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BE IT REMEMBERED that on FRIDAY, JULY 21, 2023, at 11:05 A.M., the deposition of DAVID KOBUS was taken before Monna J. Nickeson, Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Livenote Reporter, Certified Court Reporter (WA 3322), Certified Shorthand Reporter (ID 1045), (OR 16-0441), (CA 14430), the following proceedings took place:

## DAVID KOBUS

having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Mr. Kobus, would you state your full name and business address?
A. David Kobus, $D-a-v-i-d, K-o-b-u-s$. My business address is 1385 Cortland Avenue, Richland, Washington.
Q. I'm Richard Aramburu. I'm the attorney for Tri-Cities C.A.R.E.S, one of the intervenors in the EFSEC proceeding. We're here today to take your deposition.

Have you ever had your deposition taken before?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Okay. Let me just, and with permission of your counsel, try to talk about some ground rules as we go through the deposition.

So, first of all, we can't talk over each other because the court reporter has difficulty taking down both of us speaking at the same time. So if you will allow me to -even though you may think you know the answer before $I$ finish it, let me finish my question, and then we'll give you time to finish your answer. So let's not talk over each other, okay?

And if you don't understand the question that's being asked to you, let me know right away, and I'll try to reformulate the question, put it in clearer terms, but please let me know. We don't want to have any confusion later on.

This deposition will be transcribed. It may be used for various purposes. It may be used as a part of the EFSEC proceedings. So
you should consider the things that you're saying today may become a part of the record before EFSEC.

You're not permitted under the rules, the Civil Rules for Superior Court, to confer with your counsel after I have asked you a question. You can't ask her, so what do you think of the question, how should I answer, those kinds of things. Outside of that, you can confer with her as you like.

We're starting at 11:00 today. If you need a break at any time, you just let me know and we'll do that. I would like to do this in one fell swoop, so to speak, if we can, but let's -- we'll see how it goes.

I understand counsel for Benton
County and for Yakima will also have questions for you as time goes by.

So do you understand those kind of parameters we're talking about?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Okay. Well, let's get started, then.

I don't know a great deal about you,
Mr. Kobus. Could you tell us your education and background professional experience?
A. Sure. Education-wise, I have a bachelor's in nuclear technology and a master's in engineering management. My background is I worked for -- well, $I$ was in the Navy for eight and a half years in the Navy nuclear program. Then came to work -- well, I worked in the nuclear industry, ultimately came to work for Energy Northwest here, and held various positions out at the nuclear plant. And eventually transitioned into being their project manager, developer for renewable energy projects. And ended up developing the Nine Canyon Wind Project, which was built in three phases, permitted through the county.

And then, after leaving Energy
Northwest, $I$ was in the financial services industry for a while. And then, eventually, hired on with Scout Clean Energy, and am now the project manager for the Horse Heaven Clean Energy Center.
Q. And when did you come to work for Scout?
A. 2018 .
Q. And you indicated -- were you the
project manager for the Nine Canyon project?
A. I was. Developer, project manager, yes.
Q. And are you a licensed professional engineer?
A. I am not.
Q. Before you came to work for Scout, had you worked -- outside of Nine Canyon, had you worked on any other projects in the Horse Heaven Hills, wind projects?
A. Not in the Horse Heaven Hills, no. But for Energy Northwest, $I$ was developing projects all over the Pacific Northwest for them. Some -- one was sold to Avista, and others just did not come to fruition.
Q. Okay. And do you recall a Columbia project in the Horse Heaven Hills?
A. Sure. It's the first time $I$ met my CEO, Michael Rucker. He was working for Clipper Windpower and was marketing a project that they were trying to develop on the BLM land initially is where they started trying to develop.

And so we were looking at and
engaged for, you know, many weeks trying to see
if that project was something that Energy Northwest was willing to partner up, so to speak, with Clipper Windpower to build a wind project there.
Q. What's the time frame of that?
A. That would have been 2010, somewhere around 2009, 2010 .
Q. And where was -- and that was the Columbia project, correct? Is that what we're talking about, the same thing?
A. Yeah, that's what was the name of it at that time. Yeah.
Q. And give me a general geographic description of the Columbia project.
A. Well --
Q. You might do it in relation to this -- the project we're here. Is it part of it, some of it, is it --
A. It's part of it, but the Columbia project also included the BLM land, which is the higher ground which goes over towards Benton City and over to Chandler Butte. And that was about the extent of it.

I actually had wind leases west of that on that same ridge line for Energy

Northwest. And so $I$ was looking at combining the project $I$ was developing further west with what Clipper was developing along the BLM area and partially on what now is part of the Horse Heaven leasehold that we're trying to develop.
Q. And was the Columbia project -- is the land for the Columbia project now part of the -- this project?
A. My understanding is yes. I know one landowner that was part of Columbia that we have a lease with. But, you know, to be honest with you, I really don't remember what was all in the Columbia footprint.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

So, today, we're going to have a number of questions about the updated ASC. And I have put in front of you what's been marked as Exhibit 1 for this deposition.
(Exhibit 1 was identified.)
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And I will represent to you and to your counsel that we downloaded this paper copy from the EFSEC website, and we have downloaded the redine version of the amended ASC.

MR. ARAMBURU: And, Counsel, is
there any objection to this document being used by the witness?

MS. PERLMUTTER: No. Based on your representation that it was -- that it's the document you downloaded from the EFSEC website, we're good to go.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And you also notice when you open it that it's double-sided, so we're trying to save a little paper here.

So we have a number of questions about the amended ASC, as $I$ will refer to it. And can you tell me who wrote the document?
A. Yeah, sure. It was Tetra Tech was our primary contributor who prepared the redline under my guidance.
Q. Okay. So we have redline portions of the document, and those were amended from the original February 2021 application; is that correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. And who wrote the original
application?
A. Tetra Tech did as well under my guidance.
Q. And were any portions of the application that were written by anyone else, other than Tetra Tech?
A. There were contributors to it, like, various section -- for example, the wildife section, Western Ecosystems contributed to that. And then there were various functional areas within Tetra Tech that also contributed expertise related to various sections in the document.
Q. And did you write any sections of the document yourself?
A. There may have been paragraphs or sections, like, for example, looking at alternatives to the proposal we were making and describing -- you know, being the initial author of describing what those alternatives were and how they were evaluated.

And then, from that point on, it was a collaborative effort from the team that, you know, any of us could have added rediines and scrubbed content that was provided by Tetra Tech.

But -- so there were a few sections that I was the original author. For the most
part, I relied on Tetra Tech to author the majority of it because of their extensive expertise in, you know, many projects, different regions, and having a lot of talent readily available to contribute that information.
Q. Okay. I don't want to put words in your mouth, and feel free to disagree with my characterization.

Would it be fair to call you the editor of the document?
A. It would. I had the last word on it.
Q. Okay. Okay. Good. Good. Now, did the lawyers review the document?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. And did the lawyers write -- I'm talking about lawyers, counsel for scout, did the lawyers write any sections of the amended -- of the updated ASC?

MS. PERLMUTTER: I'm going to object
on the grounds -- on privilege grounds.
You don't have to answer that question.
MR. ARAMBURU: Counsel, I'm simply
asking whether lawyers did it. I'm not asking for particulars regarding what the lawyers did. I'm simply asking whether the lawyers were involved. I think that's a fair question.

MS. PERLMUTTER: It calls for work product, but you can answer.

THE WITNESS: Okay. There were contributions in the form of redlines. I do not recall any original authoring material.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. So if we look through here, some of the redline provisions could have been authored by lawyers?
A. Yeah. You know, we approached this at a team effort. We wanted to make sure that we had, you know, the best available information to fully capture what we believed was a document that, you know, in our attempt would be, you know, above reproach and, you know, best available that EFSEC has seen.
Q. Let me -- as kind of an example here, there's a section in the document about land use. And that's -- I'm going to use those
today as well, Mr. Kobus.
A. Yeah. Give me a page number.
Q. So what we've done is we've divided up into the sections $1,2,3,4 . \quad$ So this would -- we're now looking at page 2-7.
A. Okay.
Q. And towards the bottom of that page, under section 2.1.3, there's a reference to land use and zoning ordinances; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then it goes on to the next page.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you know who wrote that?
A. I am certain Tetra Tech wrote the basic draft, and then $I$ know $I$ probably diddled with it a bit as well, redlined, you know.
Q. And you generally described the nature of the process in drafting and finalizing --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the amended ASC.

Was there any input from any
potential purchasers of the project to the updated ASC?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Object as to -THE WITNESS: No.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Object as to form. You can answer the question.

THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And were any utilities consulted about the content of the ASC?
A. You know, we -- in marketing the project, we market to any potential offtaker, any potential purchaser, for the entire time we develop these projects.

And so we had many, many conversations with regional utilities, commercial and industrial potential offtakers. I even had conversations with Benton PUD.

And so, in the process, we consider designing the project and developing it so it is the most attractive type of project that we can put together for that mass market to try and capture the best fit offtaker for the project. But in no uncertain terms, there's no input from potential offtakers in this document.
Q. Okay. You indicated that you had a conversation with someone from Benton PUD?
A. Correct.
Q. And can you tell me who that was?
A. Rick Dunn.
Q. And can you tell me the nature of the conversation?
A. We were, at one point, considering utilizing right-of-way easements that they have for their system, and the possibility of co-locating transmission lines in their easements, as well as the possibility of engaging in -- $I$ forget the exact terminology for it, but a cooperative agreement where we could work together in finding ways that we could collaborate on the project relative to the infrastructure and relative to potential interest that the PUD might have to become part of it.
Q. Can you be a little more specific about was there -- well, let me ask this question.
A. I offered them a draft agreement that said, here's what we can do for you. Here's what you can do for us. Here's what
we'll offer to pay you for your service. Please sign or tell me what change you'd make.
Q. And what --
A. It was to that extent.
Q. Excuse me. I'm violating my own rule here.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Happens all the
time.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And was that an agreement to acquire the entire project?
A. No, no. At that point, it was an agreement to work together on potential infrastructure sharing and finding the most optimal economical way to interconnect the project with the Bonneville grid.
Q. So you were going to possibly share Benton County easements?
A. Sure. I'll give you an example. The City of Richland and Benton County were working together to supply or provide a high voltage transmission line in the Dallas Road area.

And the City of Richland built the
line to a terminus and it was never energized.

So it's a 115 high voltage line sitting out there alongside the highway. Was a great opportunity for us to potentially co-locate transmission to be able to interconnect with the Bonneville grid.

And it did not become fruitful. The PUD chose not to work with us on it. The City of Richland indicated that if we could do something with the PUD, then they'd maybe be interested and talk to us about it. But the PUD kind of changed their whole approach after that.
Q. So was there ever a proposal to acquire power from Benton PUD?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the nature of that proposal?
A. That, you know, offtakes available, you know. If you're interested, we'd be willing to talk about it.
Q. My question was, was there ever discussion that Scout would buy power from Benton PUD?
A. Well, for sure. And those discussions are ongoing and continue because,
you know, understand that when we locate a collector substation in a utility territory, we're going want backup service from the local distribution system in the event we become disconnected from the grid.

