take it in			
14	the manner it's intended, just to help the parties come to			
15	some kind of agreement on what's there. I appreciate that.			
16	Ms. Reyneveld is next for CFE.			
17	SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Yes. So as an initial			
18	matter, the parties, when we conferred, did request,			
19	Judge Torem, that you provide additional direction as to the			
20	scope, specificity and neutrality of the			
21	(No audio)			
22	JUDGE TOREM: Did we lose your audio?			
23	SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Oh, can you hear me?			
24	JUDGE TOREM: Yeah. Start again. You said			
25	specificity and neutrality, and then at least on my end it			

dropped.

2.2

SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Okay. I'm sorry. So yes, I can continue.

So I think we did request additional direction as to the scope, specificity and neutrality of the disputed issues. And from Counsel for the Environment's perspective, it would be very helpful for you to provide some additional direction as to how to formulate issues, maybe a couple examples of issue statements outside of the order that you've referenced, from our perspective.

So we have not yet submitted issues because we were waiting for that guidance, but I'm happy to speak generally if it's helpful to, kind of, the general nature of the issues that we see as disputed, if that's helpful.

JUDGE TOREM: It is in its own way.

Let me digest that, and in the meantime, I'd ask Ms. Voelckers on behalf of Yakama Nation.

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor, Shona Voelckers.

We were coming at this with a similar perspective to Mr. Harper, and so this is all very helpful discussion. And I would also echo what Ms. Reyneveld had said. Our goal is that we are clear in what the questions are so that we can be preparing the right scope of evidence and witness testimony, and that's our goal.

So that was the goal in getting thoughts on paper and, certainly, we can take this feedback back with us and look forward to working with the group. But I would also appreciate any further guidance on how you see this, kind of, more general list that's in Order 790, how, as you said, improving upon what's (inaudible) so that we can identify, with more specificity, the issues and still present that in a neutral fashion.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Ms. Voelckers, I think
I'm hearing from everybody that if I would draft a couple of
issues that I would think would be suitable for the counsel,
based on just one topic, maybe that would be helpful.

Is that sort of what you're asking for as well?

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: I think that would be helpful. I mean, we're certainly committed to workshopping this as a group, and so -- and not, you know, putting this on you. So we are -- we're dedicated to workshop this as a group, but yes, if that's something you were able to provide, that would, I think, be helpful for those of us that are speaking up on the need for clarity.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Well, I'm happy to take that on, because I think if I can give you better direction on what I'm asking for, I think we were all in law school where it was the bring me another rock school or hide the ball. I'm not about that, particularly. I don't want to

waste anybody's time.

2.

2.2

So I'll give some more thought as to what it is
I'm really asking the other parties to do. I'll sit down
maybe with Mr. Thompson and some of the other staff that are
interested and draft up a sample issue.

What I'm afraid of is I don't want anybody to read too far into Judge Torem's personal styling of an issue and think, Oh, they have to all be modeled like that or, Oh, that shows -- I'm afraid it might show a bias or prejudice that could be used against me. And I'm not trying to express any bias. I want you all to know I get no vote on this Horse Heaven Wind Project or anything else. I'm simply a presiding officer making rulings on the evidence that the council has to consider.

So if I style an issue, I'm going to try to keep it as neutral and in the middle as I can, but if you pick it apart, I'm sure somebody will find a word choice or something else to say, Well, look at Judge Torem; he's leaning this way or that. I'm not. I'm really not. I don't get a vote. My opinion doesn't count, except on evidentiary rulings.

So it's a little bit of a hazard if I wade into this, Ms. Voelckers. I hope the parties appreciate that, but if that's what's going to help you and make this process easier and better and more efficient, I'll do it with those

caveats, understood by the parties, to not take any opinions or micro aggressions or whatever you can read into it too seriously. They're not intended. Maybe they're revelatory in other ways, but I just try to be of help to the parties in that regard.

Let me turn to Mr. Aramburu at Tri-Cities

C.A.R.E.S. to see -- on the issues and the statements. And again, I've given Mr. Aramburu props already for going a little bit a step behind -- or beyond what the other parties submitted. Maybe you're more along the lines of the

Order 790 level of issue statement, Mr. Aramburu, but I'll let you tell me what more you think.

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Well, I think as we do issues -- this is a suggestion of mine -- that we want to make sure the parties understand, as they hear testimony, that -- what the issues in the case are.

And so, for example, no one is going to ask EFSEC to consider whether or not -- the impacts of the Chinese balloon falling on this project are going to be. That's not going to be an issue.

JUDGE TOREM: I certainly hope not.

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Well, I'm sorry for being facetious, but it's getting towards the lunch hour.

But I think it's really a matter of notice to the other parties to make sure that we know what the subject

2.

matter is. Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S. filed 110 pages of comments on the draft impact statement, so our views on these issues are well known to the parties.

So I do think that looking at 790, that that's the kind of thing that gives us notice. And we can also use that set of issues to do the kind of thing that we were talking about before, which is maybe taking a day and saying, okay, this is going to be agriculture day. This is going to be wildlife day. This is going to be esthetics day or whatever day it's going to be that we have the witnesses on subject matter present.

So I think 790 or some version of that is fine, but again, I think it's notice to the council, to the other parties, of the issues that we're concerned with; and being too tight, as the growth board is and some of the people are, with the issues, I don't think that's appropriate here, given all the background, particularly from my client, as to what their concerns are about the project. The applicant knows perfectly well what we're worried about.

So that's my thought, and I think helpful to have some example, or if there's another pre-hearing order, Your Honor, that you could direct us to, that would be helpful as well. So that's my thoughts.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, sir. I appreciate that. And I will look for other pre-hearing conference

orders that might be a good demonstration.

Again, I did what I could with the time I had budgeted, left for this, but I think I'm going to ask the assistant attorney general, Jon Thompson, maybe one of our siting specialists, like Amy Hafkemeyer and Amy Moon, who is handling a lot of issues on the SEPA side, to sit down with me and maybe others that are interested in EFSEC staff and craft a bit of a list that I could send to all of you and go ahead and share that in the next week or so. And if I can provide it to you ahead of your next collaboration, I'm sure, chronologically, that's best. So I can get to work on that as soon as possible.

Was there anybody else that wanted to say anything more on the issues we haven't resolved today? I think if I go back over the agenda, clearly, No. 1 was easy. No. 2 was easy.

No. 3, I have your opinions and my homework to go to Chair Drew.

No. 4, on the scheduling, we know sort of where the boundaries might be now.

No. 5, I think we set up. We just needed a stipulation that I want.

No. 6, the pre-filed testimony timing, I think, got wrapped up in our discussion of No. 4 and now we're on No. 7. We're going to have to come back at a second

pre-hearing conference to handle, I guess, numbers -whatever the response is to No. 3, and that will inform how
we wrap up 4, 6 and 7.

So that's what I'm thinking the agenda for next time will be. What I find out from Chair Drew, we might even get that announced or discussed at next week's EFSEC meeting, depending on when I might have time to speak with her. If not, it will be at our next pre-hearing conference, and then we can handle the other issues that are fallout on 4, 6 and 7 on today's agenda.

Ms. Chase, was there anything else you think we needed to address today or to put on the agenda for next pre-hearing conference?

SPEAKER CHASE: No, Judge Torem. I think it would be helpful at the next pre-hearing conference maybe if you came with -- if you're able to come with a set of ideas about proposed dates that the parties can further react to in terms of really pushing us to get our schedule in place once we get our issues list in place.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. And I may be able to get that, Ms. Chase, as part of when I send out the list of specific issues, I may be able to include a separate attachment with some more realistic ideas on dates, given what I've learned from all of you today.

And on that note, for all of you on the line today

that haven't filed notices of unavailability, as

Mr. Aramburu took the liberty to do, which prompted me to

start thinking about, Gee, I wonder what the lawyers' needs

are, I'd invite you to take a look at your calendars, it

sounds like from my notes earlier, late May. And why don't

you go ahead, despite the July 8th deadline, and tell me

your availability all the way out to Labor Day and early

September, maybe through the end of September. If you have

any unavailability from late May, say Memorial Day, through

the end of September, let's get it filed so that at least I

know what your preferences are.

I am sure that when I lay all of these on a calendar together and the council's availability, we'll never be able to have a hearing that suits everybody and the dates, but I'll work to do that, my best, if you get me those dates, sooner rather than later. Today's March 10th. If I can get your notices of unavailability, at least your preliminary ones, by next Friday, that will help me to start cobbling together a schedule.

All right. Back to the original question.

Mr. Harper, I'm up to Benton County.

SPEAKER HARPER: Thank you, Your Honor. Ken Harper for Benton County.

Your Honor, I would benefit, I think, from hearing just a little bit more on issues, and I just want to ask for

2.

2.2

clarification. I'm looking at Mr. Aramburu's statement right now, and if, in fact, the level of, sort of, specificity that Mr. Aramburu submitted earlier this morning is consistent with Your Honor's expectations for formulating issues, then I certainly get it, and I can tailor the county's position accordingly.

Is that a fair read, Your Honor, on where you're coming from?

JUDGE TOREM: I'll say again, I think it's a good starting point. I'm pulling up his email again here again, Mr. Harper, to say, he says he wants to particularly emphasize certain things, like visual and esthetic resources, the impact of wildlife species and habitat. For that particular one -- again, speaking off the cuff -- if there are particular species, as opposed to just the general habitat and species question, that would be helpful.

I understand, from the environmental statements, that the Ferruginous hawk is a species of great concern for many and may be impacted by this project, as well as other raptors. But, you know, that kind of a listing or a grouping, whether it's a specific species of concern and a specific impact that might occur to that species, that would be a better granular detail so we'll know upfront what the parties are expecting.

I think in the spirit of what Mr. Aramburu said,

of the parties all knowing what the issues are, that's the ultimate goal, if that helps, Mr. Harper.

SPEAKER HARPER: It -- it does. Ken Harper again for the county, Your Honor. It does. I'm just -- I think, on behalf of the county, we felt compelled to respect your request to get issues together, but obviously, we do have an outcome that we would like and we do have a preference for a result.

So I think in formulating those issues, we were trying to be candid about the way we think those issues will be developed, but what I'm getting is that we can still do that. We just need to be a little more, I guess, as you put it, neutral or generic in how we express it.

So I think that's helpful. I'm just trying to get -- I'm trying to draw out some comments, Your Honor, so when we go to a conference of council, we'll be able to channel what you're asking for a little more precisely.

JUDGE TOREM: Always dangerous to channel the mind of Judge Torem, but I appreciate that, Mr. Harper. I think I can just ask you to put yourself in the seats of this council and say, What? How do we tee it up? And from your perspective, to get the results you want, but how do we tee up the issues in a way so that those people that have a vote on the outcomes that all of you want -- and they're disparate outcomes; let's admit it. How do we tee it up in

2.

2.2

a way that all of the evidence will get considered and they'll see it our way later?

Let me depend on your advocacy for that, but this is not the time for advocacy, so much as just getting the scope of the issues, with enough so that the council says, ah-ha. These issues, the issue statement are a good opening statement of what the evidence will show at hearing.

That's the spirit that I want you to work on the next round of collaboration, to be inclusive about the issues, flesh out things that -- by doing so you're going to find some areas where you agree. There's no way a project goes forward without a particular mitigation. Now, the degree of mitigation is something to argue about, but when you're developing the issues you'll say, On this issue, as the application stands, even the applicant might be saying, Yeah, on second thought, we want a different layout of the solar array, or we want a different spot for the battery storage, or whatever the granular detail might be, that might result in a stipulation on a particular issue because you've talked about it at this level upfront. And it will save you from having to present a witness or present briefing.

This is the time to look for those areas of agreement. I hope there will be some, minor as they might be, but something will come out of the counsel of council,

- as you put it, to result in some meeting of the minds on 1 just what the council for EFSEC needs to hear and what they 2 3 need to really cover to be fair to all of you, and the public, on what the recommendation to the governor consists 4 of when this is all said and done some months down the road. 5 Mr. Harper, anything further on channeling my mind 6 there? 7 SPEAKER HARPER: No, Your Honor. Actually --8 9 Ken Harper again for the county -- it's very helpful to hear 10 you on that. I think that will guide the attorneys quite a 11 bit. Thank you. 12 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Ms. Reyneveld, CFE, 13 anything else that we need to carry over to the next one or 14 thoughts you have? 15 SPEAKER REYNEVELD: No, nothing further from 16 Ms. Reyneveld. Thank you. 17 JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Voelckers, on behalf of Yakama Nation. 18 19 SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 Shona Voelckers. 21 First, I wanted to note that counsel for Yakama
 - Nation is available the week of March 20th, all the dates that you mentioned as a potential second pre-hearing conference.
 - Second, we will submit notice of unavailability,

23

24

25

but I want to note now that I am unavailable the last week of June.