We're going to need power to run the SCADA, you know, keep all the metering energized, run the air conditioners. We also need back feed service from the grid to power the heaters and oil pumps and those sorts of things when there's no wind on the system.

And so the way Bonneville orchestrates those contracts is that we actually sign up to interconnect with the grid, but then we also have to have an agreement with the PUD to provide that back feed service. Because Bonneville won't deal directly with us, it has to go through the local PUD.

So, in fact, if at the end of the month we net -- actually haven't drawn power from the grid in the form of back feed, we have to pay the PUD for that. And so that's ongoing for the life of the project.

And we also have crossing agreements that we're going to have to have with the PUD.

We're going to cross their distribution. We're actually going to have to bury and reroute some of their distribution so that it is -- we have the appropriate setbacks and meet their criteria for proximity to their infrastructure. So it's an ongoing relationship. And I've been working -- Pat, in fact, and I, have been meeting with the PUD, and we have -the next step in our process is that $I$ have to offer them an easement agreement and designate everywhere where we're going to cross or have to move their infrastructure.
Q. So has there been discussions with the PUD to acquire power from them to use for, for example, the batteries?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked and answered. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, one of the things with the battery storage portion of the system is you have the option of charging it from the output of the wind project, charging it from the solar project, or charging it from the grid. And so we discussed and entertained those options with the PUD to see if they
would be interested in providing grid charge power for the batteries in the event that, you know, they need to be charged and there isn't adequate solar available at the time or there isn't adequate wind generation at the time.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. So was there ever a calculation of the expected energy that might be acquired on an average basis from Benton for the purpose of that recharging of the batteries?
A. Not recharging of the batteries, no. We -- we did have calculations and had discussions about the backup station service that would be needed.

But when it came to the battery, the PUD indicated that they didn't believe -- well, first, they didn't have the energy to do it. They didn't have the power supply to do it. And they didn't believe that they could acquire it from Bonneville to do it. And so the discussions ended at that point because we didn't see a success path.
Q. So if you don't get this energy from Benton, where are you going get it?
A. We either -- from the output of the wind project, from the solar, or from the offtake utility. That's actually -- see, with the battery, the way that will work in the marketplace is, we will allow them to dispatch it, and then we just have a tolling agreement that, you know, pays us for the amount of dispatch they utilize.

And the ideal situation is, you know, they're going to take transmission from the project, and when they need to charge the battery, they would just decrement some of that transmission to provide grid charge for the battery through their contractual arrangements with Bonneville. That's the optimal way.

I mean, with the PUD, I was just thinking, you know, maybe they'd want to get into that business, and, you know, have a potential revenue stream, but it isn't proving to be viable.
Q. So the alternative to that is to get it from BPA (indecipherable).
(The Court Reporter requested clarification.) BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Get it from BPA through the grid.
A. No. BPA has indicated they will not supply it, but they'll wheel it. I mean, that's what BPA generally does is, they have an open access transmission tariff where they allow utilities and IPPs like we are to interconnect with the grid, and then you contract for who you're sending power to or who you're getting power from, and then you pay Bonneville for the wheeling on their system. So they're responsible for the reliability of the system. They may provide you balancing services that are required, you know, to maintain grid stability. But Bonneville doesn't sell power.

```
    They are -- they're fully
```

contracted. They may be able to sell power to the wholesale markets when they have excess. But, you know, generally Bonneville is just the wheeler. They're the grid interconnect and the grid manager.
Q. I understand the concept of a wheeling agreement with Bonneville, but who would be the source of the power that would be
wheeled to this project to take care of batteries, for example?
A. The offtaker.
Q. Who is the offtaker?
A. We don't -- we don't have an offtaker identified yet.
Q. Is it likely that we're going have an offtaker identified within the next year?
A. Let me answer the question this way. It's challenging to market a large commercial-scale energy project and finance it without a permit.

And an offtaker, this is, you know, a risky scenario bringing on new generation, period. And, clearly, if you don't have a permit -- if you don't have a permit to build the project, it's difficult for an offtaker to make commitments.

And so until we get that permit, it's not very likely that we're going to have that offtake identified.
Q. As I understand the situation, that Scout is actively marketing this project now to utilities, to various --
A. Anybody who will listen. I'm sorry,
I interrupted. I'm sorry.
Q. That's fine.
So there is an active marketing
project -- or effort ongoing, even though
there's no license from EFSEC?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I just had a couple of questions here that I'm -- I'm confused about in the ASC, and perhaps you can just help me clarify here.
A. Sure.
Q. On page 285 -- 2-85. I think it's here. Costs. It says the cost of the project would be \$1.727 billion; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that whether you build the 244 turbine version or the 150 version?
A. The best response $I$ can give you to that is, you know, at the time we originally, you know, developed the application, we were looking at the most likely equipment that would have the best fit and the best economics for the project.

And so, you know, in response, my belief is that represents the ideal turbine for the project, which still remains the ideal
turbine for the project, and that's the 244 , smaller platform equipment.
Q. Okay. And I noticed that this cost was not -- was not updated.

So are these costs from February of 2021?
A. Yes. And they're no longer accurate. Tremendous things have happened in the market, inflation, supply constraints, changes that the manufacturers are making in actually how they market turbines.

But, you know, we have an exclusive arrangement with General Electric associated with this particular project development. And so the expectation there is that we will use General Electric equipment unless we can demonstrate that there is a more economically viable available, as high a quality model of turbine that can be built and delivered in the timeframe we need for the project.

And then, at that point, we would, you know, pursue legal challenge to that exclusivity if we deemed it necessary.
Q. Let me understand what's going on here.
to hear. I just want to explain, you're asking for terms such as, do we have a contract with GE? No, we have not procured turbines from GE. Do we have an obligation from a prior arrangement that gives them exclusivity? Yes, we do.
Q. Okay. Okay. And so you indicated in your previous answer that the cost estimate found on page $2-85$ of the amended ASC is probably too small?
A. Too small.
Q. And do you have any information to give us about how much too small it is?
A. Well, the greatest component of the cost of the project is the turbines, the turbine supply. And the way the current market is, every time we ask GE for a price update, it has an escalator on it.

So, you know, this was a ' 21 price basis. In fact, for the redline, we didn't even update it because we know it's out of date and it's going to change likely the next time we ask GE for a price update.

I mean, that's just how this market works. And the components supply, the material
supply, the fundamental commodities have escalated up and gone down just in the last six months.
Q. Okay. I understand the answer. And on a general basis, is this 10 percent wrong, 20 percent wrong? Order of magnitude, if you can. If you can.
A. I can't answer that.
Q. GE also makes the bigger turbines, don't they?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. And on the construction side of things, have you updated estimates for the construction side?
A. We continue to update estimates and we continue to work with vendors, you know, for example, the EPC-type vendors that we've been engaged with. We try and update -- refresh our request for proposals related to the balance of plant cost for the project, which are also a major -- one of the major components of the ultimate cost.
Q. Okay. Someone may be reading this deposition and doesn't know --
A. Sure.
Q. -- what EPC is. Could you define that?
A. That's engineer procure construct. And so those are the type of contractors that, you know, they come in, they provide engineering for the balance of the plan. They work with the turbine supplier which is a separate contract. The turbine supply agreement is separate.

But it's EPC contractor who arranges and erects and constructs the project. So they're like the general contractor. If you were to go out and build a building, they'd be the general contractor that you hire even though you may be buying a Butler building. That's a similar analogy.
Q. Would it be fair to characterize it as a sort of design build contract, EPC?
A. Yeah, elements of it. We don't design in-house, but we do have design capability internally within the company. And they're actually the ones that work with the contractors we hire.

And we have other consultants that we bring in as well. Like the electrical
design is done by a separate consultant.
That's even prior to letting the EPC contract.
Q. So the current preferred plan is

244 turbines?
A. Up to 244.
Q. Okay.
A. We're permitting the maximum extent we believe we can optimally site on that project.
Q. And $I$ don't mean to be facetious in any manner, but the plan for 244 turbines maxes out the project, is that for to say?
A. We will -- we will not go more than 244, but we cannot build more than 235 because we have an agreement with the Department of Defense that's -- it's called a mitigation agreement. We're in the viewshed of the fossil Oregon NORAD facility.

And so they've -- as part of the mitigation response team, they evaluated our turbine layouts and have indicated places where we had to reduce the number of turbines. So we've -- we have an agreement with them where we could not build more than 235.
Q. And is the 235 turbine layout shown
in the amended ASC?
A. No, because we want to permit all 244 so we have the flexibility as we optimize this project, until we get to the point where we pull the trigger on the construction, we need all of those locations available.

I don't know what I'm going to lose in the next week for something to pop up that says, that's too much cut and fill. We can't build that one. You got to use one of the others that you got on the bench, and replace it.

So I've got to have all 244 sites permitted so $I$ have that flexibility to build the optimal, most suitable project for whoever the ultimate offtake entity is, or entities. It could be more.
Q. Okay.
A. Or we could sell the project to somebody. I mean, all these things are on the table. It's what developers do. I mean, we're a private developer. We're trying to satisfy a market. And, you know, as opportunities come available, we'll evaluate them to the fullest.
Q. So the change from the 244 to the

235, which is the maximum, is that -- that does not identify specific turbines. It just says you can't have more than 244 , is that the way the arrangement is?
A. The 235 turbines that we can build are precisely identified by coordinates in the mitigation agreement, yes, and that's publicly available.
Q. Okay. So that's where I'd go to look for that?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Okay. So I want to go back a little bit of the history of the project.
I understand you got involved in

2016?
A. 2018 .
Q. 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what was the project when you got involved?
A. When I got involved, it was a 250-megawatt project intending to interconnect at Red Mountain.
Q. And 250?
A. 250 megawatts of wind, yes.
Q. Of wind only?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was in 2018?
A. That was in 2018, yes.
Q. And was that a viable project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Every iteration we
have in the development of the project is
intended to get it to the most viable state we can.

As it turns out, you know, we never did have a success path to interconnect at Red Mountain, and that's why we gave up
that interconnection request.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. That was a BPA connection?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. And what was wrong with Red Mountain?
A. We -- how do I say it? It was challenging to get all of the easements that were required to get our gen-tie installed from the project site to actually to the Red Mountain substation.

In the interim, we were competing against another wind developer that had leases and interconnections in the queue interspersed with our leases on the project site.

And, ultimately, we worked with that competitor, acquired their assets, acquired two interconnection queue positions that they had for the 230 kV line on the east and the 500 kV line on the west, which made the 115 kV interconnect no longer viable because now the project had expanded to be -- well, I think at that stage it was 850 megawatts at that time.
Q. Okay.
A. But, you know, our job as developers is we're continuing to finesse and optimize and make this more attractive for an offtake market. And so we're constantly working. That's my job, is to look for ways to make this better, to make it more attractive, to make it more economical.
Q. So there was capacity at the Red Mountain substation to take the 250 turbine project?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Who was with the competitor?
A. WPD Incorporated. In fact, we have an ongoing -- similar to exclusivity with GE, have an ongoing contract obligation with them as a result of acquiring those assets.
Q. Which include leases?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Which include leases, land leases?
A. No. With WPD, we've acquired all of the land lease that we desire. And they've given up the ones we didn't desire. And so, yes, we're the only ones out there that have leases, that $I$ know of.
Q. So just to backtrack a little bit. When you came on board in 2018, the project that was then under consideration was a 250 megawatt wind project?
A. Yes.
Q. So, then, what was the next iteration of the project?
A. Well, the next iteration was to acquire leases from WPD and this eastern interconnection that they had that was in the queue for 250 megawatts.

But then, since we had more assets, more ability to interconnect, we added another

100 megawatt interconnect request to use up the remaining available capacity on the 230 kV side of the project. So that then went up to 350 megawatts.
Q. That was all wind?
A. Yes. At the time, that was all wind.
Q. And did you take over a queue position --
A. Yes.
Q. -- from them?
A. Two of them.
Q. Two of them?
A. Yeah.
Q. A 250 megawatt and a 100 megawatt?
A. No. We filed the 100 on our own.

You can file and terminate and file
interconnect requests to your heart's content.
So we acquired their 250. We then
filed for another 100 megawatts of wind. And
then we filed for another 300 megawatt of
solar. And then we filed for another
100 megawatt of solar overbuild.
Q. Okay. I don't mean to interrupt
you. I was just trying to get a consecutive arrangement here.

So 250 to begin with?
A. Yes.
Q. Then we go from 250 plus 100. And then what's the next iteration after that?
A. The next iteration after that was to file a 300 megawatt solar. So that would make it 650 megawatts of interconnection on the 230 kV system.
Q. And that was east or west?
A. That was the east side.
Q. Okay. So 350 of wind and 300 of solar?
A. Yes.
Q. And was there a layout for that project? I mean, was there a design --
A. It's in the -- it's in the application for site certification, yes.
Q. Okay. Okay. So that adds up to 650, then?
A. Yes.
Q. Then what was the next iteration of the project?
A. We filed for 100 megawatts of solar overbuild.
Q. Okay.
A. Want me to explain that?
Q. Yes. And what do you mean by overbuild?
A. It means that we're interconnecting 100 megawatts, but it's not -- it's not in increasing the amount of transmitted energy on the system. It's literally behind the meter.

So it says you can never exceed 350 megawatts on the system. But you have 100 megawatts of solar that if, say, the wind dies down, then you can interject that into the system as long as you maintain below 350 megawatts. So that's -- available transmission capacity is the terminology that's used.
Q. So in various places in the application you use the term "grid injection capacity"?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what we're talking about?
A. Grid injection capacity is kind of the term that relates to what you can inject into the system and have it go where you desire.
Q. So why is there a grid injection capacity? What causes that to happen?
A. That's the capability of the Bonneville system. It has limitations. I mean, wires have limits. Bonneville has to manage reliability on the grid, so they have to maintain the electrical characteristics of everybody that's interconnected with the grid. And so they do a lot of study to determine, you know, how much can be inter -- injected at any point in the system.
Q. And any hope that you can get your overbuild into the system?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer. THE WITNESS: We don't need to.

It's overbuild.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay.
A. You inject it whenever you drop below 350 megawatts injection, you can use some of that overbuild. Let me just go through. Let's say, you know, the wind is blowing, we're generating 350 megawatts injection of wind on the east side, and the wind starts to die down.

Okay. The solar's there and available. It's daytime. We can just start injecting the solar to maintain 350 megawatts, even though the wind has died down.
Q. So over the course of a year, what period of time in percentages, perhaps, would you not be able to use the full capacity, the full nameplate capacity and interject it into the grid?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls for speculation. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: You know, that's kind of a commercial concern. That's -- I mean, that's the intellectual property that, we're trying to market this project, and we're designing various components of it to optimize the output relative to the climatic conditions that are here.

And we spend a lot of effort to make sure those numbers are ideal. And we work with our potential offtakers -- I mean, that's why we did the 100 megawatts overbuild was in response to an offtaker's desire to be able to optimize the transition on the grid.

And what $I$ mean by that is, if you have 350 megawatts of wind, you've got have 350 megawatts of capacity. Well, what happens when the wind stops blowing? You still have that obligation. You're still paying for that capacity on the system.

So what if you could add solar that would ramp up using that same contractual capacity to use it when the wind is not? You're optimizing your system.

And the same thing goes for battery storage. The intent is to optimize it so when you've got solar, when you've got that excess solar that's there and able to generate, you can divert it to charge the battery without using the transmission system.

And so all of these things work together to optimize the project for the eventual offtaker.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. I understand that.

And who was the offtaker that wanted
the 100 overbuild, the 100 megawatts overbuild?
A. I can't answer that.

MS. PERLMUTTER: You tell me. If that's confidential, then I'm going to object and ask him not to respond.

THE WITNESS: It's confidential
negotiations. I'm not at liberty to say that.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Are these ongoing negotiations now?
A. Yes.
Q. My question to you is without regard to an offtaker or purchaser of the project.

My question to you is, you've
described a scenario by which wind slows down, but the sun keeps shining just like it's shining out today?
A. Yeah.
Q. And then you can ramp up the sun to take account of the declining production from your wind turbines, correct?
A. Exactly. You got it. You got.
Q. Okay. Now, my question to you is, how often does that happen? What period of time over the year? Is this 10 percent of the year, 20 percent of the year, 50 percent of the year? How often does this happen?
A. Frequently.
Q. Well, I mean, but can you help me with some sort of quantification if you would, Mr. Kobus?
A. I would rather refrain from it because we're still optimizing the project. I mean, we don't know what size the batteries are going to be. You know, we know what size the solar is going to be, but that is our intellectual property. That's what we do for a living.
Q. But these are mathematical calculations, are they not? These are calculations that you make?
A. I have to know the exact conditions of what size the battery is, what time of year that you're talking about, to, you know, be able to determine what that optimization level is. But bottom line, $I$ can't spout it off, off the cuff. If I said a number, I'd be wrong.
Q. Why?
A. Because -- you said this is a big document. And I'm the project manager for this site, and $I$ have to know a little bit about everything. So $I$ can be a few questions deep
on anything, but $I$ don't have all those numbers at my -- on the tip of my tongue.
Q. Okay. But there are certain times of the year when the overbuild for solar or the overbuild for wind, correct? There's an overbuild for wind?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Both of those might be optimized when one or the other declines in production?
A. Correct. Well, the overbuild on the wind is a bit different.
Q. Explain why.
A. The overbuild on the wind is, from the point of generation to the actual point of delivery to the grid, there's electrical losses.

And so, with the wind, you can technically have those overbuilt turbines functioning all the time because all they're doing is making up for the losses between your nameplate generation and what's actually getting injected into the grid.
Q. I'm sorry, doesn't that depend on the length of the transmission?

```
    A. It depends on all things electrical
    related to the project. There could be
    turbines on one side of the project generating
    fairly strongly and on the other side not.
    So it's just, you know, a dynamic
    where you have the overbuild design to be the
    desired amount to make up for the average
    electrical losses on the project. But
    recognize you can never exceed your available
    injection capacity.
    Q. Okay. But you're talking about line
losses, right?
    A. Yeah.
    Q. That's, what, 3, 4 percent at most?
    A. That's probably a fairly good
number, yeah.
    Q. But you're not overbuilding because
you're losing 3 or 4 percent on the
transmission, are you?
    A. Oh, yes, we are.
    Q. That's the sole reason for
overbuild?
    A. Oh, yes.
            MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
            Mischaracterizes his testimony. But you
``` can answer.

THE WITNESS: Yes. We have other projects within the Scout portfolio that we have overbuilt turbines for that exact reason, and it works quite well.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. So if you get to a situation where the grid can no longer take power because you've reached grid injection capacity, then at that point, whatever solar energy is being produced or turbine energy is being produced isn't doing anything, is it?
A. We have -- we will have what's called a park controller for the output of project that will make sure you don't exceed your injection limit for the grid. And it will ramp back on any generators as necessary to remain below that maximum injection capacity.
Q. Okay. So if you've reached grid injection capacity, and you've got -- do you turn off the turbines, then? Is that what you do?
A. No. They're ramped back. I mean, you have the ability to dial back the generation of any turbine, individually or as an entire park.
Q. Okay. And you do that by changing pitch of the blades; is that right?
A. Generally, yeah. Yeah.
Q. Okay. We were going through the project here, and you've been very helpful with trying to provide a bit of a kind of continuum here.

So I think we're at the point of 350 wind, 300 solar, 650 total megawatts.
A. Okay. I thought we were at the point of 350 wind, 300 solar, 100 solar.
Q. Okay. Okay.
A. Overbuild, 100 overbuild.
Q. And if I'm trying to put words in your mouth, Mr. Kobus, tell me to stop, okay?
A. All right.
Q. So now we're up to it looks like, if my math is right, 750?
A. Of generation, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, it can actually be more than that because the solar generation is based on the inverter, the nameplate rating of the inverter.

I can actually have more solar panels than the nameplate rating of the inverter to increase efficiency of the operative project.

Because the sun doesn't shine all the time. And so we actually optimize the number of solar panels. So if you're looking at nameplate solar panels, that can actually even be higher.

That's a difficulty with evaluating it this way is that, you know, these are parameters related to our agreements with Bonneville, which is a federal power marketer. And, you know, the State's just concerned that you meet Bonneville's criteria. And so, you know, we're designing the project with that in mind.

But the key parameters are what we say in the application for site certification, and that's the nameplate capacity of the wind and the nameplate capacity of inverters.
Q. I'm going to really try to simplify this, and if you don't agree with me, tell me. BPA doesn't care how many turbines you build, how many solar panels you put, or
anything else, as long as you don't try to put more than a certain amount into the grid?
A. That's not true.
Q. Okay. Why am I wrong?
A. BPA has to manage the electrical characteristics of the grid and maintain reliability for everyone that's interconnected. I can't overbuild any more than four turbines because that's what we filed in our interconnection application.

So BPA cares very much. In fact, they care that the turbines we interconnect are state of the art technology and have certain electrical control characteristics that meet their criteria for grid reliability. So, yes, of course, Bonneville cares.
Q. But their principle concern is that a solar farm, wind farm, hybrid project doesn't try to inject into the system more than a certain amount?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
foundation. But you can answer if you can. THE WITNESS: They will assure that we do not inject more than we are contractually allowed, and they'll require
us to have devices associated with the project that control that. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. Okay. Now, I think we're up to around 750. Now, what's the next step in the continuum of the project?
A. We terminated the 300 megawatt interconnection request on the east side.
Q. Why was that?
A. We discovered that when Bonneville was doing their feasibility studies, that what they would have required to do for the network would have been extremely costly. And we decided that it would not have been in the best interest of our potential offtake market to shoulder that kind of cost.
Q. So you forgot about the 350, then? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.