And third, if not today -- and I understand I'm asking for something outside of your agenda, but if not today, we'd ask that the next pre-hearing conference for a discussion for any procedure that you could share about how you would like to handle discovery and subpoena practice.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Fair enough. We'll pick up discovery next time. I think -- I think Order 790, one of its topic lines was an order on discovery. That should give you some insight into what past practice has been, but no guarantee of a future performance, if you will. But I'll add that to the agenda for next time, gladly.

SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. I did see that in the order and look forward to discussing further.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. If nothing else, that will be food for thought and discussion next time,
Ms. Voelckers. Thank you.

Mr. Aramburu, any last thoughts on agenda items for next time or anything else we need to cover today, besides picking a new -- next date for another pre-hearing conference?

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: So on the next pre-hearing conference, March 20 is open for us. March 21 is not.

2.

There may be some depositions that land in that week, but right now I'm available on the 20th and not the 21st.

So I think that there is an issue that I think the parties ought to consider here is -- I'm looking at the processes and procedures found in Order 790, and quite frankly, I'm not sure we can do this and get a council decision by July 9. That just seems very difficult, given the circumstances here.

Can we schedule and look at things to take us out some period of time after this? I just don't think we can get all of this stuff done and get a council decision by July 9th. Just seems impossible.

JUDGE TOREM: Well, Mr. Aramburu, sometimes we don't all call out the elephant in the room, and my military time, I was Captain Obvious for some period of time before promotion.

It's really up to the applicant to see whether they think that the July 8th extension they've applied for and been granted will allow the council to do what's legally necessary in this amount of time.

I know I'm giving a really strong hint here, and you can guess what it is, and I know that Mr. McMahan is gritting his teeth because he has to go back to his client and say maybe we need to file a third extension. But I can't direct that. That's, again, above my paygrade.

But I appreciate what you're saying. The applicant has clearly heard this today. They now have something substantive to take back to their client, to ask or not. Whether Chair Drew or the rest of the council will make the same realization that you've stated on the record today, again, I think it could occur and I think we may get some movement on that, but I also am respectful that the applicant's been waiting a long time and so have the people of Benton County. And any further extension we go out to compromises those interests above getting an administrative process that the governor of this state still believes is the best way to site these projects and have them evaluated.

That 12-month statutory period, as I said, turns into a legal fiction, but it is the law. And reality is different than the law. I'll say that, Mr. Aramburu. I hope that captures what you're saying.

SPEAKER ARAMBURU: Your Honor, it does. Yes, indeed.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Well, we're both smiling then. Remember this day, because who knows if we'll be frowning at each other later.

Let's go ahead and see if we can pick a reasonable time. I hope that next week, given that it's already

March 10th and next week involves at least some festivities on Friday for St. Patrick's Day, if you'll have enough time

- to collaborate next week and if I work hard to get you 1 something maybe Monday or Tuesday -- I'm just looking at my 2 3 schedule for Monday. It's already overburdened, but I'm going to try to draw together EFSEC staff, if I can, for a 4 5 meeting early Tuesday to work on or comment on anything I can pull together between now and Tuesday morning to submit 6 to you for your collaboration. 7 So if you're going to want to collaborate again, 8 9 hopefully, I'll have something to you by midday on Tuesday 10 the 14th of March with my items, and you can find some time 11 between that point and the Monday afternoon that I have 12 available for a pre-hearing conference, I would suggest 13 maybe 1:30 to 4:30 as a hold. But let me go around the room
 - Ms. Chase, for the applicant, would our next pre-hearing conference March 20th, on a Monday, starting at 1:00 or 1:30 work for the applicant?
- SPEAKER CHASE: Yes, it does. This is

 19 Ms. Chase for the applicant.

and see if that's available for everybody.

- JUDGE TOREM: All right. Same question,
- 21 Mr. Harper?

14

15

16

17

- 22 SPEAKER HARPER: Ken Harper for Benton
- 23 | County. That's fine, Your Honor.
- JUDGE TOREM: Two for two. Okay.
- Ms. Reyneveld, keep the streak going?



SPEAKER REYNEVELD: That is fine for Counsel 1 2 for the Environment. Thank you. 3 JUDGE TOREM: And, Ms. Voelckers, I don't think that you said you were unavailable the 20th. It was 4 5 the 21st. Right? SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor. 6 7 Shona Voelckers. We are available all the days you propose, and so, certainly, 1:30 on the 20th works for Yakama 8 9 Nation's counsel. 10 JUDGE TOREM: Excellent. 11 Mr. Aramburu. 12 SPEAKER ARAMBURU: We're available at the 13 March 20, from 1:30 to 4:30. 14 JUDGE TOREM: It is my lucky day. That will be it. I will have EFSEC send out a 15 16 similar notice that you got from -- for today's conference, and with whatever the call in information will be. I'm not 17 sure if I'll bother with the Microsoft Teams next time, 18 19 wasting time waiting for my computer to fail me again. But 20 we'll meet again March 20th. 21 I'm going to make a note to try -- again, I'll 22 send an email to our staff, after we hang up today, to not 23 only send out the notice formally, but you've got it on the 24 record today. And we'll also try to get you a couple of

example issues fleshed out, and perhaps, also, the other

25

2.2

homework you wanted from me besides issues -- will somebody speak up and remind me, besides examples of issues, what else you wanted?

SPEAKER CHASE: It was Ms. Chase, who is speaking now, and our request was if you were able to sketch out intended proposed schedule that would give the parties something to react to at the next prehearing conference.

JUDGE TOREM: Thank you.

SPEAKER CHASE: Yes.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Thank you. I will see what I can do with that, subject to the limitations that exist for the July 8th piece.

Right now, as it stands, if the applicant,

Ms. Chase, chooses to come back and somehow let the parties know that that might be a flexible date and to what extent, who knows? But again, I'm asking all of you, by next Friday, on St. Patrick's Day, to get in the notices of unavailability and just for -- just in case, have them run out until September 30th.

Mr. Thompson, let me ask you if I've left anything off that you think I needed to raise today with the parties, if you're still on, Jon.