You can answer.
THE WITNESS: The 350 is still
there. This is the extra 300 solar that we added and then terminated.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. But as I understand it, the -- you terminated the -- your position in
the queue for the 350 ?
A. No. For the 300 .
Q. Oh, for the 300 . Excuse me.
A. The extra 300 solar. Every one of these interconnects is a precise application document and a precise queue position and, you know, meets all of Bonneville's tariff requirements related to it.

So they manage the queue. And so if you put in 300 and then terminate it, it doesn't affect anything else in the queue. You just terminated your queue position for that 300 desired injection.
Q. Somebody else moves up?
A. In this case, anybody could file, but there wasn't capacity to do it because, as I said, when we had our feasibility study, it was determined that the network upgrades that would be required -- well, I don't want to repeat myself, so...
Q. Network upgrades on the BPA side?
A. On the BPA side would be very expensive, yes.
Q. So has a decision been made now between the 244 smaller turbines and the

150 larger turbines? Is that a corporate decision made as of now?
A. No. We -- that will be a last-minute determination when we go to the turbine supplier and negotiate for the turbine that we desire to have.
Q. So there's interconnect proposals that have been made to BPA, am I correct about that?
A. Yeah.
Q. For the whole project?
A. Yes.
Q. And what's the status of those?
A. We have -- we're at the E\&P agreement stage for both interconnections, which means Bonneville is doing engineering and procurement that we have funded to advance the design of the projects, culminating in a large generator interconnection agreement once we have unappealable permit available.
Q. And when do you expect the decision on the interconnect with BPA?
A. At the point we have an unappealable permit.
Q. If you got your permit today, would
you get the approval from the interconnect -large interconnect agreement with BPA?
A. Within a very short period of time, yes.
Q. I understand from the application that they're going through a NEPA review process?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. And when will that be complete? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.

Foundation. You can answer if you know. THE WITNESS: Typically, it's the
last thing they do before issuing the large generator interconnect agreement. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. And then I gather from reading the application, sometime or another, batteries were added to this thing?
A. Yes, battery storage.
Q. And when did that happen?
A. When we added the solar. It was a solar battery. So it was a hybridization that was done at the same time.
Q. Okay. And reading the application, it looks to me that there's 300 megawatts of
batteries in two -- and 1550 in each place, am I right about that?
A. Yes. We intended -- we have two points of interconnection. And so, to optimize the project, we wanted the solar and the battery to be clustered by the interconnection to minimize the amount of wires to make it as cost effective as possible.

Because we didn't know where Bonneville was actually going to finally decide where the western interconnect would be, we had to have a redundant part of the application to cover whichever decision Bonneville would make so that we wouldn't have to add it to the application later on in the process, which would, you know, be an increased impact environmentally, so...
Q. So I don't see any drawings or designs or any engineering for the battery project. Is that ongoing that?
A. That is ongoing, yes.
Q. But it's not here, is it? Here -I'm sorry, here as in the updated amended site application?
A. There's as much in there about the
battery as \(I\) believe there is about solar and wind.
Q. Okay. Well, we have locations for the turbines.
A. And the type of battery technology that's available in the market, the size of battery that we are anticipating using.
Q. And the batteries are going to be lithium ions?
A. That's the most commercially viable economical technology on the market today. However, it's going to be whatever the offtaker desires. The offtaker could step up and say, I want eight hour batteries, or \(I\) want a flow battery of a different technology, and we would scramble to accommodate that, if necessary, do an amendment to our SCA, and a supplemental EIS, if necessary, to accommodate it.
Q. So let me understand that scenario. Scout would build the project to the specifications of the offtake, is that the way it works?
A. We would attempt to design the project to meet their specifications, but we'd have to permit it. We'd have to adjust our
permitting to incorporate it.
Q. So would it be more than

300 megawatts for batteries?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Speculation. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: We don't intend to
increase the size of the batteries, no. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And \(I\) read in the application that the size of the area for the batteries is six acres; is that right?
A. Could be if we build the largest amount we were contemplating, yes.
Q. But as we're sitting here today and we're thinking about whether this ought to be approved or not, we should assume two battery locations with 150 megawatts each, correct?
A. That's correct.

THE COURT REPORTER: Can we take a
break?
MR. ARAMBURU: Yes.
(A recess was taken.)
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Mr. Kobus, we're back on the record now. I want to have you turn to page 2-15 of
the amended ASC. So there's -- under section 2.3 , there's some redine language that was added here.

Was that something you were responsible for?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. So do I have the right person as the one who wrote it?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. Wonderful, wonderful. Okay. And so why was the redline put in? What was the change that was necessary? Can you explain?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. The
document speaks for itself. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: There were two things
that were going on, one with Bonneville and
one with EFSEC staff. The EFSEC staff
exchange was when EFSEC was going to
publish the -- their notice, their SEPA
notice for having to do an EIS --
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Let me interrupt you.

A determination of significance, would that be the document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Excuse me for the interruption.
A. Yeah. And I had an exchange with Amy Hafkemeyer at EFSEC about the concept of nameplate capacity. That, you know, I had discovered that, you know, for example, on the solar, if the application materials say nameplate capacity, it depends on whether it's the solar inverters or the solar modules themselves, which as I said earlier, could add up to a larger amount of generation potential than the inverter itself. And so we were clarifying the terminology related to nameplate capacity so it was clear that you could overbuild.

What was happening with Bonneville is, Bonneville was, you know, maintaining the policy of the inverter nameplate for solar, but they were also saying that you could not overbuild wind.

And so we engaged in further
conversation with Bonneville and eventually
came to the understanding -- we got to the
right person in Bonneville, and came to understand that you could overbuild the wind, you just have to have a separate interconnect to do it. You have to spell out how many turbines, what type of turbines that you would use to be able to overbuild the wind.

So at that point it was clear we had to change the terminology so that it supported the fact that you could do overbuild of both solar panels and wind turbines.

And so this redline was an intent to
just bring together all of that mutual understanding that occurred between us and EFSEC and Bonneville at the time.
Q. Well, let's stick with page 2-15.
A. Sure.
Q. You indicated that you could overbuild, wind turbines -- push solar off to the side for a second -- overbuild wind turbines even though -- okay.

You could overbuild wind turbines, but BPA had to know how these wind turbines were going to get -- these overbuilt turbines were going to get on the system.
A. Yeah.
Q. And have you provided that information to them?
A. Yes. We filed an interconnection request to add four turbines, four additional turbines of the same kind of turbine to the project configuration.
Q. Okay. And so over onto page --
A. Just can \(I\) clarify one thing?
Q. Okay.
A. These four overbuild turbines are part of the 235. They're not four additional that we're slamming out there. Okay. They would be part of the 235 that we're allowed to build.
Q. Okay.
A. We would just configure the site so that whatever was injecting on the east side had those four additional turbines injecting there, so they wouldn't be available to inject on the west side.
Q. Okay. And more capacity in the east side substation than the west?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: On the east side per
the interconnect applications we have in the queue, we have the ability to interject 350 megawatts of wind turbines, plus four more or -- or 13.6 more megawatts above that 350 as overbuild.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Let me have you look at page 2-15, the second full paragraph.
A. Okay.
Q. Is this something you wrote?
A. Well, again, it's -- working with Tetra Tech, \(I\) contributed, you know, editorial, yes.
Q. So I'm reading this, and it says that the transmitted the two -- two transmission lines, two interconnections, one east, one west.
A. Okay.
Q. And 650 megawatts of nameplate generating capacity could interconnect at the Bofer Canyon substation.
A. Correct.
Q. But that's limited to the

350 megawatts injection capacity, right?
A. That's actually an error. I need to fix that.
Q. Okay.
A. Because at that time, the 650 was the 350 wind plus that additional 350 solar, which we subsequently terminated.
Q. So this is incorrect?
A. Yeah, this is incorrect. I need to fix that.
Q. So tell me how we can fix it.
A. We can only inject -- per our current interconnection request, we can inject 350 megawatts on that 230 kV system.
Q. That's what it says.
A. It says up to 650 .
Q. Well, it says up to 650 --
A. Could interconnect. It says up to 650 could interconnect, but that it's limited to 350 injection capacity. While, if we were doing 650, we would need 650 of injection capacity.
Q. But you don't have 650, you only have 350?
A. Wind only we have 350 , and we terminated the interconnection for the 300 solar. So \(I\) could tomorrow file a new one
for that 350 solar and be within my, you know, EFSEC permitting bounds, but we don't intend to do that.
Q. So, I'm sorry, the way I read the sentence, and this appears to be your sentence, so I want to make sure we get it right.

It says up to 650 megawatts of nameplate generating capacity, limited to 350 megawatts grid injection capacity, could go to the planned 230 kV Bofer substation.

So as I understand it, we have 650 megawatts of nameplate generating capacity that can be hooked up to the system, but the most you can do is 350. That's the way I read that sentence.
A. Well, that is correct. That's the most we can do, yeah.
Q. Okay. Good.

Now, so that -- so that sentence is fine?
A. Yeah, that's true. At this point in time, that's fine. We terminated the extra 300 .
Q. Then it says, up to 350 megawatts of nameplate generating capacity, grid injection
capacity, could interconnect to the BPA 500 kV Webber Canyon substation.

But that doesn't say whether that's wind or solar.
A. No. You said up to 350 , but it's up to 500 is what it says. Up to 500 megawatts.
Q. As I read the sentence, and I don't want to argue with you, Mr. Kobus, but as I read the sentence, it says that 350 nameplate generating capacity could be wind or solar. It doesn't separate it --
A. I'm sorry, you've lost me. Are you on second full paragraph on 2-16?
Q. I'm on the third sentence:

Up to 500 megawatts of nameplate generating capacity/grid interconnect.
A. Correct. I'm with you.
Q. But that doesn't say that that's wind or solar or combination of the two, just 500 megawatts, period.
A. Okay.
Q. Is that right?
A. That's what it reads, yes.
Q. And is that correct? Have I got it right?

2
A. At the time we updated it, that was correct. Originally, this was a 500 megawatt interconnection request for wind, but we subsequently did material modification and evaluation and it is now 340 megawatts of wind and 160 megawatts of solar, per those --
Q. So is this information correct or not?
A. This is the application information, yes.
Q. Okay. We don't need to correct this, this isn't wrong?
A. No, it doesn't need to be corrected. But we've filed another interconnect request for another 100 megawatts of solar there. So if you look in the queue, we have 600 megawatts of interconnect request right now at that 500 kV 。
Q. So let me go over and let's talk about solar now, if we may. And look over on page 2-49 of the application.
A. Okay. I am there.
Q. And it's paper, Mr. Kobus, my goodness.
A. Yeah.
```

Q. Down in the second paragraph --
A. Slick paper, too.
Q. We had it printed thickly so it wouldn't bleed through.
A. Yeah.
Q. Second paragraph talks about solar arrays --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and nameplate generation capacity. And then there would be -- first sentence says micrositing factors, solar technology. Then it says:
Nameplate generation capacity of solar arrays may be greater than --
(The Court Reporter requested clarification.)
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. We'll start that sentence over again.
The nameplate generation capacity of the solar arrays may be greater than the maximum grid injection capacity, but will be limited to the maximum grid injection capacity as a function of the AC ratings of the inverters.
Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So what's the maximum grid generation -- you refer to maximum grid injection capacity here. What is that number?
A. Well, the purpose of this sentence is to state what I've already related to you about that the solar arrays, the modules, can actually be greater than the inverter capacity. And so our interconnect is limited to the inverter nameplate rating. That's what that's intended to say.
Q. I'm going to try to make this simple, and correct me if I'm wrong.

The solar panels can create all the generation that you want, but what actually is produced and goes into the grid is limited by the inverter?
A. Correct.
Q. And how much of -- how much more nameplate capacity of the panels would there be than the inverter capacity?
A. That's a design parameter we're still optimizing.
Q. I mean, in general terms, 5 percent,
2 percent, 20 percent?
A. 20 .
Q. $\quad 20$ percent?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Can you buy a different inverter and get it to produce more power?
A. Sure.
Q. So as we go through this process and we're looking at these turbines, can you tell me what the output of each individual turbine is that's located on your maps?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to form.
Answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: The smaller size
turbine?
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Well, let's say bigger size. We'll talk about the 244 smaller turbine arrangement.
A. Okay.
Q. Is there data available that predicts the amount of generation that comes from each turbine as shown on your drawing that locates the turbine?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Renew the
objection. You can still answer.

THE WITNESS: It's the nameplate capacity of the turbine itself. If at the time we submitted the application we had a 3 megawatt model versus a 6 megawatt model. Now, that 3 megawatt model is likely to be a 3.4 megawatt turbine, and that is its limit, 3.4 megawatts. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. I think I misspoke --
A. Okay.
Q. -- when I did my question. Let's go at it again.

The -- can you predict, let's say, for a 3 megawatt turbine that's located in each part of the site, how much power would actually come from that, given wind parameters, other parameters for the property?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Object as to form. You can answer if you can.

THE WITNESS: Depends on the wind how much it's generating. It can't generate more than 3.4 megawatts. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. But let me put it this way.

Is your assumption when you give us
this drawing that shows all the wind turbines, and I know they're going to be moved around, but the assumption is each one of these turbines is going produce the same amount of power?
A. Well, they're not going to be moved around. The micrositing corridors are the micrositing corridors.
Q. Okay. We'll leave that out of the question.
A. Okay.
Q. We'll leave that out of the question.
A. Okay. Can you repeat the --
Q. Is the assumption, the operating assumption when you locate these turbines on the map, that each one of them is going to be equal in production to every other one?
A. They're all going to be different.
Q. And --
A. But they can't exceed 3.4 megawatts.
Q. I understand that.

But do you have information that might indicate which of the turbines would be better producers than other turbines?
A. Yes, we do. That's how we cited the turbines on the site originally is, you look for the highest wind spot and you put a dot there. So I want that turbine, that's the highest one.

Then you fill out the site and force rank the turbines based on their production potential. And when you get to the maximum injection capacity you can inject, the rest of the turbines are on the bench because they're lower producers.
Q. Okay. But is that data, is that -does that data exist for the individual turbines?
A. Well, yeah, we create that data. That's the intellectual property that gives us our competitive advantage.
Q. Okay. I understand your position on that, but that data does exist?
A. Well, we're marketing a project so, of course, we're going to analyze it to the fullest extent, yes.
Q. I'm not trying to get into marketing or proprietary interest or anything of that nature.