SPEAKER THOMPSON: Again, yes, I am, and nothing that I can think of that can't be taken up at the next pre-hearing conference. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE TOREM: All right. And, Counsel, I'll do my best to crystalize this agenda a little bit more and send it out next week with kind of what we've agreed on and worked through -- workshopped today so you'll have it more than five minutes before you get on the line. Again, I apologize for doing the just-in-time, supply chain approach to this work, but I'll try to catch up a little bit in the days ahead. I'm going to go around the horn one more time and see if there's anything else. And then if parties would stay on the line, simply for the court reporter to ask for spellings of anything we've pitched at her today so the record can be a little cleaner. Anything else for the applicant, Ms. Chase? SPEAKER CHASE: No. Thank you, Judge Torem. This is Ms. Chase. JUDGE TOREM: And for Benton County, Mr. Harper, anything else for the record today? SPEAKER HARPER: Nothing further. Thank you, Your Honor. All right. Ms. Reyneveld. JUDGE TOREM: SPEAKER REYNEVELD: Nothing further. Thank you, Judge. JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Voelckers. SPEAKER VOELCKERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

```
Nothing further for Yakama Nation.
 1
 2
                    JUDGE TOREM:
                                   And Mr. Aramburu.
 3
                    SPEAKER ARAMBURU:
                                        Good to go. Thank you.
 4
                    JUDGE TOREM: All right. EFSEC staff,
     anything else for the record today? And you don't have to
 5
     speak up if there's nothing.
 6
               Hearing nothing, then this pre-hearing conference
 7
     is adjourned at 11:35.
 8
 9
                     (Proceeding concluded 11:35 a.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	
2	CERTIFICATE
3	
4	STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, Ann Marie G. Allison, CCR,
5) certified court reporter, State of
6	COUNTY OF PIERCE) Washington, do hereby certify:
7	COUNTY OF FIERCE , Washington, do hereby certify.
8	That the foregoing meeting was taken before me, via Teams video conference, completed on March 10, 2023, and
9	thereafter transcribed by me;
10	That the transcript contains a full, true and complete reporting and transcription of the proceedings;
11	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel
12	of any party to this action, or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially
13	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature on the 24th day of March, 2023.
15	ene Bren da, or naren, 2023.
16	
17	Clay Mais Clair
18	Anni Merce Aller
19	
20	Ann Marie G. Allison, CCR Certified Court Reporter #3375
21	COLULIA COMIC TICE OLOGIC MOSTO
22	
23	
24	
25	



iorse rieaven wind rann, voi i - ivia	00 day 15 0	
	20-day 45:2	6
	20-some 46:5	
(2) 55:2	2022 3:18 29:25	6 31:4 42:14 63:7 84:23 85:3,10
1	2023 3:2,23 29:3	7
<u> </u>	20th 49:12 72:6 90:22 92:2 94:16 95:4,8,20	
1 84:15	21 34:21 35:11 37:12 91:25	7 55:23 62:10 63:7 74:25 84:25 85:
10 3:1	21st 72:7 92:2 95:5	10
100 29:5	22nd 35:12 37:5 40:3,7 72:12	790 53:16,23 61:11 62:9 71:17 75: 77:6,15,18 80:5 82:11 83:4,12 91:
10:00 38:12,18	24 12:25 47:7	92:5
10:35 62:16	24th 72:9	
10:49 72:15	27th 28:24	8
10:50 4:5	28 31:10 34:21 35:11 36:6 37:8	80.50 29:5 55:19
10:50-11:00 72:22	44:15 53:20	80.50.090 55:5
10th 3:23 45:25 49:9 86:16 93:24	28-day 45:1,2,5 46:1	80.50.090(4) 56:12
11 55:24 61:13,14	29th 30:18	8th 29:3 30:7,10 35:16,19 46:23,24
110 83:1		25 47:2,8,14 62:18 86:6 92:18 96:
11:00 71:22 72:16,21,23	3	9
11:30 71:23	3 23:7 84:17 85:2	
11:35 98:8,9	30th 40:4 96:19	9 92:7
12 29:12 63:16 76:7	34.05 56:4	90-day 46:17
12-by-12 24:4	36 47:7	9:00 3:2,24
12-month 29:8,19 47:6 93:13	3rd 33:14 34:16 35:7 36:3,9 37:5 44:9 45:9,15 49:4 59:14	9:02 3:23
14 63:16		9:50 4:3
14th 94:10		9:51 38:9
15 28:19	4	9:51-10:00 38:19
15-day 45:3	4 28:19 30:12 61:19 63:6 84:19,24	9th 34:24 74:24 92:12
15th 3:18 31:13 49:12	85:3,10	
18th 35:16	45 4:2	A
19th 30:19	46-347-060 55:2	a.m. 3:2,23 38:19 72:22 98:9
1:00 94:17	463-47-020's 57:12	ability 19:2,15 23:18 45:7 47:6
1:30 94:13,17 95:8,13	463-47-060 54:8	absence 58:3
1st 15:18 18:24 34:19 35:11,14 36:3,	4:30 94:13 95:13	absolute 30:10
37:5,9	5	absolutely 30:2
2		acceptable 37:9 70:22
	5 63:6,8 84:21	accommodate 17:16,24 26:24
2 12:17 61:23 84:15	50 4:2	accomplish 48:3
20 91:25 95:13	5:00 12:21	

account 40:12,15 accused 69:14 acronym 9:3 act 29:21 56:3 action 9:4 23:16 active 10:7 activities 69:15 actual 44:5 77:8 Adam 3:10 add 34:22 53:15 91:13

addition 23:25 67:9

additional 13:17 14:1 22:12 32:11 78:19 79:4,7

address 13:16 23:24 51:15 59:9 65:14 66:14 67:3,5,11 85:12

addressed 15:21

addresses 54:8 60:25 66:12 67:2, 18

addressing 61:24 adjourned 98:8 adjudicate 56:18 adjudicating 74:6

adjudication 3:14,17 4:17 15:13,20 16:14 23:9 29:13 30:24 39:25 41:23 49:17 51:19 52:6 54:11,15 56:4,14 57:5,11,19 58:3 60:5 64:12,13,17,19 65:15 66:14 67:10 71:1

adjudication@efsec.law.gov 65:6

adjudications 54:10 55:8 adjudicative 53:5 55:5

adjust 41:6

administrative 3:10 46:6 55:2 56:3 93:10

admit 54:15 88:25 **adopted** 55:3

advance 4:19 11:22

adverse 68:15

advocacy 75:13 89:3,4 **advocate** 18:20 53:22

advocates 18:7 advocating 75:12

afar 5:12

affirmation 49:14

afield 43:25 afraid 81:6,9

afternoon 72:6 94:11

agency 64:13

agenda 3:21 11:22 12:15,17,18 14:18 15:12 23:7 28:21 30:13 35:13 41:15 62:8,10 66:22 73:24 74:25 84:15 85:4,10,12 91:4,13,20 97:2

aggressions 82:2 agnostic 45:18

agree 27:20 49:14 69:10 89:11

agreeable 48:24

agreed 32:13 66:9 67:7 68:19 69:14 76:5 97:3

agreement 15:1 29:1 68:11 70:2 71:20 73:23 74:13 78:15 89:24

agriculture 83:8

ah-ha 89:6

ahead 3:15 12:6,24 18:17 42:11,23 46:15 84:9,10 86:6 93:22 97:8

aired 37:1 59:17 ALJ 22:2 56:9 all-party 65:4

Allison 3:3 10:10 38:11 72:15

allowed 25:6 37:20 Altman 7:9,11,12,16 altogether 69:20 ambitious 51:13 52:5

ameliorated 45:10 amended 59:12

amount 47:9 55:19 92:20

Amy 11:4 84:5 analogies 76:8 and/or 25:22

Andrea 10:1,2,4 42:11

Ann 3:3

announced 85:6 answers 56:19

anticipate 21:4 22:22 34:5,8 52:7

anticipating 48:12 anybody's 81:1

APA 69:16

apologize 12:15,21 35:23 42:21 61:18 97:6

appeal 17:3 21:12 55:14,16 appearance 7:5 8:9 73:17

appears 12:5append 71:6

applicant 4:22 5:14 12:1 13:22 16:14,18 28:24 29:20 30:11 31:5,9, 19 32:18 33:4,24,25 34:5 35:10 37:7,13 40:14 41:9,18 42:9 44:1 49:19 50:25 51:7 52:9,12,15,19,20, 24 53:2,6,21 58:19 59:2 60:13 62:15 63:23 66:6,8,24 76:12,15,19 83:18 89:15 92:17 93:2 94:15,17,19 96:13 97:14

applicant's 13:6,19 36:15 37:12 40:18 49:2 53:17,25 76:10 93:8

applicants 16:13 29:9 31:24

application 3:12 14:6,16 30:8 31:7 32:1,10,20,24 33:23 35:2 46:22 53:2 54:20,25 56:15 62:19 72:25 76:14, 20 89:15

applied 92:18 apply 52:23 56:3 appointed 3:11 approach 60:23 97:7 approaches 75:12

approved 71:7

April 30:7 33:14,20,21 34:16 35:7 36:3,9 37:5 44:9,12,25 45:8,15,25 46:25 49:4

Aramburu 9:6,7,8,9 13:12,18,20 14:3,21 15:5,7 23:5,8,10,11 25:12 28:1,2 35:14,21,22 36:5,21 37:1 39:16,17,18 40:8 43:13,20 57:21,25 58:6,8,13 59:24 60:23 61:2,25 62:13 67:1 68:25 69:2 73:13,14 74:14,16



82:6,8,11,13,22 86:2 87:3,25 91:20, 24 92:13 93:15,17 95:11,12 98:2,3

Aramburu's 87:1

area 43:25

areas 89:11,23

argue 58:22 89:13

argument 74:3

arguments 27:10

array 89:17

ASE 59:12

aspects 60:9

assigned 11:1

assistant 7:21 9:18 69:5 84:4

assisting 5:7

assumption 50:22

assure 14:8

attachment 85:23

attend 23:14 30:21

attendance 11:20

attending 7:12

attention 34:17 57:24 61:15 76:12,

23

attorney 7:4,9,21 9:5,18 69:5 84:4

attorneys 8:7 9:12 90:10

audio 11:24 12:5,7 66:3 78:21,22

authority 25:20

availability 33:17 44:10 86:7,13

avoid 20:7

aware 9:16 28:9 33:25

Aziza 6:13

В

back 3:18 6:24 7:2 8:20 10:21 12:9 16:10 17:21 23:6 26:3,15 28:24 34:17 35:13 38:11,17,18,21 46:24 48:14 50:6 54:7 61:15 63:7 71:22 72:1,23 73:1 74:11 75:14 78:7 80:2 84:15,25 86:20 92:23 93:3 96:14

background 10:10 32:7 54:18

83:17

backward 44:5

backwards 46:3

bag 46:7 47:13

bags 46:9

ball 80:25

balloon 82:19

Band 8:6

Bandit 48:14

barking 10:8

barn 55:10

base 74:10

based 22:24 24:2 35:10 52:21 67:18

70:7 75:19 80:12

basics 74:13

battery 89:17

beck 50:1

begin 3:24

behalf 3:13 5:14 7:17 8:11,15 10:21 13:12 16:18 18:3 19:9 23:5 52:23

66:6 68:9 73:11 77:1,2 79:17 88:5 90:17

90.17

believes 58:20 93:11

benefit 45:19 86:24

Benton 6:8,17 7:3,9,19 10:16,21 17:1 26:1,8 37:17 39:3,5 43:11,16

51:16 60:11 66:24 73:5 77:1,3 86:21,23 93:9 94:22 97:17

Beyer 6:9

bias 81:9,11

biased 74:1

bifurcating 60:3

big 24:10

bit 6:23 13:24 19:6 24:22 31:3 37:25 38:7 52:25 56:20 62:17,20 64:1 70:10 71:11 73:21 75:9 81:22 82:9

84:8 86:25 90:11 97:2.8

bite 28:1

blank 12:14

blend 17:9

block 35:20

board 23:1.2 75:15 83:15

bother 95:18

bound 56:10 60:10

boundaries 84:20

box 64:2 65:15 70:10

boxed 78:4

break 4:3 28:20 33:16 37:1 38:9 40:24 44:12,18 71:11 72:16

breaking 12:22

breaks 4:2

briefing 15:23 57:15,17 58:9 59:15,

16 74:3,4 89:22

bring 18:12 19:2,15,22 26:1 50:25

51:3 57:23 80:24

bringing 51:2,8 53:21

broadband 16:4

Brost 10:13,14,15,17 30:1

brought 28:16

Brown 7:3,6,7,14,17

budgeted 84:3

build 77:20

built 39:24 41:10

bullet 30:14

burden 52:11 53:2 58:15 60:13

63:15,20 76:20

burdensome 6:23 17:23 68:12

burned 69:11

busy 10:4

butcher 6:13

C

C.A.R.E.S. 9:3,10 13:5 14:8 23:6,11 36:17 37:16 39:16,18 57:23 58:1,19 66:25 69:1 73:15 74:18 82:7 83:1

calendar 35:7 37:9 44:19 46:4

47:10 71:24 86:13

calendars 30:2 62:20 86:4

calibrate 77:25

call 4:7 5:24 7:19 9:13 11:18 16:6 34:17 38:12,21 39:20 50:1 60:3



61:15 64:24 69:4 72:2 76:6 92:14 95:17

called 42:12 66:19

calling 59:25

calls 4:21

candid 88:10

candidly 50:16

Captain 92:15

captured 19:12 21:14,22 22:20

captures 78:3 93:16

capturing 21:16

care 11:18

carried 20:15

carries 52:15 75:2

carry 58:15 90:13

carrying 34:1

case 8:23 12:7 42:25 50:3 54:1 55:8, 9 60:21,22 61:13 63:17 72:13 75:1,2

77:8 82:16 96:18

cases 59:21 **catch** 97:7

categories 43:18

category 34:6

cats 10:9 73:17

caveats 82:1

certification 54:20,25

Certified 3:3

cetera 64:11

CFE 48:21 78:16 90:12

chain 97:7

chair 15:24 16:11 26:9,11,14 28:18

63:2 75:23 84:18 85:5 93:4

challenges 62:17

chance 3:18 28:8,21 57:8 60:21

62:8

change 56:1,9

channel 88:17,18

channeling 90:6

Chase 5:4,11,16 6:1,3,5,6 11:25 12:1 16:13,17,18 18:24 26:18,19,20 27:6 31:3,15,17,19 32:6 33:10,13,24 34:4,5,17,20 35:5 37:4 38:25 39:1,2 40:14,18,21,22 41:8 42:8,13,17,20, 24 43:8,13 47:4 49:18 50:23 61:10, 17,22 65:9,12,25 66:4,20 70:16 73:1,2,3 76:10,17,18 85:11,14,21 94:15,18,19 96:4,9,14 97:14,15,16

Chase's 19:12 20:2 27:20 42:16

44:10 45:16

check 8:22 26:6

cheek 50:6 **chime** 28:9

Chinese 82:18

choice 81:17

choose 22:9,12 25:21,22 37:8

chooses 96:14

chronologically 84:11

circle 63:7

circumstances 58:15 59:3 92:8

cited 41:15 **civil** 55:24 56:2

clarification 31:21 34:25 51:6

53:14 65:13 67:24 87:1

clarifies 52:25

clarify 10:20

clarity 80:20

clean 3:13 10:11 46:22 74:9

cleaner 7:1 97:13

clear 6:7 28:7 31:15 53:17 57:4

63:16 66:2 79:23

client 13:13 14:23 16:7 20:5 23:8

45:8 47:5 57:4 83:17 92:23 93:3

clients 14:14 16:11 55:15

climate 68:17

clock 49:3

closed 54:14

cobbling 86:19

code 55:2

cognizant 33:16

collaborate 74:12 75:8 78:7 94:1.8

collaborated 45:5

collaboration 52:1 84:10 89:9 94:7

collaborative 15:17

colleague 8:16

colleagues 5:10 39:14

comfort 4:3 22:15

comfortable 19:21

commencing 3:17 64:12

comment 4:14,18 14:20 26:20

54:13,22 56:17 94:5

comments 27:14,20 41:4 43:12,18

48:2 59:23 75:21 78:6,10 83:2 88:15

committed 80:15

common 74:13 75:9

communicating 39:21

communications 64:10

Community 9:4

compelled 88:5

compiled 67:17

complete 29:7

completion 55:6

complex 14:19 38:1 52:6

complication 46:18

comply 47:14

component 17:6

compromises 93:10

computer 12:18 95:19

concept 41:16 43:21

concern 14:23 24:16,17 42:4,22

43:25 45:14 46:21 59:10 78:2 87:18,

21

concerned 14:15 44:17 58:5,20

68:14 74:18 83:14

concerns 17:2 25:11 26:25 35:23 36:23 40:14 43:22 45:9,25 47:21

48:25 54:8 57:5 61:1 70:6 83:18

concluded 98:9

conditional 42:2 49:17

conditions 58:21 conduct 36:12

conducted 17:13 conducting 16:8

Confederated 8:6

confer 65:20 66:8 72:2

conference 3:17 13:10,17 30:5 32:12 36:12 38:22 41:13 52:4 66:18, 22 67:23 69:22 70:3,19 71:21 72:5 75:17 83:25 85:1,8,13,15 88:16 90:24 91:5,23,25 94:12,16 95:16 96:7,25 98:7

conferences 49:5

conferred 69:6 78:18

conferring 40:24

confirm 14:4 conflict 40:9

confusion 42:21

connection 16:5

consideration 20:24 25:17 28:15 41:17,18,20 46:23 48:9 53:10 54:3

considerations 15:20

considered 30:9 61:3 89:1

consistent 45:4 87:4

consists 90:4

constraints 14:24 50:15

consult 75:19

context 60:19

continue 50:6 79:3

contractor 54:22

control 23:1 75:25

convenience 15:9

conversation 19:11 70:23

convoluted 37:25

coordinate 49:3 68:5

coordinating 44:2,13 48:25

copied 66:11

copies 63:10,16,19,21,22 64:14 65:11,18,19 68:3,16

copy 12:18 13:21 64:11,19 65:2 67:10 70:17

correct 8:20 17:10 20:4,12 34:20 35:21 36:24 67:13

correctly 17:7 20:4

correspondence 65:14

council 3:11 9:17 10:12,22,23 11:15 15:24 18:10 20:9 21:2 23:16,25 24:15 26:2,12 29:25 30:12,20,24 33:3 50:1 52:13 53:9 55:4 61:6 62:23 63:22 74:8 75:10 81:14 83:13 88:16,21 89:5,25 90:2 92:6,11,19 93:4

council's 20:24 61:8 86:13

counsel 7:20 8:8 12:3 15:18 17:12, 14 18:6 19:11 39:7,9 44:20 49:23 59:13 66:24 67:2 68:11,13 73:9 79:6 80:11 89:25 90:21 95:1,9 97:1

counsel's 56:10

count 46:24 81:20

counted 11:20

county 3:4 6:8,17 7:4,9,19 10:16,21 15:17 16:23 17:1,5,8 26:1,2,8 27:14, 16 33:7 37:17 39:4,5 43:11,16,19 44:3 51:16 60:11 66:24 68:5 73:5 77:1,3,8,14 86:21,23 88:4,5 90:9 93:9 94:23 97:17

county's 43:14 87:6

couple 9:22 50:14 67:4 79:8 80:10 95:24

court 3:3,25 4:1 6:21 10:10 21:8 38:14 47:17 55:10,18 66:2 72:17

cover 3:21 28:11 70:21 90:3 91:21

craft 84:8

create 55:13

created 21:9 26:12 33:3

creating 55:20

creative 21:15 70:12

criticizes 69:13

cross-examination 24:19.21

Crystal 5:4,11 6:6 11:25 31:18 38:25 73:1,3

crystalize 52:4 97:2

cuff 87:14

cultural 19:4

current 56:6

D

dangerous 36:19 88:18

date 3:22 4:19 29:4 31:8,14 36:9 37:8,18 40:3 41:21 43:22 44:5 45:9, 12,15,25 46:2,4,8,11,12,19 47:3,8, 14 62:19 63:4 72:4 91:22 96:15

date-setting 43:21

dated 36:7

dates 14:21 35:24 40:4,12,16 41:5 46:25 49:11 50:10 60:1,6 72:11 85:17,23 86:15,16 90:22

day 12:25 16:5 30:17,18 40:7,9 48:8, 14 54:18 56:23 83:7,8,9,10 86:7,9 93:20,25 95:14 96:17

days 14:23 27:7 31:10 34:21,22 35:11 36:6,10,11 37:8,13 41:6 44:15 95:7 97:8

deadline 29:6,19 30:8,11 32:5 35:8, 14,18 41:10 42:25 47:15 53:20 62:2, 18 86:6

deadlines 40:25 41:21,22 54:1

deal 13:8 75:7

dealing 15:6

December 3:18

deciding 16:9

decision 12:25 18:19 26:10,12 92:7,

dedicated 80:17

defer 7:19 8:20 77:10

degree 71:15 77:13 89:13

delegated 25:20

deliberate 30:24

deliberations 47:16 61:6

demonstrate 78:4

demonstration 84:1

depend 89:3

dependent 13:11

depending 16:4 27:3 36:13 72:9

85:7

depends 32:7

depositions 92:1

Deputy 7:8

designated 65:22

desire 62:21

detail 56:23 77:15,18 87:23 89:18

details 70:5

determination 16:19 29:16

determine 21:20 **develop** 67:7 70:15

developed 66:23 88:11

developing 74:7 89:14

development 46:17 71:13 76:10

develops 78:11 **deviate** 69:12,17

deviating 70:7 diagrams 23:18

dictated 15:2

differ 37:15 69:9 71:1

difference 17:4

difficult 23:25 38:8 44:13 92:7

digest 79:16 dilemma 22:1,5

direct 19:2,15,23 25:2 31:24 50:23, 25 51:3,22 52:18,22 58:17 59:1,3 60:15,17 62:1 83:22 92:25

direction 48:6 50:21 52:2 63:1 78:19 79:4,8 80:22

directly 56:3 64:16

disagreements 57:1

disappearance 12:16

disappointed 73:21

discovery 91:7,9,10

discuss 13:25 26:22 41:19

discussed 50:19 85:6

discussing 26:24 91:15

discussion 13:11 15:4 43:12 47:12 50:22 53:20 54:2,5 69:21 70:8 79:21 84:24 91:6,18

discussions 15:8,17 34:9 66:9

disparate 88:25

dispense 56:8 66:5 68:6 69:20

dispensing 65:18

dispute 76:16

disputed 4:11 32:12,15,23 35:10 36:14 49:6 51:2 52:7 71:13,19 73:20,22 74:22 75:20 76:22 77:8 79:5,14

distances 68:17 documents 67:9

dog 10:8

draft 29:23 54:12,16,21 55:6 59:11 80:10 81:5 83:2

dragging 67:12

draw 70:20 75:20,22 76:12,23 88:15 94:4

drawing 41:16 75:15 **drawings** 23:18,23

Drew 16:11 26:10 75:23 84:18 85:5

93:4

dropped 12:14 79:1

due 18:7 38:1 48:16 50:17 53:18

Ε

earlier 12:23 44:2 45:6 46:21 86:5

87:3

earliest 40:3 41:5

early 33:20 36:9 86:7 94:5

ears 43:6

easier 81:25

easily 44:21

easy 84:15,16

easy-to-determine 29:14

eat 26:7

echo 42:7 79:22

Ed 10:13

efficient 81:25

efficiently 24:20

effort 44:14

EFSEC 3:12 4:9 9:15,16 10:12,25 12:5,12 15:19,24 16:11 28:15,18 29:5,11,21 30:20 39:20 42:11 52:6 54:10,23 63:8 64:2,8,15 65:5 66:16 67:17 69:8,13 70:15 72:25 75:4,19 78:11 82:17 84:7 85:6 90:2 94:4 95:15 98:4

EFSEC's 16:19 29:1 47:6 55:17

67:9

EIS 29:18 55:6

elder 21:21

elders 19:16,20 20:6,23 21:1

electronic 23:15 63:24 64:1 65:10 66:7 67:8 68:3,6,12,23 69:2,19 70:3 71:9

elephant 92:14

Ellensburg 48:19 62:4

email 14:4 64:2,10,12,17,20,23 65:4, 6,15,18,19 67:1,5,18 74:15 87:10 95:22

emails 65:21

emergency 7:14

Emily 5:6,7,12

emphasize 87:12

empowered 56:9

end 26:5 27:3 29:24 32:11 36:11 41:3 47:3 66:1 78:25 86:8,10

ended 57:22

energy 3:11,13 20:8 46:22

engage 20:1

engaging 19:22

English 21:5,9,11,25 22:8,11

entitled 24:2

Environment 7:21 12:3 15:18 17:12,15 39:8,10 49:23 66:24 67:3 68:9,11,14 73:9 95:2

Environment's 79:6

environmental 9:5 14:7 29:15,17, 23 32:22 54:13,17,21 55:6 58:4 60:8 63:13 68:15 74:17 77:12 87:17

environmentally 68:13