```
    A. Okay.
        Q. My question is simple.
            Is the data available by which we
could look at each turbine to see what its
production is?
                                    MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
    form. You can answer it if you can.
        THE WITNESS: I cannot answer it,
        and the reason I cannot answer it is we
        have obligations with the turbine suppliers
        that we will not disclose their power
        curves, period.
        MS. PERLMUTTER: If I may, for a
        second. My objection was to form because
        of the question available. I think you
        guys are talking cross purposes.
        If your question is, does data
        exist, there's one answer. If your
        response is, can I disclose the data,
        that's a different answer.
            Now I'll let it to you guys to
        figure out what you want to do.
        BY MR. ARAMBURU:
        Q. It was the first question, does this
        data exist, no matter proprietary, secret,
```

triple $X$ secret?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that would be data for each turbine?
A. I mean, we wouldn't be flying blind designing a project without knowing that information. The data exists and it's our competitive advantage.
Q. I understand. It was not intended to be a disparaging question. I just want to know whether the data exists or not.
A. Okay.
Q. I read some information about the impacts of wakes from one turbine on the next downstream turbine. Are you familiar with that concept?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And so other people who may be reading this for the first time, what is the wake effect?
A. Well, the wake effect is that every turbine has an influence on the wind that goes past it because it extracts energy and it creates turbulence.

Just like, you know, a boat on the
river. There's a wake of stirred-up water that is there after the boat leaves, and it makes waves and reverberates and eventually dissipates.

With turbines, there's a wake effect that influences that downstream wind. And so when you design a project, you make sure you have certain distance between turbines on a string and between subsequent strings of turbines to make sure that that wake has adequately dissipated so it doesn't have a dominant effect on the performance of the turbine that's just downwind of it.
Q. And was the wake effect studied for either the 244 turbine or the 150 turbine project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: The layout of the site is precisely that way to make sure that the wake effects are minimized to the extent necessary to maintain the performance of the turbines that we desire.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. I understand that was the intention.

What engineering or design was done to assess the wake effect of the turbines?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Object as to form.
You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: We know the wind resource profile. We know the performance characteristics of a given wind turbine. We model them together to come up with what we believe the production profile is for the site.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. I understand that.

But is there a specific modeling
that takes into account the wake turbulence?
A. Our internal modeling, yes, it does. Yeah, we have to know that. Yeah.
Q. And that was done for this project?
A. Of course, yes.
Q. And did you have Greg Poulos do that work?
A. We do it internally, and then we also have independent evaluators that do it. So, you know, Greg Poulos is affiliated with ArcVera. And so ArcVera is our second check of our internal assessments, yes.
Q. And did ArcVera run a model to assess the effect of wake turbulence on downstream turbines?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation. You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: On our turbines, yes. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And when was that done?
A. It's continually done on a frequent basis. Every time we change the layout we reevaluate it.
Q. And in my readings, it appears that Mr. Poulos has been active in the community talking about the impacts of wake turbulence. Are you familiar with that work?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. And was that model that he was talking about in those studies been applied to this project?
A. I do not know what model you're referring to. I'm sure my resource manager would, but $I$ don't keep up with the different names and vintages of the software.
Q. Okay.
A. I might add that the turbine
supplier as well restricts how close you can have turbines to each other.
Q. Why does the turbine supplier care?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation. You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: Because the loading, the mechanical loading on the turbine, is affected by wakes as well.

So it's not just production. It's
the structural integrity and the -- they have to warrant it to last a period of time. And so in order to honor the warranty, they have to make sure you're not overloading the turbines by exposing them to a greater wake.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Let me try to make it simple, and disagree with me if you like.

There are two concerns with wake turbulence. One is, you're robbing the downstream turbine of wind, affecting its efficiency, and you're also creating turbulence.
A. No. That is the same thing.
Q. Okay.
A. The two concerns are the impacts of the turbulence on the downstream turbines, plus the mechanical loading that occurs from that turbulence.
Q. So I understand.

The wind is now uneven, it's not a
linear path?
A. Right.
Q. We've got a bunch of wind that's running around like that, and that may put additional pressures on the downstream turbine, and so the manufacturers want to assess that; is that right?
A. Exactly, yeah.
Q. Okay. Okay.
A. You got it.
Q. See, we're going to agree on
something.
A. Yeah.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Excuse me if I
throw up for a moment.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Let's turn to page 2-103. I
understand that the proposal is to phase this project?
A. When we were initially conceiving
how to permit this, we wanted to accomplish two main things. Number one is, we wanted to permit it all at once because we wanted to assure that for all of the stakeholder concerns out there, that we are putting forth the maximum extent of what we conceive we can develop in this -- in Benton County.

And so at the time, the
interconnections were on separate paths in the Bonneville evaluation system. We didn't know which interconnect was going to get built first, east or west.

So it could have been that we were thinking of Phase 1 initially, but the Phase 2 interconnect became federalized and got built, and we wanted to shift to then starting on Phase 2 first.

We also conceived that maybe we could build the whole thing all at once. But in the application, we had to accommodate all of those concepts, but at the end of the day, we had to make sense of it, too, so that people can understand it.

But the decision as to how we build
the project, whether phasing, all at once, will in large part be determined by the turbine supply. You know, turbine suppliers are changing how they commit their production capacity.

And so the turbines, we may not be able to get all the turbines in a single season. We may not be able to get all the craft people that we need to construct it all in the same season.

You know, it's the concept where if it takes so long to do something with ten people, adding ten more can cut it in half, no, that isn't how it works. But, also, we don't know if the craft capacity is going to be available at the time that we need them. They could be building a solar project in Yakima County and Benton County at the same time, as well as a wind project in Oregon.

And so until we get to the final throes after we get an unappealable permit and actually start the contracting process and the financing process, we won't know for sure how this is going to be staged.
Q. Okay. Well, I've been reading table 2.15-1, and seeing that as the phases that would be followed. Is that table still accurate?
A. Yeah. Relatively speaking, yeah.
Q. So I have not seen a drawing or a map of where Phase 1 is. Can you tell me where Phase 1 is?
A. It can change.
Q. Well --
A. The concept at the time we did this, you can see Phase 1 says 230 kV, right? So it's turbines and solar and battery in proximity to the 230 kV point of interconnection.
Q. But right now, I don't see a map that shows where Phase 1 and Phase 2 is; is that correct?
A. It hasn't been determined yet.
Q. Would it be fair to say that one is east and one is west?
A. That's where the 230 kV interconnect is on the east, yeah. You can say that, yeah.
Q. So Phase 1 on the -- I'm trying to figure out --
A. Okay.
Q. -- because we're working towards the hearing where we are here.
A. Yeah.
Q. So the battery system, Phase 1, 150 megawatts of battery.
A. Yeah.
Q. Phase 2-A another 150 --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- megawatts. But Phase 2-B, the alternative, has no batteries in it at all.
A. Because the only reason phase -alternative $B$ exists is as an all wind alternative. That's why there's no battery on alternate B.
Q. Okay.
A. There's only two phases that were contemplated, but Phase 2 was portrayed as one with battery and one with no battery.
Q. Phase 2?
A. Phase 2, yeah.
Q. Okay. And why wouldn't you do batteries for the wind project?
A. Well, we're optimizing the project for the interest of the offtakers. They may not want the battery portion of the
hybridization.
Q. They may not want either of them?
A. There's potential that no one wants the battery, in which case, we just wouldn't build it.
Q. It becomes a very different project, though, without the battery, doesn't it? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to form.

THE WITNESS: Not really. The battery optimizes it, but it's a great project without the battery. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. So over on page 2-102, Phase 2 A and B, one includes 10.2 miles of transmission and the other one has 19. What's the difference?
A. There's a keyword in there called intertie. It says:

Up to 19.4 miles of 230 kV intertie between the east substation and the west substation.
Q. Okay.
A. And on Phase 2 alternative A, it's 10.2 miles of 230 kV gen-tie from the intermediate substation to the step-up
substation. And -- well, you can read it.
Q. So gen-tie is a transmission line?
A. Yeah. Gen-tie is from the generator to tie into the transmission system, yes.
Q. Okay. And then how do we get to the 19 on the second one?
A. Because we have initially designed in an intertie between the east side of the project and the west side of the project.
Q. And that's Phase 2-B?
A. That's where it's depicted, yes.
Q. That's 2-B?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Page 2-103 says:

The turbine supplier and EPC
contractor would be selected during the EFSEC ASC review process.

Is that an accurate statement? Do you see where I'm pointing you, Mr. Kobus?
A. No, I don't, but --
Q. Okay. It's --
A. So the intention is that we would have the project permitted as considered in the application. And then we would select the turbine supply, the solar supply, the EPC
contractor. And we have an obligation to provide the final design of the site before we start construction. In fact, we -- currently, the DEIS says we have to do it 180 days prior to the start of construction.
Q. Okay. But this says it would be selected during the review process. Is that going to happen? We're in the review process now.
A. Yeah. And we'll be in the review process until the SCA is approved by the governor.
Q. The question is, is that process, is that selection process ongoing now?
A. We're constantly working with the turbine suppliers, the solar suppliers, all the equipment suppliers.
Q. So I've also looked at the schedule here of construction, which is broken down into two phases.
A. Yes.
Q. Appears to me to be a pretty aggressive schedule working beginning just a few months after the ASC is approved; is that right?
A. That's -- that's correct.
Q. Is that the current plan, to build it that quickly?
A. We're going to build it absolutely as quickly as we can get started.
Q. Okay.
A. But we're going to need to finance it first.
Q. But it's not financed now?
A. No. We don't have a permit. So you can't finance something that doesn't have a permit.
Q. Look at page 2-118, please. Very last sentence on that page, would you read that? You can read it to yourself.
A. Okay.
Q. Is that an accurate statement today?
A. Absolutely.
Q. You say there that it's:

Favorable for regional utilities as it is coincident with peak loading demand.

Does this represent your conversation with regional utilities?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And who would those utilities be?
A. All utilities in the region.
Q. Like?
A. Avista, Portland Sound Energy, Portland General, Benton PUD. Anybody that has a demand for clean energy.
Q. And are these utilities ready to purchase the output?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation. Answer if you can.

THE WITNESS: It's -- there are
press releases constantly about the
procurement activities of the regional
utilities. You can find exactly what they
want based on active RFPs that are
currently in existence. You can follow
their IRPs, which are publicly available,
that actually forecast what their demands
are going to be and where they're going to
get it and what they think their best
viable resource is for them.

And we are trying to optimize and
formulate this project to meet that
evolving demand.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. I understand that.

But in terms of regional utilities, is there any regional utility that indicates they want to buy the output of this project?
A. Is there any that indicate -- yes.
Q. How many?
A. All of them.
Q. All of them are interested in buying the output?
A. Plus -- plus C\&Is. There's a high demand right now for clean energy. There's going to be shortages in the very near future. There's going to be slim pickings as to what's available to meet those demands. And the closer, the better. The closer we are to the load, the desired market, the better. They all want it. They're clamoring for it.
Q. If I was to call PSE this afternoon and ask them whether they want to buy the output of this project, what would they say? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls
for speculation. And also on foundation.
You can answer if you can. THE WITNESS: I can't answer that.

They change their minds every day. I'm sorry. They have procurement cycles and
they're a regulated utility. They have to follow the rules on how to procure new resources.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Has PSE issued an RFP for a project this size?
A. Oh, yeah. They just closed one, in fact. And they've said they're working on another.
Q. Okay. The second part of your sentence says that it's a commercially viable site, favorable for utilities, as it is coincident with peak loading demand.

Could you explain that?
A. The loading demands in the Pacific Northwest are winter. So there are peak winter loading demands. This region is a storm-driven climate. So when the winter storms come in and when the spring storms come in as the seasons change, that's when we get our peak generation.

You know, as opposed to a gorge project per se, is more predominantly summer, summer peaking. This is winter peaking, and that's when the utilities' loads peak the largest.

So the generation profile of this project is a very good match for the load profile that the utilities have to serve.
Q. Well, is it not the case that particularly wind during cold times in the Tri-Cities doesn't blow for days and days?
A. There are times it doesn't blow for days and days, that's right.
Q. So that's not coincident with peak loading demand, is it?
A. Sure is. Because when it does blow, there's a lot of it available. It's an intermittent resource. It generates when the wind blows, correct.

MR. ARAMBURU: So it's 1 o'clock.

Maybe we --
MS. PERLMUTTER: Off the record.
(A recess was taken.)

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. We're back on the record so everyone can hear.

Now I'd like you to turn over to 2-118.
A. Okay.
Q. Exhibit 1, or the updated ASC.
A. Yes.
Q. Section -- paragraph 2.22 is the analysis of alternatives. And it says:

The application shall include analysis of alternatives for site, route, and other major elements of the proposal.

And there's a page or two here. Goes over to page 121, about alternatives?

Did you have any hand in writing this?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you write it? Are you the author?
A. I initiated it, yes. But then it was a team effort, like the entire document.
Q. And $I$ have not seen in the $A S C$ or in this particular section of the updated ASC an alternate site layout with fewer turbines; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And why isn't -- why haven't you presented a project that has an alternative for site?
A. I mean, the ASC explains why we didn't. But it was EFSEC's choice as to how
they were going to evaluate alternatives, and they chose the no alternative, and then the two turbine options for the proposed alternative. That was an EFSEC decision. We didn't -couldn't influence that.
Q. So the two alternative turbines were the 244 and the 150 layouts?
A. That's correct.