equal 63:21 equally 23:17 equipment 16:4

error 8:20

essentially 34:1 48:8 55:3

establish 49:7 67:14 **established** 32:13 69:12

establishing 67:13 68:18

esthetic 58:20,21 87:12

esthetics 83:9

Ethan 8:9,11

evaluated 93:12

evaluation 3:11 47:18

evaluations 30:25

events 44:4 45:17 48:10

everybody's 9:16 38:18 47:20 52:5

74:4

evidence 30:25 31:6 46:17 74:9 76:4 79:24 81:13 89:1,7

evidentiary 81:21

examples 79:9 96:2

excellent 9:21 68:1 95:10

excuse 10:13 17:1

exhibits 15:23 22:23

exist 96:12

existing 44:19 56:1 62:18

exists 30:8

expanded 40:5

expect 4:17 29:21 32:7 33:4 36:13

55:17

expectation 31:22 44:3

expectations 44:22 87:4

expected 35:3 38:4

expecting 34:13 87:24

expedited 29:13

experience 14:18 21:7 22:25 24:3 29:17 46:4 52:10 55:18 64:3 75:4

78:13

expert 48:25 49:1

experts 49:24

explain 22:6

explained 43:9

explaining 32:19

explanation 55:25

express 57:12 59:10 81:11 88:13

expressed 49:16 78:3

extended 29:2 46:22 61:7

extension 28:25 29:10 62:19 92:18,

24 93:9

extent 18:21 43:13 63:15 96:15

extra 53:8

F

faced 50:7

facetious 82:23

facilitate 68:5

Facility 3:11

fact 44:15 48:1 87:2

factor 53:9

factors 40:11

fail 95:19

fair 20:14 23:3 57:7 76:25 87:7 90:3

91:8

fairly 48:10 73:25

fairness 45:7

fall 30:18

falling 82:19

fallout 85:9

falls 53:5

familiar 54:9

family 7:14

fan 16:1

farm 3:14 4:10 14:18 29:2

farms 33:8

fashion 30:13 80:8

fault 16:3

favor 17:24 68:18

favorable 53:3 60:14

feedback 80:2

feel 10:19 14:24 17:4 20:6 63:18

feeling 59:22

feelings 20:8 75:6

feels 51:9

felt 88:5

Ferruginous 87:18

festivities 93:24

fiction 29:19 93:14

figure 13:13 46:10

figured 30:4,5

file 3:19 31:10 37:8,23 41:10 43:1 50:24 52:22 55:25 63:21 92:24

filed 3:12 8:8 13:2 28:25 46:15 51:17

63:10 83:1 86:1.10

files 37:19

filing 31:13 33:22 36:15 37:18 39:25 40:4 41:21 47:1 52:8 63:5,8,15 64:1 65:18 66:5,12,14 67:13 68:6,24

69:3,19 70:3 71:4 77:14

filings 64:10 66:13 67:19

final 9:2 26:10 58:3

finalized 29:24

finalizing 36:14 49:6

find 11:14 26:7 62:5 74:12 78:1

81:17 85:5 89:11 94:10

fine 5:22 38:14 65:18 69:3 72:17

83:12 94:23 95:1

finely 24:18

firm 6:8 65:20,21,25 66:10

firms 66:11

fit 46:7

five- 4:2



five-pound 46:7 47:13
flag 41:3 76:2
flagging 27:2
flesh 54:23 89:10
fleshed 95:25
flexibility 16:21
flexible 96:15
flying 78:12
focus 61:6
focuses 14:12
focusing 13:14
folks 10:6,21 22:13 33:16 54:9

follow 12:19 22:13 26:1 58:8,9 food 91:18 foresee 44:25 forests 63:16 form 60:4 74:8 formal 69:16

formally 4:16 65:3 70:24 95:23

formulate 78:2 79:8 formulating 87:4 88:9

formalize 70:20

format 20:7 24:2

forward 3:14 23:9 33:5,12 48:7 53:10 57:11 65:15 70:25 80:3 89:12 91:15

Foster 6:13,14 found 61:12 92:5 frame 48:11 75:8 framed 53:16

framing 31:18

frankly 14:4 17:2 29:19 36:8 53:7 55:7 64:3 71:12 72:12 74:15 77:6 92:6

free 10:19

Friday 3:1,22 72:9 86:18 93:25 96:17

00.17

friendly 68:13

front 20:10 46:9 51:10 61:21 77:19

frowning 93:21

fruit 63:5

full 14:2,9 15:4,6 18:10 29:18 30:16, 23 37:6,25 50:17 54:5,22 60:22 72:24

full-party 53:1

fully 18:21 19:13 36:13 42:1 50:14 51:9 57:3 66:2

functionally 45:1 funding 53:7 future 91:12

G

game 76:3 garbled 66:1 gatekeeper 76:4 gathering 31:6 gave 33:20 Gee 86:3

general 7:21 9:19 45:12 69:5 79:13 80:5 84:4 87:15

generally 14:19 43:11 48:23 49:20 79:13

generate 66:9 generic 88:13

get all 92:11

give 14:5 20:23 24:25 28:8 32:4 37:21 47:17 50:16 56:5 57:8 58:17 71:5,25 72:12 80:22 81:2 91:11 96:6

giving 4:19 92:21 gladly 91:13

goal 79:22,25 80:1 88:2

good 3:9 5:1 6:5,10 7:11,23,25 8:10, 14,24,25 9:8,24,25 11:25 25:5 26:19 31:17 39:1 55:25 61:3,9 62:22 72:16 73:2 77:21 84:1 87:10 89:6 98:3

governor 29:8 30:9 31:1 33:4 52:14 56:10,11 60:15 90:4 93:11

grade 25:20

granted 13:5 15:14 92:19

Grantham 10:1,2 42:10,11,15,18

granting 13:1

granular 60:20 87:23 89:18

gratified 33:19

great 20:20 42:20 63:14 87:18

greater 32:2 gritting 47:4 92:23 ground 70:25 75:9

group 50:19 51:1 80:3,16,18

group's 53:19 grouping 87:21 growth 23:2 83:15 guarantee 65:7 91:12

guess 21:19 43:17 49:20 57:7 59:15 77:7,24 85:1 88:12 92:22

guidance 5:20 79:12 80:4

guide 90:10

Н

habitat 87:13,16 Hafkemeyer 84:5 half-hour 72:1 handle 85:1,9 91:7 handling 84:6 hang 95:22

happen 18:11 38:2 55:7 58:23

happened 55:8 62:4

happy 31:20 45:15 66:4,5,8 68:5 79:12 80:21

hard 6:22 23:23 51:5,9 94:1

hardest 71:12

Harper 6:9,10,12,18,19,20 7:3,7,19 16:24,25 17:8,10 27:14,16 39:3,5 43:10,15,16 45:23 47:11,23,25 48:18 68:2,4 73:4,5 77:1,2,11,22,23 78:10 79:21 86:21,22,23 87:11 88:2, 3,19 90:6,8,9 94:21,22 97:18,19

Harper's 48:25

hash 52:3

hat 73:21

hats 75:13

hawk 87:18

hazard 10:8 81:22

hear 4:24,25 6:4,7 7:17,25 12:1,12 18:4 20:10 33:19 42:16,17 50:21 56:14 62:24 65:16 77:4 78:23 82:15 90:2.9

heard 17:7 30:25 43:12 47:23 50:9 58:10 61:5 70:1 93:2

hearing 4:16 9:14 10:24 12:8 14:22 16:20,21 17:3,15,16,20 18:7,19 19:3,16,18,23 22:24 23:12 24:9,14, 23 25:1,6,9 27:7 28:5 30:6,21 40:5, 12,16 41:13,20 43:20 44:5 46:3,11 47:14,15 49:11 50:17 51:12 56:16 57:19 60:3 68:15 80:10 86:14,24 89:7 98:7

hearings 14:18 23:1,2 26:3 31:13

Heaven 3:13 4:10 29:2 72:25 81:12

held 3:2 13:8 16:14 26:6,23 30:5 56:4

helped 77:20

helpful 6:25 14:20 22:6 31:22 51:9 53:13 61:23 65:16 77:4 79:7,13,14, 21 80:12,15,19 83:20,23 85:15 87:16 88:14 90:9

helping 62:6

helps 52:4 54:23 63:11 88:2

hide 80:24 hint 92:21

hired 54:23

history 5:18 21:10 29:11 37:21

hold 32:17 38:9 45:12 56:2 94:13

holding 30:6 holidays 30:17

home 10:8 35:7

homework 84:17 96:1

honestly 43:5

Honor 4:23 5:15 6:2,10,15 7:10,11 8:10,14,24 9:9,24 15:7 17:1,10 18:5, 18 19:8 21:3 22:4,21 23:10 27:17,24

39:17 43:16,17 44:17 45:11,21 47:25 50:12 51:15 53:12 57:9 68:4, 22 77:5,22,24 78:6 79:18 83:22 86:22,24 87:7 88:4,15 90:8,19 91:14 93:17 94:23 95:6 97:20,25

Honor's 87:4

hope 3:24 7:22 18:9 25:25 52:25 56:19 60:25 81:23 82:21 89:24 93:16,23

hoping 49:23 71:16 73:16,22

horn 97:9

horse 3:13 4:10 29:2 55:9 72:25 81:12

hour 4:1,4 38:21 57:22 71:22 72:1, 24 82:23

hours 12:25

Houston 8:17,21,24 9:1

human 12:24 humane 41:1

hybrid 16:16,20 17:4,9,16,24 18:19 25:19,22 27:1 62:25

1

idea 61:3 62:11

ideas 52:15 69:18 85:16,23

identified 18:8 38:22 74:17 78:1

identifies 77:12

identify 6:23,25 9:14,17 10:25 65:2 76:22 80:6

images 21:16

imagine 44:13 47:15

immediately 40:9 54:24

impact 29:18,23 54:13,17,21 55:6 58:4,21 59:11 68:17 74:17 83:2 87:13.22

impacted 22:24 87:19

impacts 19:4 29:15 60:8 68:15

77:12 82:18

imply 60:19

important 23:17 25:4,11 29:4,20 48:7 49:7 64:19

imposing 33:17

impossible 92:12

impressions 74:8

improvement 62:12

improving 80:6

in-person 16:15 17:3,6,8,25 18:7 21:20 22:18 23:12 24:13,23 25:1,9 62:25 68:15

inadvertently 40:25

inaudible 80:6

include 42:25 66:14 85:22

included 34:23 65:23

including 30:1 36:16 55:9 65:22

inclusive 89:9

incorporation 57:13

independent 53:1

independently 52:21

indication 13:6

individuals 24:17

influence 76:3

inform 32:4 85:2

informally 60:24

information 13:24 18:9,13 20:19

95:17

informational 26:3

informed 54:16

infrequently 54:10

initial 8:20 31:23 45:17 67:19 69:23 76:20 78:17

initiate 55:4

ink 63:12

input 15:19 65:10

inputs 16:10 75:19

inside 70:10

insight 75:3 91:11

Inslee 56:11

instance 37:16

instances 64:14

integrated 44:22

intend 18:20 19:13 32:1

intended 78:14 82:3 96:6

intense 48:10

intensive 44:14

intention 12:22

interaction 16:2

interest 17:5 74:1

interested 4:9 23:14 81:5 84:7

interests 34:3 55:15 75:12 93:10

interim 45:17

interjecting 25:13

interlocutory 26:11 75:23

interpreter 21:1,6,12

interval 37:5,8,12 45:5 46:11

intervals 34:18,21 38:11

intervener 14:9

interveners 8:6

intervening 9:2

intervention 3:19,20 11:23 12:20 13:1,4,9 14:1 15:9,14,16 34:14

52:22 54:19 67:24

investigation 54:22

invite 4:15 54:5 86:4

involved 41:2 74:4

involves 93:24

issue 14:13 23:17 34:11 35:1 51:17 55:13 57:15 58:4,16 59:9,14 60:12 61:3 76:14 79:9 81:5,7,15 82:11,20

89:6,14,19 92:3

issue-specific 60:6

issued 3:17,20 12:20

issues 4:12 5:19 13:13,14,25 14:1,5 18:8 23:24 25:3,4 26:22 31:18 32:13,15,22 34:3 35:10 36:14,18 37:1,10 40:15 41:20,23 42:2 43:17 47:21 49:7,18 51:3,4,10 52:7,17,20 54:24 56:5,15 57:18 58:2,20 59:4,8, 17,20 60:2 61:25 71:13,19 72:20 73:20,23 74:5,7,9,17,19,22 75:5,8, 20,22,24 76:11,16,22 77:5,8 78:2 79:6,8,11,14 80:7,11 82:7,14,16

83:3,6,14,16 84:6,14 85:9,19,22 86:25 87:5 88:1,6,9,10,23 89:5,6,10, 14 95:25 96:1,2

item 3:21 11:22 12:17 15:12 23:7 31:4 42:9 55:23 62:10 63:7

items 14:17 15:22 26:23 42:3 91:20

94:10

J

Jackson 6:8

January 59:14

Jay 9:5

Jeff 7:9,12

Jessica 8:17

Joan 11:3 66:15,19 67:22

job 38:7 72:14

John 9:18

joining 8:17

joint 51:16

Jon 64:16 84:4 96:22

Jonathon 69:7

Jones 8:9,10,11

judge 3:9,10 4:25 5:9,13,22 6:3,5,7, 12,16,19,21 7:16,23,25 8:5,12,18,25 9:11,21,25 10:4,15,18 11:4,6,9,11, 13,17 12:1,5,6,9,12,13 13:20 14:3 15:2,10 16:17,23 17:7,11 18:1,16,22 20:3,20 21:7 22:16 23:3,20 25:12 26:20 27:6,18,22 28:1,6,14 31:17 32:6 33:7,13,19 34:4,10 35:4 36:5, 24 38:15,20 39:3,7,11,15,19 40:21 41:7,25 42:10,15,19,21,23 43:5,10 45:22 46:6 48:13 49:22 50:5 51:23 54:2 57:16,25 58:6,11 59:24 61:9, 17,20 62:3 64:6,11,16,22 65:12,17, 24 66:15 67:16,20 68:8,20,25 69:4, 11,24 70:9 72:19,23 73:2,4,7,10,13, 16,20 76:1,19,25 77:10 78:9,12,19, 22,24 79:15 80:9,21 81:7,18 82:21 83:24 85:14,20 87:9 88:18,19 90:12, 17 91:8,17 92:13 93:19 94:20,24 95:3,10,14 96:8,10 97:1,15,17,21, 23,24 98:2,4

juggle 72:9

juggling 72:12

Julie 67:4

July 29:3 30:7,10 46:23,24 47:2,8,14 62:18 86:6 92:7,12,18 96:12

jump 5:17 28:15

jumping 6:24

June 30:7,19 49:12 91:2

Juneteenth 30:17,19

just-in-time 97:6

Κ

keeping 35:6

Ken 16:25 27:16 39:5 43:16 68:4 73:5 77:2,22 86:22 88:3 90:9 94:22

Kenneth 6:9,19 39:3 73:4

key 9:22

kicked 60:24

kind 16:16 24:2 25:1,8 27:10 38:1,2 39:21 44:22 46:11 49:3,8,16 50:10 58:25 59:8 60:23 66:22 74:2,18 78:12,15 79:13 80:4 83:5,6 87:20 97:3

Kittitas 33:7 41:14 42:5 43:4 55:9 75:1

knew 53:20

knowing 6:22 14:19 37:19 63:20

88:1

knowledge 19:20 20:8,11,14,15,24 21:10

L

labels 60:24

Labor 86:7

lack 55:3 63:12

laid 43:4 64:12

land 5:19 26:3 41:22 42:1 49:17 59:20 60:9 92:1

language 21:2,5,10,25

large 23:21 24:4

late 12:22 86:5,9

law 3:10 6:8 55:3,17,19,22 56:1,7,9,

10 80:23 93:14,15 **lawyer** 63:14

lawyers 60:18 66:10

lawyers' 86:3 lay 86:12

layout 89:16 lays 56:13

lead 5:16 6:16 44:7

lead-up 66:20 **leaning** 81:19

learned 77:18 85:24

leave 66:8 **leeway** 56:5

left 39:23 55:9 84:3 96:20

legal 8:8 29:19 32:7 55:15 74:21 93:14

legally 92:19 **lessons** 75:3 **let alone** 47:20

letter 15:18 18:23 19:12 20:2 34:18, 19.24 36:7 44:2 45:6 51:1 77:14

letters 57:14 64:10,24

letting 12:6

level 22:14 55:16 57:19 82:11 87:2 89:20

liberty 86:2

limitations 96:11

limited 13:7 19:4,17,18 23:19 31:25

lined 40:25

lines 70:12 82:10 91:10

Lisa 9:23 10:4 12:4.11 64:8 67:16

list 32:12,15 35:10 36:14 55:24 65:20,25 66:9,22 67:7,13,17 68:19 70:15,17 71:7 74:7 75:20,22,24 76:11,16 77:6,11 80:5 84:8 85:19,21

listed 67:2

listening 11:2 67:12

listing 14:5 30:14 66:23 87:20

lists 71:19

literally 71:8

litigate 56:23

litigation 14:19 38:1

litigator 5:5

live 17:20 19:1,17 21:16 50:21

LLC 3:13,14 LLP 6:9

lobby 25:21 26:14

long 4:4 25:10 48:14 62:21 68:17 75:2 77:15 93:8

longer 24:22 71:23

looked 40:2

lose 78:22

lost 12:5,7 21:12

lot 30:11 62:24 63:9,12 71:13 74:6

84:6

loud 6:7 36:19 love 38:8 74:2

low-hanging 63:5

lucky 95:14

lunch 72:1 82:23

lyrics 48:13

M

made 21:16 25:25 30:9 52:13 63:10

mail 56:19 62:14

make 7:1 8:22 20:21 27:13 29:7 30:25 38:17 41:9 48:8 67:8 69:10,15 70:11,23 71:6 72:8 73:17 76:5 81:24 82:15,25 93:5 95:21

makes 26:12 33:3 41:19,21 44:12 60:6

making 48:2 52:12 81:13

manage 48:9 managed 44:21

management 23:2

manner 78:14

maps 23:18,22 24:5

March 3:1,23 15:18 18:24 30:6 34:19,24 36:7 49:9 72:6,9,12 74:24 86:16 90:22 91:25 93:24 94:10,16 95:13,20

Marie 3:3

Masengale 9:23,24 11:21 12:4,11 63:25 64:5,6,8,23 65:7,13 67:16,17, 21 70:15,17

material 23:21

materials 23:15 24:8 25:7 33:23 44:8

44.0

math 36:6

matter 3:15 4:10 13:6 16:10,12 21:13 23:14 24:3 36:13 44:18,19 61:7 78:18 82:24 83:1,11

matters 46:5 59:22

Mcmahan 4:22,23,25 5:3,11,15,25 6:1 15:15 18:24 33:6 40:23 47:4 92:22

meaning 60:18,20

means 20:7

meantime 79:16

measurably 22:23

mechanism 69:16,23

meet 47:6 74:24 76:19 95:20

meeting 4:12,15 12:10 26:3 50:20 85:7 90:1 94:5

member 4:8 22:14 30:21

members 9:16,22 10:12,23,24 11:17 19:3,16,20 20:5 21:17 24:1,15 29:25 30:20 39:20 56:16 62:23

Memorial 30:17.18 40:7.9 86:9

memory 62:3

Menke 6:8

mention 51:21

mentioned 46:21 47:13 90:23

message 12:6

mic 8:22

micro 82:2

microphone 6:4

microphones 10:5,7

Microsoft 10:5 16:2 27:12 95:18

Mid-sentence 12:13

midday 94:9

middle 30:15 41:2 81:16

midst 67:12

military 70:22 92:15

mind 19:7 21:15 29:22 33:10 52:5 54:16 70:14 71:18 74:12 88:19 90:6

minds 90:1

mine 66:3 82:14

minimize 10:9 69:19

minimum 33:11 40:2

minor 89:24

minute 3:25

minutes 4:2 28:19 97:5

misspoke 61:18

mitigated 29:15

mitigation 53:4 89:12,13

mixed 76:7

model 17:24 78:12

modeled 81:8

moment 75:13

Monday 30:18 35:8 72:6 94:2,3,11,

16

Mondays 41:1

money 74:6

monitoring 7:18 9:22 10:5 67:25

month 26:5 33:20 46:16 53:24

months 3:15 29:12 46:13,24 47:7

90:5

Moon 11:4,5 84:5

morning 3:9 5:1,17 6:5,11 7:11,23 8:11,14,16,24,25 9:8,24,25 10:6 11:25 13:23 14:4 23:19 26:19 31:17 39:1 60:24 62:8,15 72:7 73:2 87:3

94:6

motion 27:10 38:5 40:1 43:1 55:12

58:10

motions 41:11 45:17 46:18 61:19

move 28:19 47:8 56:1 69:18

moved 48:18

movement 93:7

moving 57:11

Mr.-- 15:15

multi-tasking 43:6 62:6

multiple 23:22,23 49:5 63:21,22

mute 38:16 66:17

muted 42:11

muting 10:6

Ν

nation 8:7,11,15 13:2 17:17 18:3,6, 20 19:1,3,10,13,16,20,21 20:6 27:23 37:19 39:12,14 49:15 50:8,13 52:17, 23 56:22 60:12 66:25 68:20,23 73:12 79:17 90:18,22 98:1

Nation's 13:3 22:17 50:11 95:9

nations 21:17

natural 5:5

nature 18:7 79:13

necessarily 34:13 45:4 52:18 59:1,

21

needed 4:3 22:19 84:21 85:12 96:21

neutral 71:16 77:16 80:8 81:16

88:13

neutrality 75:9 78:20,25 79:5

news 12:22

night 12:21 67:22 69:6

noise 10:10 38:17

nominally 44:15

non-significance 29:16

noon 71:24

nose 38:12

note 7:3 40:8 49:12 85:25 90:21

91:1 95:21

notepad 37:4

notes 86:5

notice 4:19 7:5 8:8 35:15 49:3 82:24

83:5,13 90:25 95:16,23

noticeable 73:17

notices 34:14 86:1,17 96:17

notional 29:6 30:8 36:25 40:11

notionally 35:8

nugget 74:19

number 4:6 15:21 23:1 54:23

numbers 42:12 85:1

0

objected 41:11

objection 13:3

objections 13:7

obligations 44:20

obtained 29:1

obvious 54:24 92:15

occur 19:7 29:9 31:14 46:11 87:22

93:6

occurred 59:21,22

occurring 44:24

offensive 21:18

offer 26:20

office 7:18 8:1,8 34:19 35:24 36:1

officer 16:9,10 56:25 81:13

officially 64:18

offline 39:21

old-school 63:14 70:21

one-lawyer/one-witness 5:23

one-page 71:4

online 3:24

open 17:15 25:19,23 38:2 52:14

59:25 62:12 91:25

opening 3:25 27:9 89:6

opinion 56:21 81:20

opinions 20:8 74:10 75:6 82:1

84:17

opportunity 4:14,18 23:13 26:13,21

43:2

opposed 41:23 87:15



opposition 13:19 56:15

option 27:2

options 16:15

oral 19:2,15,17,21 20:11 21:10,21 37:20,21 74:3

orally 20:15

order 3:17,20 11:23 12:20 13:1,8 26:24 41:15 42:5 43:4 47:16 53:16, 23 55:21 61:11,12 62:9,10 63:14 64:12,17 67:23 75:1 77:6 79:9 80:5 82:11 83:21 91:9,10,15 92:5

ordered 32:13 75:22 orders 71:17 84:1 organizational 4:12

original 21:23 23:6 54:24 58:16

59:7 86:20

originally 12:23

other's 37:18

outcome 76:3 88:7

outcomes 88:24,25

outline 50:10

outlined 20:2 48:24

overburdened 94:3

Owens 11:3 66:15,16 67:6,11

Ρ

packed 47:13

pages 61:14 71:8 83:1

pants 78:13

paper 63:10,19,24 65:11,18 66:5 68:3,7 69:20 80:1

paper's 63:14

paragraph 18:25 19:12 56:13 61:19,23

parallel 54:12

Pardon 65:24

part 14:17 30:23 51:25 61:12 71:12

85:21

participate 4:17 15:8 18:21 19:13

participated 7:4

participating 5:21 7:6,8 8:1 13:15 14:11

participation 7:13 34:15

parties 3:5,24 4:6,15 9:9,12 13:23 14:12,19,25 15:13,14 16:21 17:17 24:6,17 25:18 26:13 28:16 31:10 33:24 34:2,23,24 35:6 36:16 37:7, 14,24 38:23 40:17 41:10,24 42:25 45:4 47:19 51:2 52:1,24 54:5 56:18 57:4 60:16,21 62:1,7,14 63:18,20,22 64:25 65:3,14,20 66:8 67:6,15,19 68:16 69:9,10 71:14 73:23 74:17 75:3,11,18,25 76:9,21 78:14,18 81:3,23 82:1,4,9,15,25 83:3,14 85:17 87:24 88:1 92:4 96:6,14,21 97:10

parties' 37:22 53:25 70:2 74:2

parts 28:3 33:9 44:11 72:10

party 5:25 7:20 9:2 14:2,9 15:6 34:6, 7,11,14,25 37:10 38:7 44:20 58:15 68:2 69:12 70:24

passionately 74:4

past 31:12 52:10 55:8 62:11 91:11

Patrick's 93:25 96:17

pay 25:20

paygrade 92:25

penalties 76:6

pending 15:16

people 3:19 4:15 26:1 83:15 88:23 93:8

perceive 77:5

perfect 6:14 15:10

perfectly 44:6 83:19

performance 91:12

period 24:21 29:9 35:13,17 44:14 45:1,2,3,17 46:1,17 54:13,22 92:10, 15 93:13

permit 42:2

permitted 21:21,22 56:6

persist 45:25

person 4:9 17:18 18:21 25:19,22 26:23 28:5 65:23 67:14,25

personal 49:25 52:10 81:7

personally 16:1 20:10 25:25

persons 56:14

perspective 28:10 79:6,10,20 88:22

perspectives 74:5

persuasion 60:14

petition 13:1,4,5

petitions 3:19 15:16 34:14 54:18

phone 12:10 27:12 42:12

phones 38:16 phonetic 67:4 photographs 25:7

photos 24:5

pick 12:17 39:22 40:12 43:6 46:19

47:13 81:16 91:8 93:22

picking 46:8 91:22

pictures 23:22 24:5 25:16

Pierce 96:12 **Pierce** 3:4 **pipe** 8:23

pitched 97:12 **place** 85:18,19

plan 4:1,3

planning 51:15

play 58:18 76:5

Plenty 75:6

point 8:16 31:12 32:18 35:2 40:13 44:10 45:16 53:11 59:18 62:19 63:4 67:14 77:21 87:10 94:11

pointed 74:14 pointer 24:7

points 30:14 53:8 58:12 74:13

pollution 23:1

portion 19:18 21:9 42:1

portions 26:25 27:4 32:9,19,24 77:12