Q. So who at EFSEC told you that's the way it's going to be?
A. EFSEC staff. So the official is Sonia Bumpus.
Q. Is she the one that told you that?
A. She's the one that made the
decision. And then, you know, we had many conversations about it. We have staff calls regularly with EFSEC.

They're not required to evaluate alternatives. It's an option, they're not required.
Q. Well, let's not get into a legal argument over that.
A. Okay.
Q. I just want to know what's actually happening here.

So the original ASC, which was February of 2021 , as $I$ recall?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Contained pretty -- a lot of the same language, but some further explanation with the updates.
A. Right.
Q. So did EFSEC staff tell you you didn't have to consider alternatives before February of '21?
A. No.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. It's unclear as to -- if you can answer, go ahead.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Well, let me clarify the question. Let's not have questions that are out of order.

You indicated you were told by EFSEC staff that you didn't have to consider options other than the 244,150 , correct?
A. When they were ready to complete the DEIS they made that determination and informed us of it.
Q. Okay. But this was done before --
A. Yeah, this was --
Q. -- the DEIS was started?
A. I don't believe they need to evaluate alternatives, and so we wrote this accordingly.
Q. Okay. But was this part of the application done in concert with EFSEC staff?
A. No. This was our application for site certification. And we evaluated the alternatives as we deemed necessary.
Q. Okay. But EFSEC staff said you did not have to consider a smaller project; is that correct?
A. They ultimately came to that decision when they were finalizing the draft EIS.
Q. Was that in consultation with you?
A. They independently came to that decision.
Q. Well, was this discussed in communications, in conversations with EFSEC staff?
A. I'm certain I've told them what I just told you, that $I$ don't believe we're obligated to evaluate alternatives. It doesn't make sense to evaluate alternatives. We need
to permit the optimal project and be nimble to continue to optimize it until we actually are to the point where we're ready to finance the project.
Q. I understand the business objectives that are here, and I appreciate what you're telling me.

The question is, when did EFSEC
staff tell you that you didn't have to consider alternatives? When were those conversations?
A. What EFSEC told us is that they determined that the only alternatives that need to be evaluated are the no alternative and the proposal, with the exception that the proposal would be the two turbine option alternatives.
Q. So the original ASC came in, was filed on February -- in February of 2021 --
A. Right.
Q. -- is that correct?
A. Right.
Q. Did you have those conversations with EFSEC about the alternatives prior to filing the application?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm sure $I$ told them, we don't think you need to evaluate alternatives. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. So was it your request that they not be considered?
A. I can't request that. They're the decision-maker.
Q. I understand they're the decision-maker, but you can also ask them to do things, and $I$ don't think you're shy about that.

So did you ask them to not consider any alternatives?
A. No, I did not make a request that said, please do not consider alternatives. I said, you make the decision as you see fit.
Q. And was that decision made for the ASC and for the DEIS, for both of the documents?
A. $\quad \mathrm{No}, \mathrm{no}$.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Object as to form.
Go ahead, you can answer.
THE WITNESS: It wasn't the decision
until the DEIS came out. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Well, but this document came out -the original document here updated now --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- with new language, that came out in February of '21. The draft impact statement didn't come out until December of ' 22 .
A. This is our document. We created this, and we updated it in the image that we expect to be permitted for. And EFSEC's responsible for their independent environmental impact statement and determination of what alternatives would be evaluated. They made their choice. We submitted our application as you see it.
Q. But your application doesn't contain any discussion of alternatives other than no action or the 244, 150?
A. What's required by EFSEC is what's in this analysis of alternatives.
Q. Did you present this analysis to EFSEC as consistent with WAC (indecipherable) --
(The Court Reporter requested clarification.)

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Did you go to EFSEC and ask -- and present to EFSEC draft language in compliance with WAC 463-60-296 and ask them to approve it?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. And calls for a legal conclusion.
If you can answer it, you can.
THE WITNESS: We submitted the document to them and asked them to process it. That's -- I mean, that's the form it took. I did not request them to not evaluate alternatives. I likely told them, you don't need to, because that's what I believe.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay.
A. I can read WACs, too, just like anybody else.
Q. Okay. So that's your reading of the WAC 463-60-296?
A. I think it's EFSEC's, too.
Q. Okay. Now --
A. Well, that was speculating. I probably shouldn't have done that.
Q. Okay. So you're very determined to
talk about only what I'm going to call the 244 , 150 options. We understand what those are?
A. That's what $I$ want to permit, yeah. I need that flexibility.
Q. Okay. Now, why can't we do half that project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. What's wrong with that?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Object as to form.
And calls for speculation. But you can answer.

THE WITNESS: We need to be able to get an offtaker for this project. One of the key factors in determining the economics of the project is the economy of scale.

So we need to build it -- you know, if we could add any more turbines that would increase the overall average capacity factor, we would do that because that improves the economics.

So we've built it out to the extent we believe maintains a viable, desirable, competitive offering for our marketplace.

And so anything we do to knock off turbines is changing that economy of scale and making it less economic. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Well, I don't understand the difference of economy of scale. We've got a certain number of turbines here. We've got a certain -- they can be cut in half.

What's the economy of scale? Why isn't the option of half the turbines something that can be explored?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Object as to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I know every
combination of turbines versus
infrastructure cost. We've evaluated the full spectrum over and over and over exhaustively.

And you have to accept that there is economy of scale when you have a certain basic economic infrastructure cost. And so the more generation you can pile onto it, the cheaper that generation per unit is going to be.

That's -- this is our business.

This is what we do to develop projects that the market will prefer. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Well, for example, Phase 1 of the project --
A. Yes.
Q. -- on page 2-101, if you would like to refer to it.
A. Okay.
Q. Phase 1 and Phase 2, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why don't we just build Phase 1 of the project? What are the economies of scale that prevent you from just building that project?
A. Scout has been investing considerable time and capital in building the largest project we can bring to market because that's what makes us successful.

So the commercial case for this site is to build absolutely as much as we can to satisfy the market need. So any whittling away that we do of anything that generates as a part of this mix is hurting our prospects.
Q. Well, I understand that there are
certain sunk costs of wages and engineering and various other things, salaries of people that have already been spent for this project.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. But just in terms of Phase 1, it consists of turbines on the east side, consists of a substation on the east side, a battery operation --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- on the east side, substation, some connections, and a large generation request of $B P A$.

Why isn't that a standalone project?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked
and answered. If you can answer it, you can.

THE WITNESS: We have no interest in
tying our hands behind our back and
limiting the competitiveness and the
ultimate revenue potential of this project
for our company. Why would we shoot
ourselves in the foot and make it smaller?
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Could you --
A. That's not our business.
Q. I understand that Scout is in the business of selling wind turbines, solar, et cetera.
A. Yeah.
Q. I understand that.
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. My question is, if you built

Phase 1, would somebody buy it?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls
for speculation. And asked and answered.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I would believe there
might be somebody out there that just wants
Phase 1.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. And so why isn't then Phase 1 an alternative to this project that avoids certain environmental impacts, cultural impacts, impacts --
A. Because it doesn't meet our needs.
Q. If that's the reason then --
A. We're a private developer. We want to build as much capacity to meet the market need in the Pacific Northwest as we can possibly do. That what makes us survive and
prosper, right?
Q. Okay. I understand the objectives. I don't have disagreement with them.

But you've indicated to me that there's a really high demand for renewable projects now.
A. The entire thing, yep, and more. There's not enough to meet the demand.
Q. So to use the vernacular, people are snapping them up? Disagree with that?
A. No, that doesn't --
Q. Okay.
A. That doesn't meet it. Because there's a long, long process in negotiations to get to the point where you ultimately come to a completed offtake agreement with an entity. And it takes years. I mean look at how long we've been developing this. I mean, it takes years.

So when it's ready, when we have our permit in hand, we've got a good chance of winning a market bid for it.
Q. But there are projects that are much smaller than this that are being developed and sold either to commercial entities or to utilities; isn't that true?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
THE WITNESS: That is true. Sorry. MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Argumentative. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, there are small projects, there are big projects. We're a big project builder.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. I want to go back and talk about the batteries a little bit.
A. Sure.
Q. The batteries, as I understand, are a bit of a latecomer to this project?
A. We chose -- when batteries started becoming commercially feasible, when the technology evolved and the prices dropped where it started to get in the ballpark of something that would be interesting to our offtake market -- and like $I$ say, we converse with our offtakers all the time, and they're telling us, this is what we desire.
You're probably not familiar with
the Wheatridge Project, which was built, you know, 30 miles south of Umatilla. That was one of the first hybrid projects in the region.

We saw that happening. We conversed with our market and they said, yeah, we're looking at wanting hybrid, you know, if you can make the economics work.

So we evaluate the heck out of it and get ourselves to a point where we feel we have something that is competitive in the market.

And there is interest in the batteries by some utilities, but whether we build it or not will depend on what the market will bear.
Q. So would you say that the project as a whole would have commercial viability without the batteries?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls for speculation. And lack of foundation. But you can answer.

THE WITNESS: The batteries add an optimization element, but it's in the eye of the beholder, in this case, the market, whether it's advantageous for them or not.

And also understand, it may not be advantageous for a party today, but
ten years from now it might be. So I want it in there. I want it permitted so ten years from now, if that market develops, $I$ can build it. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. And so what -- so it was decided that the batteries, there would be one on each side of the project?
A. Well, you couple the batteries ideally with solar. Because you know solar only generates when the sun shines. And so, since it's not generating at night, it would be nice to have an option. And it's, you know, an optimization technique to add the storage.

So you can phase shift the
generation of the solar from the daytime when the sun's shining to like a high peak time when the sun goes down.

> (Telephone interruption.)

THE WITNESS: That's typically how
utilities use it in the current market is, they'll use the solar to charge it, and then they'll dispatch it sometime later when there is no solar and they still have peak needs. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. So have you estimated the amount of time it would take for the solar or for the batteries to discharge into the grid?
A. Just like your car battery, it depends on how long you're cranking it as to how long it's going to last. It'll be dispatched. So if it's a four-hour battery, it means if you're dispatching it at maximum capacity, it'll last four hours.
Q. How long does it take to charge?
A. Depends on what you're charging it with. You can charge it pretty quick or can you charge it all day long. You optimize it.
Q. What's your experience of batteries?
A. I have -- well, every car I've had has one. I know how they work. It's very similar.
Q. I'm not talking about car batteries, Mr. Kobus. I'm talking about commercial-grade lithium-ion batteries of 150 megawatts.

What experience do you have with anything -- with lithium-ion batteries at that scale?
A. I've studied the heck out of it, and

I have very good experts that support me with any demand or question $I$ desire. And the manufacturers are more than eager to tell us all the technical details we need.

And we're evaluating -- we have a whole group that we've hired at Scout that knows batteries and knows what to do with them.
Q. Okay. So are there some reports about the operation of the battery --
(The Court Reporter requested clarification.)

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Are there any reports that have been done with regard to the operations of the batteries?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation and form.
You can answer, if you can.
THE WITNESS: We have lots of
information from the manufacturers --
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And do you --
A. -- on how they work, yeah.
Q. And do you have a manufacturer for the batteries that has been selected?
A. Same as for solar and wind turbines. We're constantly evaluating the market and looking at available technology and price points. And when the time comes, I'll guarantee you we're going to choose the most optimal arrangement and manufacturer at the time.
Q. But it may be that the operator doesn't need the batteries?
A. Yeah.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: It may be we don't
build it on the first buildout, that it'll
be five years from now before we decide to
put the batteries in and upgrade the
project. But $I$ got to have it in here to
do that, so...

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. But if one's analyzing the project now, one should consider the batteries are a part of it?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form
and foundation. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Our market looks at
all of these optimizations constantly. They're constantly evaluating what's optimal, and it changes literally from day to day.

So today, right now, $I$ can't tell you what our first buildout is going to look like because $I$ can't tell you who the offtaker is. We haven't selected our equipment, so $I$ can't tell you what brand name of battery we're going have. We may have a six-hour battery. We may have an eight-hour battery. I can't tell you right now. I would if I could, but we have to be nimble. We have to keep this flexible. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. So for people looking at it and talking about the application and whether EFSEC ought to grant a permit for this, we go with the current technology, which is lithium-ion four-hour batteries?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: No. We go with
150 megawatt battery potential. We can build up to 150 megawatts of battery at
each point of interconnection. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. No, I understand you're going buy a lot of batteries.
A. Yeah.
Q. But we're basically talking about four-hour lithium-ion batteries, correct?
A. Not necessarily. I mean, that was our target at the time we last updated the ASC. I don't know what it's going to turn out.
Q. Well --