portray 24:11

pose 24:1

position 37:17 45:20 53:9 87:6

possibilities 24:24

possibly 39:25 40:6 44:8 45:18

posted 15:19

potential 40:25 45:16 49:1 90:23

potentially 61:12

pound 42:14

pounds' 46:8

power 50:3

powers 49:24

practice 27:10 38:6 40:1 55:12

91:7,11

pre-covid 63:9

pre-filed 25:2 31:5,8,24 35:9 43:1 53:17,25 61:19,24 62:1,21 63:15

84:23

pre-hearing 3:16 13:10 30:5 32:12 35:9 36:12 38:22 41:12 47:1 49:5 52:4 66:22 67:23 69:22 70:2,18 71:21 72:5 75:17 83:21,25 85:1,8, 13,15 90:23 91:5,22,24 94:12,16

96:25 98:7

pre-scheduled 33:17

precisely 88:17

preclude 34:7

prefer 16:14,19 17:2,8,15 71:25

preference 16:7,20 17:16 49:16

68:11 88:8

preferences 17:24 62:25 86:11

prefiled 15:22

prehearing 96:7

prejudice 81:9

preliminary 3:20 11:23 12:20 13:1

16:19 67:23 86:18

premature 54:16

prepared 13:25 15:8 17:21 20:1

32:19 50:24 76:19

preparing 79:24

present 3:5 9:20 10:3 14:25 17:17 21:23 39:6,10,14 48:8 58:16 60:21, 22 73:6,9,12,14 75:4,20 76:12 80:7

83:11 89:21

presentation 20:25 21:21 25:6 62:23

presentations 45:18 74:2

presented 30:12 31:23 47:21 61:5

presenting 14:13

presents 24:12

preserved 55:16

preserving 55:13

preset 35:24

preside 3:12

presiding 16:9 56:25 81:13

press 4:8

pretend 21:19

pretending 37:2

pretty 32:22

preview 37:22 72:19

previous 7:4 55:18

principally 24:19

printer 63:12

printing 63:12

prior 7:5 24:3 33:15 41:12,13 55:5

78:13

problem 36:1 43:8 55:14 66:3

problems 24:12

procedural 15:20 51:19 63:8 70:7

procedure 91:6

procedures 56:3 76:1 92:5

proceed 51:20 58:3 73:19

proceeding 7:1 13:10 15:25 16:8 18:19 20:17 23:9 26:25 28:3 30:22 55:5 59:20 60:1 75:5 76:22 77:20

98:9

proceedings 3:2 5:6,8 7:5 14:2 22:25 26:6 27:4 33:8

proceeds 14:22

process 14:15 19:14 20:2 22:15 35:3 38:1 51:20 56:21 57:6 64:4,18

76:21 81:24 93:11

processes 53:5 92:5

processing 29:1,14

produce 68:16

production 52:12

progress 51:20

project 4:10 19:5 23:21 24:10,11,14

26:2 28:25 29:2,12 32:21 47:22 50:17 52:5 53:21,23 58:22,23 60:14

81:12 82:19 83:18 87:19 89:11

projects 93:12

promise 25:25

promised 38:9

promising 26:8

promotion 92:16

prompted 86:2

promptly 29:22

pronunciation 8:19

proof 52:11 58:16 60:14

proponent 34:12,25

proposal 44:1 52:13 66:7

propose 53:21 65:20 95:7

proposed 4:10 19:5 26:2 32:21

34:21 47:21 49:11 51:6 85:17 96:6

proposing 43:3

props 14:5 82:8

prosecuting 7:4,8

protections 20:18

provide 20:22 30:1 78:19 79:7

80:19 84:10

provided 13:22 67:18

proving 53:2

public 4:8,14,18 20:17 23:14 54:19

56:16,17 90:4

published 29:24

pull 50:5 94:6

pulling 87:10

purpose 56:13

purposes 55:13

pushed 54:17

pushing 85:18

put 16:15 22:2 24:5 33:5 38:22 46:8 57:13 65:5 71:24 75:13 85:12 88:12, 20 90:1

puts 73:21

putting 33:11 43:7 46:9 69:20 80:16

Q

qualifying 32:1

quality 47:18

question 14:10 22:13 23:7 25:4,14 26:18 27:15 28:11 32:3 37:6 42:22 50:21 51:1,18,19,22 52:12 54:4,7 56:20 57:21 58:2,13 59:19 63:24 65:17 66:21 68:3 73:19 86:20 87:16 94:20

questions 10:19 13:9,18 15:5 22:17 24:1,7 26:17 31:21 39:23 45:7,14 54:11 74:20 79:23

quick 12:16 38:12,20 71:4,5

quickly 56:8

R

raise 41:24 45:7 52:17 56:7,11 57:18 96:21

raised 14:6 17:2 51:1,14,16 54:4 55:15 60:2 61:25 62:15

raises 52:20

raising 42:9 56:5

Randolf 11:10,12,13,16

range 43:21

rant 57:8

raptors 87:20

RCW 29:5 56:4

reach 10:20

react 85:17 96:7

read 23:20 28:22 30:22 34:13 71:14

74:23 81:6 82:2 87:7

reads 73:24

ready 13:25 29:24 33:5,12,15 62:23

67:22

real 14:9

realistic 32:4 36:9 47:12 85:23

realistically 31:7

realities 50:7

reality 44:8 93:14

realization 93:5

realized 40:24

reason 22:18 25:9 52:8 53:6 55:25

66:19

reasonable 93:22

reasons 23:13 24:13

rebuttal 19:19 34:22 37:23 58:17

59:1,6,7 60:17

receive 64:18 65:21

received 28:23

recently 54:14

recess 38:16,19 72:20,22

recognize 47:19

recommendation 21:14 29:8 30:9

31:1 33:4 52:13 53:3 60:15 90:4

recommended 53:4 75:14

record 3:22 4:7 7:1 9:3 10:11 21:8, 12 22:2,8,20 26:12 30:23 33:3 49:13 55:13,20 70:2 72:20 93:5 95:24

97:13,18 98:5 recording 22:14

records 64:18

referee 76:2

reference 62:9 71:5

referenced 42:5 61:11 70:16 79:10

refine 78:8

reflected 41:4 53:23

refresh 71:19

regard 51:4 58:23 82:5

regulations 57:13

regulatory 33:2

relating 5:19

relevant 31:25 32:10 38:6 66:11

remarks 77:4

Remember 93:20

REMEMBERED 3:1

remind 64:9 96:2

remote 22:24

repeat 66:1

reply 34:21 35:18 36:4,16 37:10,14,

23 60:17

report 26:15

reporter 3:3,25 4:1 10:10 38:14

66:2 72:17 97:11

reporter's 6:21

reporters 21:8

representatives 44:21 70:24

represented 18:25

representing 6:9 9:9 10:16

request 19:19 22:3,18 28:25 53:15 57:14 64:9 78:18 79:4 88:6 96:5

requested 13:4 35:16

requesting 14:2 19:2 21:6

require 14:24 30:21 63:9,19 68:16

required 29:13,18 55:5 62:2 67:10

70:1

requirement 63:8 64:2 69:19

requirements 33:2 40:20 63:5

65:19 66:6,7

reservation 13:8

reserve 24:24

residing 3:3

resisted 63:11

resolution 41:12

resolved 84:14

resource 5:5 19:4

resources 87:13

respect 20:20 48:16 78:5 88:5

respectful 93:7

respectfully 51:13 64:9

respond 35:17,20 37:11 45:8 51:9

52:16 57:8

responded 13:19,21

responding 37:13,15 52:9

response 13:21 34:3 36:16 43:3 49:1 57:10 85:2

responsibilities 11:1

responsible 9:4 51:7

responsive 31:11 52:19

rest 30:5 93:4 Restate 42:4

result 58:23 88:8 89:19 90:1

results 38:5 88:22 revelatory 82:3

review 21:24 26:11,14 29:7,16,22 61:8 62:23 75:21,23

reviewable 47:16 reviewing 23:16

Reyneveld 7:21,23,24 8:1,3 12:2,3 17:11,14 18:2 27:18,19 39:7,9 48:21,23 49:23 50:2 68:9,10 73:7,8 78:16,17,23 79:2,22 90:12,15,16 94:25 95:1 97:21,22

Reyneveld's 67:3

Richard 9:5,9 23:11 39:16,17 73:13

Rick 57:25 73:14

Ridge 24:3 rioting 10:9

Rives 5:1,4 15:15 18:23 36:7

road 90:5 rock 80:24 rodeo 48:20

role 5:14 8:22 38:23

roll 4:7,21 11:18 38:12,21

room 18:12 24:4 92:14 94:13

round 15:15 31:23 38:3,4 46:14,15, 18 75:15 89:9

10 70.10 00.0

rule 5:23 55:24 78:11

rule-making 69:16

ruled 55:10

rules 33:2 56:2 63:8 69:8,17 70:7,

13,25 71:5 76:6

rulings 81:13,21

run 71:23,24 96:18

Ryan 7:3

S

sacredness 20:19

sample 81:5

Sara 11:10,12,14 39:9

Sarah 7:21,24 11:13 12:3 39:7 73:7,

satisfactory 38:13

save 74:2 89:21

schedule 24:18,19 26:25 31:4 35:23,25 36:3,23 42:25 47:6 49:8 50:18 51:6,18 52:8 57:15,17 58:9 59:15,16 61:23 72:10 85:18 86:19 92:9 94:3 96:6

scheduled 3:23 36:1 40:6,10 60:1 62:18

schedules 15:23

scheduling 4:11 14:20 31:2 38:10 39:22 40:19 43:4,14,17 46:5 47:20 48:22,24 50:7,11,17 57:21 59:9 60:12 84:19

Schimelpfenig 5:6

school 80:23,24

scold 73:21

scope 13:4,7,9 15:8 19:24 31:22 32:2,8,14 52:21 78:20 79:5,24 89:5

score 35:6 59:16 **Scout** 3:13 46:22

screen 11:23 12:14,18 23:19,20,24

24:4,11 28:22

seat 78:13

seats 88:20

Seattle 17:21

section 29:5

sections 31:25

seeks 58:15

sees 76:15,21

segregating 60:7

select 49:24

selecting 72:4

send 12:6 65:1 67:22 70:17 84:8 85:21 95:15,22,23 97:3

sending 65:3,4 66:21

sense 41:19,22 60:7 61:24

sensitive 18:13

sensitivity 18:9 20:18 63:13

SEPA 29:16,18 51:20 53:5 54:4,7,11 56:20 57:5,6,12,13 59:14,17 84:6

SEPA's 55:1

separate 30:15 41:22 49:16 54:11 55:1 57:6 59:20,25 85:22

separately 57:12 separating 42:1

September 28:24 86:8,10 96:19

sequence 44:4 **series** 48:10 60:6 **serve** 65:21,25 66:9

served 67:7.9

service 63:19 67:8 68:6,23 69:2,19 70:4 71:7

session 30:21 57:23

set 35:8 36:6 40:15 41:22 43:22 44:5,8,23 46:3,8 52:21 57:15 58:9, 21 59:16 63:3 64:3 66:12 71:17 73:22 74:9,21,25 76:5 83:6 84:21 85:16

setting 43:24 45:12

settle 65:20

shape 60:4

share 17:1 18:10,14 19:6 43:19 48:25 60:12 84:9 91:6

shared 20:19 Shauna 8:13

shift 63:6

shifted 40:4

shifts 45:9

Shona 8:12,15 18:6 19:9 21:3 22:5, 22 39:11,13 50:13 53:12 57:10 73:10,11 79:19 90:20 95:7

short 44:14 48:11,15 49:2

shorter 44:15 48:11

shortly 42:16

show 25:7 81:9 89:7

shows 81:9

side 84:6

sign 70:24

signed 18:24

significant 17:6

significantly 22:23 45:10

similar 41:14 43:3 79:20 95:16

simple 37:2

simply 4:11 14:14 27:9 37:13 42:24

44:7 55:20 60:8 81:12 97:11

sincere 47:21

sir 9:11 10:17 36:8 83:24

sit 46:23 81:3 84:6

site 3:11 54:20,25 93:12

siting 20:8 84:5

sitting 18:11

Skavland 11:8

sketch 96:5

slack 56:5

slide 36:10

slides 36:11

small 23:20,24

smaller 53:23

smallest 47:9

smiling 93:20

Smokey 48:14

solar 89:17

solve 42:7

song 48:14

Sonja 11:8,9

sooner 86:16

sort 4:14 22:2 33:1,5 39:24 43:20,21 44:4 45:11 48:1 50:3 66:21 74:25

80:13 84:19 87:2

sounds 40:5 46:12 50:22 61:9 86:5

speak 11:19 21:5 31:3 45:11 51:5

79:12 85:7 96:2 98:6

SPEAKER 4:23 5:3,11,15 6:1,5,10, 14,18,20 7:7,11,23 8:3,10,14,24 9:8,

20,24 10:2,14,17 11:3,4,8,10,12,16,

25 12:2,4,11 13:20 15:7 16:17,25 17:10,14 18:5,18 19:8 20:13 21:3

22:4,21 23:10 26:19 27:16,19,24

28:2,12 31:17 33:13 34:4,20 35:22 36:21 39:1,5,9,13,17 40:21 41:8

42:10,17,18,20,24 43:8,15 47:25

48:23 50:2,12 53:12 57:9,25 58:8,13

61:2,17,22 64:6 65:12 66:4 67:16

68:4,10,22 69:2,24 73:2,5,8,11,14

76:17 77:2,22 78:17,23 79:2,18

80:14 82:13,22 85:14 86:22 88:3

90:8,15,19 91:14,24 93:17 94:18,22

95:1,6,12 96:4,9,23 97:15,19,22,25

98:3

speaking 5:14 6:22 8:22 21:1 34:8

36:21 38:23 50:9 80:20 87:14 96:5

speaks 54:6

special 51:18

specialists 84:5

species 87:13,15,16,18,21,22

specific 14:6 35:1 45:15 49:10 51:2,

4 56:15 64:2 71:2 76:22,23 77:6,11

85:22 87:21,22

specifically 41:21 76:15 78:1

specificity 71:15 77:13,19 78:20,25

79:5 80:7 87:3

spellings 97:12

spend 55:19 74:6

sphere 54:20

spiel 47:24

spirit 87:25 89:8

split 43:18

splitting 17:3

sponsor 32:19

sponsoring 31:25 32:9

sports 76:2

spot 69:21 89:17

spring 30:3 33:16 44:12,18

St 93:25 96:17

staff 9:15 10:24 11:17 28:8,15,18 29:25 39:20 42:6,11 64:15 65:23

66:10,16 67:9 70:15 75:19 81:4 84:7

94:4 95:22 98:4

stage 75:5

stagger 27:3

staggered 27:4

stand 32:25 63:9

standard 74:24 78:12

standing 20:9

stands 63:1 89:15 96:13

star 42:14

start 4:21 6:24 10:9 15:23 45:6 46:2

49:8 63:23 74:19 78:24 86:3,18

started 35:15 57:22

starting 30:15 31:12 32:18 47:1

54:15 77:21 87:10 94:16

starts 10:8 45:3 49:3

state 4:7 17:22 33:9 44:11 47:17

56:7 93:11

stated 93:5

statement 25:1 29:18,23 51:17

54:13,17,21 55:7 58:4 59:11 78:8 82:11 83:2 87:1 89:6,7

statements 27:10 79:9 82:7 87:17

status 14:2,9 15:6 53:1

statutory 7:20 29:19 33:2 49:24

93:13

stay 16:19 66:18 97:11

step 82:9

Stewardship 9:5

stick 47:3

stipulation 33:1 69:8 70:23 71:4,7

84:22 89:19

Stoel 5:1.4 15:15 18:23 36:7

Stoloff 67:4

storage 89:18

streak 94:25

strictly 59:6

strike 38:6 41:11 43:1 45:18 61:19

strong 45:20 59:21 75:6 92:21

strongly 17:4 18:6 23:12 24:23

63:18 68:23 75:13

studies 14:7

stuff 38:8 92:11

style 81:15

styling 81:7

subject 54:2 59:15 61:5,7 75:23

82:25 83:11 96:11

submission 35:9

submissions 74:23

submit 35:3 62:1 90:25 94:6

submits 58:14

submitted 59:3 71:15 79:11 82:10

87:3

subpoena 91:7

substance 57:1 75:17

substantive 7:13 62:22 93:3

sufficient 49:3 70:3

sufficiently 49:8

suggest 44:16 94:12

suggestion 59:15 82:14

suggestions 62:12

suitable 80:11

suited 27:8,9

suits 86:14

sum 62:16

summarize 71:4

summary 20:14

supplement 25:8

supplemental 19:19

supplemented 37:20

supply 97:7

support 23:12 24:23 25:3 31:6 33:23 35:1 56:14 65:22 66:10

supporting 32:15

supports 68:23

supposed 29:7

Supreme 47:17 55:10,18

survey 16:6 29:25

switch 12:15

Т

table 26:17

tailor 87:5

takes 11:18 62:22

taking 5:14 8:16 40:15 83:7

talk 4:11 21:23 26:9 40:13 47:20

64:1

talked 40:19 60:17 62:17,20,24

89:20

talking 3:25 25:2 31:4 46:16,25

64:25 83:7

tally 25:18

targeted 77:7

team 5:1 8:16 17:23

Teams 3:5 10:5 12:14 16:3 27:13

95:18

technical 60:18

technological 20:7

technology 16:3

tee 56:24 88:21,23,25

teeth 47:5 92:23

tells 55:21

ten 46:7

ten-minute 4:2

tenor 57:2

terms 32:4 41:20 45:12 49:10 59:9

60:18 61:23 65:17 66:6 85:18

test 6:3

19:1,2,3,14,15,17,19,22,23 20:1,23 21:20 22:11,18 25:2,8,13 26:23 31:5,8,11,13,23,25 32:15,19,23,25 33:5 34:21,22 35:3,9,18 36:15

testimony 14:14 15:22 17:18,25

37:10,12,14,18,19,21,23,24 38:3 40:1,4 41:11 43:1 46:13 47:1 49:1,2

50:23,25 51:4,8 52:18,22 53:17,22,

25 54:1 58:14,16,17,24,25 59:1,2,3, 4,6,7 60:15 61:19,24 62:1,21 63:16 79:25 82:15 84:23

text 24:5

thereabouts 36:10

thing 15:3 38:2 51:14 83:5,6

77:18 87:12 89:10 92:9

things 9:23 12:24 13:16 14:6 15:6, 21 23:19 27:12 35:20 36:25 38:6 40:2,11 44:22,24 47:12,18 48:17 52:3 58:22 62:18,22 63:9,12 67:25

thinking 31:6 33:15 36:8,18 45:5 48:2 69:11 85:4 86:3

thinks 15:3 77:8

Thompson 9:18,20 28:10,12 64:16 69:5,18,21,24 81:4 84:4 96:20,23

thought 25:13 37:7 61:13 81:2 83:20 89:16 91:18

thoughts 38:10 40:14,18 49:21 50:11,14 69:23 71:19 80:1 83:23 90:14 91:20

thousand 25:16

three-tiered 35:2

throw 48:5

throwing 76:2

ticking 49:4

tied 25:14 51:18

tier 41:19

tiered 45:18

tight 50:17 83:15

tilted 74:20

Tim 5:3

time 6:22 10:22 14:24 22:12 24:6,17, 20 27:25 29:1,8 33:21 34:17 35:2, 13,20 36:1,3 40:6 41:11 43:9 44:14 46:15 48:11,15 49:2 51:22 53:22 55:20 61:5,7 70:10,11,18 71:14 72:5,7,8 74:6 75:2,6 81:1 84:2 85:5, 7 89:4,23 91:9,13,18,21 92:10,15,20 93:8,23,25 94:10 95:18,19 97:9

timeline 30:4

times 35:24 61:4

timing 36:13,22 50:15 84:23

today 3:16,21 4:4 5:10,14,24 7:6 8:2,17 11:20 13:12 15:11 16:6 26:13,22 30:1 31:8 32:11,17 34:9 36:20 46:23 47:19 52:9 57:2 63:4,12 64:25 66:20 70:1,8,17 71:3,14 72:3 73:23 76:13,24 84:14 85:12,24,25 91:3,5,21 93:2,6 95:22,24 96:21 97:4,12,18 98:5

today's 3:22 4:9 7:1 13:9,17 22:20 28:21 46:12 52:4 56:23 66:22 85:10 86:16 95:16

told 70:9 76:8 tolerate 5:18 tone 71:16 tones 77:15

tongue 50:6

top 34:18 57:22 71:22

topic 14:22 61:1 74:14 80:12 91:10

topic-specific 60:1,5

topics 14:10 44:2

Torem 3:9,10 4:25 5:9,13,22 6:3,5,7, 12,16,19,21 7:16,24,25 8:5,12,18,25 9:11,21,25 10:4,15,18 11:4,6,9,11, 13,17 12:1,5,6,9,12,13 13:20 14:3 15:2,10 16:17,23 17:7,11 18:1,16,22 20:3,20 21:7 22:16 23:3,20 25:12 26:21 27:6,18,22 28:1,6,14 31:17 32:6 33:13,19 34:4,10 35:4 36:5,22, 24 38:15,20 39:3,7,11,15,19 41:7,25 42:10,15,19,21,23 43:5,10 45:22 48:13 49:22 50:5 51:23 54:2 57:16, 25 58:6,11 59:24 61:9,17,20 62:3 64:7,11,22 65:17,24 66:15 67:16,20 68:8,20,25 69:4,24 70:9 72:19,23 73:2,4,7,10,13,16,21 76:19,25 77:10 78:9,12,19,22,24 79:15 80:9,21 81:18 82:21 83:24 85:14,20 87:9 88:18,19 90:12,17 91:8,17 92:13 93:19 94:20,24 95:3,10,14 96:8,10 97:1,15,17,21,24 98:2,4

Torem's 81:7 **tough** 5:6

town 48:19 track 54:12 55:1 77:7

tradition 20:11

traditions 19:21 21:18

transcript 21:24 26:6,14 30:22 71:3

transferable 61:12 translate 22:9,11 translated 22:7 transmit 20:7,23

transmitting 20:11

transparent 57:3

travel 17:21 24:16 25:23 68:17

treated 52:18

Tri-cities 9:2,10 13:4 14:8 17:22 23:6,11 36:17 37:16 39:15,18 57:23 58:1,19 66:25 69:1 73:15 74:18 82:6 83:1

trial 4:16 55:16 57:19

tribal 21:17

tribe 21:18 56:22 77:14

Tribes 8:6

trigger 31:9 36:15

trouble 12:8 true 49:4 59:8

Tuesday 72:7 94:2,5,6,9

tune 24:18

turn 16:13 23:5 43:20 45:2 82:6

Turning 8:5 68:2

turns 93:13 tweaky 16:4

type 5:23 20:22 27:8

types 22:25

typical 54:8

typically 38:4 54:9

U

ultimate 88:2 ultimately 31:1

ultra 69:14

umbrella 60:5

unavailability 14:21 35:15 86:1,9,

17 90:25 96:18

unavailable 30:2 91:1 95:4

unclear 59:13

understand 4:13 9:4 20:16 21:2,16 22:1,5 23:18 25:15 31:22 41:25 45:19 51:10 54:9 55:14 82:15 87:17 91:3

understanding 17:19 20:4,21

understood 23:3 36:20,22 82:1

undue 38:17 55:19 uniform 66:12 unmute 42:14

unmuted 42:8

unpredictable 38:5

upcoming 4:16 update 13:24 updated 32:20

upfront 87:23 89:20

usable 45:1

٧

vacations 33:18

vague 73:25

Valley 42:5 55:9 75:1

varying 34:3

venue 15:13,24 20:22 25:15,21 26:18 27:8,15 28:11

venued 27:4

version 83:12

versus 63:24 65:10

viability 43:22

viable 44:6

vicinity 24:14

video 21:15,24 22:14

view 34:7 60:13

views 83:2

vigorously 29:21

vires 69:14

virtual 15:25 16:15,20 17:15,20 25:19 27:1.9 28:4 63:1

visual 24:9 25:4,7 59:4 87:12

Voelckers 8:13,14,15,18 18:3,5,6, 16,18,22 19:8,9 20:3,13 21:3,4 22:1, 4,5,21,22 26:24 27:22,24 39:11,13 50:9,12,13 51:24 53:11,12,13 56:19 57:7,9,10 61:25 68:21,22 73:10,11 79:17,18,19 80:9,14 81:23 90:17,19, 20 91:14,19 95:3,6,7 97:24,25

voice 7:25 42:16

vote 81:11,20 88:24

voting 25:18

W

WAC 54:7 57:12 69:9,12 78:1

wade 81:22 wait 54:18

waiting 79:12 93:8 95:19

wanted 9:14 14:5 15:23 16:6 17:22 57:3 84:13 90:21 96:1,3

wanting 25:18,19

Washington 3:4,12 56:7

waste 81:1 wasting 95:19 watched 33:8

ways 82:4 weather 16:5

water 34:1 52:15

website 15:19

week 12:23 30:16 33:14,15 36:11 40:6,9 41:2,3 44:12,25 50:20 53:20 72:8 84:9 90:22 91:1 92:1 93:23,24 94:1 97:3

week's 85:6

weeks 30:15,16,19 49:13 50:24 51:8

whatsoever 37:3 Whistling 24:3 wildlife 83:9 87:13

wind 3:13 4:10 14:18 29:2 33:7

72:25 81:12

window 49:2

witnesses 16:21 18:12 19:25 21:4 22:10 24:1,25 25:16 28:3 32:1,10 34:2 44:20 60:7 61:4 83:10

wondering 4:9 47:5 64:24

word 55:4 81:17

words 22:7 25:17 26:7 31:24

work 27:13 36:20 48:7,8 51:11 54:23 62:22 66:13 67:14 70:14 71:11 75:16 84:11 86:15 89:8 94:1, 5,17 97:7

worked 17:9 44:5 70:6 97:4

workflow 44:19

working 5:5 21:8 22:10,13 46:3,4 49:6 50:15 67:6 80:3

works 95:8

workshop 80:17

workshopped 97:4

workshopping 80:15

worms 38:2

worried 14:15 83:19

worry 35:19

worth 25:16 46:8

wrap 85:3

wrapped 71:23 84:24

writing 47:16 55:21 56:22

written 19:14,22 20:1,7 31:23 55:20

68:16 69:9 74:3

wrong 20:5

Υ

Yakama 8:6,7,11,15 13:2,3 17:16 18:3,6,20 19:1,3,10,13,16,20 20:5 21:1,18,21 22:17 27:23 37:19 39:11, 14 49:15 50:8,10,13 52:17,23 56:22 60:12 66:25 68:20,23 73:12 79:17 90:18,21 95:8 98:1

Yakima 16:25

year 30:3

years 21:8 23:1 26:4,5 27:12 46:6 48:19 55:4 62:4

yesterday 3:20 51:17 77:14

Ζ

Zoom 27:12