A. I want to do the most optimal. I want to sell the most of this project that $I$ can to meet regional needs for clean energy. That's what this is all about. That's what we need to do.
Q. Okay. I understand that.
A. Yes.
Q. The question is, for people who are assessing the project now, we're not going to base that on something 15 or 20 years from now when the batteries may be bigger or longer or different composition.

We need to do it on the basis of what's currently commercially available; isn't
that correct?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form and foundation. You can answer, if you can.

THE WITNESS: We have what we need to tell EFSEC. They can make a decision on what's in here.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. Good.

So in connection with the discussion of batteries is this question of water for the project.
A. (Witness nodded head up and down.)
Q. And I understand -- I'm, again, looking at the application, page $2-86$ talks about water supply.

Have you been involved in assessing and getting water rights for the project?
A. I'm the key person doing that, yes.
Q. You're the one?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Okay. And I understand from reading the document that drilling a well and getting water from a well on the site is not feasible.
A. Not true.
Q. Well, the --
A. There are wells out there.
Q. I understand that. I'm not talking about those wells.
A. But if you want to go dig dry holes to try and see if you can get water, no thanks. No thanks.
Q. So as I understand, that no new water rights are anticipated for this project. You're not going to be getting new water rights to provide for water for the project.
A. Not true. We will have rights for whatever water supply we need, and contract for the project. And we have that identified, and it's perfectly valid.
Q. Page 1-10 under energy and natural resources, it says:

No new water rights are anticipated to be necessary for the use of local off-site water resources.

Is that correct?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer, if you can.
THE WITNESS: This update indicated
we do not need to obtain new water rights. We have water supply potential that has water rights. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And what's that?
A. Appendix -- which -- the one in there that identifies the Port of Walla Walla agreement.
Q. Okay. So that's what you're relying on?
A. We may find others.
Q. Okay. Has an investigation been made of other water suppliers for the project other than the Port of Walla Walla?
A. I've been working on it for two years. In fact, we originally thought we would -- the most convenient and obvious would be Kennewick. They have a huge water -municipal water system, and they were selling water to anybody that applied and checked out a water meter. And then they decided to change their policy and say, no, we're going to keep it for only within the city limits.
Q. Okay. So --
A. That's too bad. That was water
literally right next to the project.
Q. Not available now, though?
A. Not available now.
Q. And have you talked to other water districts or water utilities about getting water?
A. Almost all of them, yeah.
Q. And has anybody else other than the Port of Walla Walla said they will provide water?
A. Yes. We've turned down suppliers of water.
Q. Okay. And where would those be?
A. Locally, yeah.
Q. Locally?
A. I'm not going to name parties that we're in negotiations with.
Q. But you don't have a signed agreement water right for any of those parties, do you?
A. From Port of Walla Walla, yeah.
Q. Yeah.

But not the other ones you're talking about?
A. No, I don't -- I don't have signed agreements.
Q. And --
A. You know a lot of agreements don't get signed until they're needed, right? You sign them just in time when you've found the optimal source and the most economic and best opportunity for you.
Q. That's the way business works?
A. Yeah.
Q. So let's look over page 2-150, please.
A. Boy, this is a big document. Okay. I'm there.
Q. Under statement of compliance on that page.
A. Yes.
Q. The first sentence reads:

Construction and operation of the project would comply with certain sections of the Benton County code.

And the last one listed there is:

Minimum standard -- minimum
standards fire flows, water mains, fire hydrants, and roads.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you write this?
A. No. Tetra Tech wrote this.
Q. And has the project -- can the project meet these requirements?
A. I'm absolutely convinced we can.
Q. And what would be the source of water for the minimum fire flows, water mains, fire hydrants, roads, et cetera, particularly for the batteries?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to form.
And asked and answered. But you can answer, if you can.

THE WITNESS: The batteries may not have water suppression. They're not required to.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Okay. But I'm asking about the minimum standard fire flows.

What information can you provide me that those fire flows are being met?
A. The standards are not going to expect you to have water available when there's no hydrants. So, obviously, you have to have some capability to get the water to where it's
needed. So I'm absolutely convinced we can meet the standards. We just said that here.
Q. No, I understand what you've said here.

My question is, where are -- where are the drawings, where are the specifications, where are the other materials that indicate these minimum standards can be met?
A. In the section of the ASC where it addresses water. It addresses it in various places.
Q. I understand, and I've read through a lot of the document, but $I$ have seen no drawings. I've seen no standards. I've seen nothing about fire hydrants. And I've seen nothing about the --
A. There will be no fire hydrants. There is no water service out there. We have to have contracted sources of water. We do not intend to drill our own wells.

We will have water storage at the site because we'll need water for domestic needs as well in normal operation on a daily basis. We will rely on Benton County Fire Services in the event of an emergency.
Q. Well, if there was a fire up there now, what would be the source of water for extinguishing it?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation. Calls for speculation. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Well, I can answer it's BC-1, Benton County Number 1 . BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And how much water do they have available to fight a fire?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Lack of foundation. Answer if you can.

THE WITNESS: I don't know what their equipment -- current equipment is. I know they have water tankers, I've seen them out fighting fires.

They have interagency agreements where, if they need more, they can get it from BC-2, they can get it from Walla Walla, they can get it from any of the local fire departments. They will meet the need.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. So on page 2-151, there's further
discussion of water. Could you turn over there?
A. Sure.
Q. And about two-thirds of the way down that first paragraph --
A. Okay.
Q. -- there are two sentences that say:

Proof of water availability is addressed in section 3.3 of this ASC. Automatic sprinkler systems would be installed in the project O\&M building and in the BESS containers per BCC 3.04.041.

Do you see that sentence?
A. Yes.
Q. And so is it the intention of Scout to put automatic sprinkler systems in the BESS operations?
A. Yeah. I mean, that's our statement.
Q. And how big are these? How big are the battery operations?
A. We haven't procured the battery yet, so I really can't answer you.
Q. As best $I$ can see, it's six acres of battery.
A. Well, they're modularized
containers. They're self-contained. I mean, I've seen them down at the Wheatridge facility and there they have the suppression, it's just not connected to anything.

We're going to have the same thing.
We're going to have modules, like C bands, they'll be modularized components that you build together whatever size you need.
Q. What's the source of water for the automatic sprinkler systems that you mentioned here on page 151?
A. I don't have an answer for you at the moment.
Q. Well, there isn't any, isn't that the case?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Argumentative.
THE WITNESS: I just don't know what the plan is. We haven't procured it yet. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Are you aware the fire dangers with lithium-ion batteries?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. And what are those dangers?
A. They can have internal faults that
cause them to burn.
Q. And have you seen lithium-ion fires? Have you seen any videos of them?
A. I've seen pictures of Teslas burning up, sure. Is this a Tesla? I don't know if we're going buy Tesla batteries. I don't know that answer. They might be the best one in the market.
Q. You're not going to buy Tesla car batteries, are you?
A. Tesla makes batteries for battery storage for commercial utility projects. Yes, they do.
Q. I understand that they do, but do you understand what the fire dangers of those batteries are in a commercial setting on six acres of property?
A. We will negotiate with the manufacturer to make sure we meet all standards for the batteries that we procure for the site. And so they will be safe as the technology is available.
Q. I understand they will be. What will be the source of water to fight a fire at the batteries?
A. Benton County 1 .
Q. Okay.
A. Well, it's Benton County 2 at the west site because that's over in Benton County 2 territory. So Benton County 2 .
Q. Okay. So if I go to Benton -- have you asked Benton County about their ability to fight a six-acre battery fire up on the plateau?
A. Yes. Talked -- spoke with the fire marshal myself.
Q. What did he say?
A. He said, I don't have time for this. I'm sorry, that's what he said. He won't answer phone calls anymore. So talk to the Benton County fire marshal.
Q. So the answer is, you haven't gotten approval --
A. Benton County will be the provider of emergency services. They're going to have to figure it out.
Q. But you have not gotten approval from the Benton County fire marshal for the plans for this six-acre battery operation, have you?
A. We do not have our emergency plan approved through the county, no. That will likely be a condition of our site certification agreement. That's how that works.
Q. Are you familiar with the concept of thermal runaway in lithium-ion batteries?
A. I believe I understand. That's what I meant by internal faults that can occur.
Q. And you're aware that this is a fast-moving fire?
A. Yeah.
Q. Very fast, correct?
A. Within the battery, yeah. Not away from the battery.
Q. Are you familiar with the concept of repropagation of fires in lithium-ion batteries?
A. I believe that's a concern, yeah. You have to watch it.
Q. Have to keep water on it for days at a time, don't you?
A. I can't say for sure. This is commercially available technology, right. This is state of the art. We're going after state of the art lithium-ion batteries, if that's
what we install at the site.
We will get the best batteries available in the market, and they will be demonstrably safe and they'll be warranted. And I'll guarantee you Benton County will make sure that they have the emergency services capability they need to support this project.
Q. You guarantee that they will?
A. They have to. That's their responsibility.
Q. That sounds like a legal conclusion to me.

MS. PERLMUTTER: You don't have to answer that.

THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. So we had a little trouble copying page -- this is actually page $2-126$. And when we copied it, we got a couple of holes through, but this is what it looks like. It's your --
A. Yes, okay.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you find that there in the material? Yeah, I think it's up -- yeah, I
think it's right here. Right there.
Can you turn that over? That's what talks about the Benton County fire marshal?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And there's a hole through it there, but it refers to Benton County code and International Fire Code?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you investigated the requirements for fighting lithium-ion fires that are found in the International Fire Code?
A. Yes.
Q. You have.

It says a permit may be required for the Benton County fire marshal in accordance with International Fire Code; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you secured that permit?
A. No.
Q. Have you received a commitment from the Benton County fire marshal to issue such a permit?
A. No. We engaged with him and, as I said, he indicated he didn't have time to deal with it.
Q. And then there's another sentence after that that was recently added, which says: If necessary, the applicant would obtain these permits in coordination with EFSEC.

Do you see that?
A. Yes. EFSEC has preemptive authority to issue the permits themselves.
Q. So if you can't get it from the Benton County fire marshal, you're going to ask EFSEC to issue the permit?
A. Absolutely. It's a benefit of going to EFSEC, it's a one-stop shop.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Wait until there's
a question pending.

THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
MS. PERLMUTTER: That's okay.
You're doing great.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. I'd like you to look at page 4-33, and the very last sentence.
A. Got it.
Q. Last two sentences:

Lithium-ion battery storage may pose
a risk of fire and explosion due to the
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tendency for lithium-ion batteries to overheat. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you assist in writing this?
A. I reviewed it, yes.
Q. And do you think that's an accurate statement?
A. I believe it is.
Q. And what is FPRF, which is the end of that sentence?
A. I would have to look at the references to identify that acronym. I'm not exactly sure offhand what it stands for.
Q. And then it says:

If lithium-ion batteries are exposed
to abnormal heat, electrolyte products may vaporize and be vented from the cells. This vented electrolyte is flammable and may ignite on contact with an ignition source.

Is that an accurate statement?
A. I believe it, yeah.
Q. And what water is currently planned to be applied to the extinguishment of a fire that's discussed here?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked
and answered. You can answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: Well, I remember we just went through a bit ago where we said we were going to have fire suppression for the batteries. So whatever water supply is required to make that operational is what it'll end up being.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Do you know what the minimum fire flows are that are required for industrial commercial operations in Benton County? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Foundation. I'm sorry. Objection. Form. You can answer, if you can. THE WITNESS: Not offhand, no. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Getting near the end here. Give me -- \(I\) know. I know, you can barely wait. MR. ARAMBURU: Let's go off the record for a second. (A recess was taken.) BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. A couple of questions.

You have been -- have you been the principal contact for the applicant with EFSEC and EFSEC staff?
A. Yes.
Q. And how long has that been going on?
A. Since, we -- since, well, prior -just prior to filing our permit and getting ready to file it, and then since, I've been the principal contact.

Now, that being said, every now and then, if there's large files, I'll have Tetra Tech do a manage file transfer to EFSEC, but that's at my authorization and it's considered coming from me when \(I\) authorize that, so...
Q. So as I understand the record, the first contacts with EFSEC were in the fall of 2020. Does that comport with your chronology?
A. That would be -- yeah, that would be the timeframe where we were deliberating whether to do the county permit process or the EFSEC process, yeah.
Q. And during that period of time, let's say, through the fall of 2020, you were involved at that time?
A. Absolutely, yeah.
Q. And through 2021.

Was there conversations with EFSEC about the content of the environmental impact statements?
A. \(\quad \mathrm{N} O\).
Q. And have you had contact with them about the content of the impact statements?
A. Well, when we initially filed our application, we had conducted a SEPA analysis. And, you know, in our belief, we felt we could meet the criteria for mitigated determination of nonsignificance.

And then, after we filed for the expedited permitting process, we later decided to rescind that application and agreed with EFSEC that we would support them preparing an environmental impact statement.
Q. And so there was interactions, then, between EFSEC and Scout staff, including yourself?
A. Yeah, because we had to -- we had to request them to declare that it would need an environmental impact statement. Because they're the ones that are responsible for that determination and they're the ones that prepare, or have an independent expert prepare the environmental impact statement.
Q. And as \(I\) understand it, the independent expert is being paid by Scout?
A. Oh, yes. EFSEC is entirely on our -- our -- we have to pay -- we have to pay a certain share of EFSEC's normal costs, plus we have to pay everything specific to this application.
Q. The comment period for the draft impact statement ended February 1st of this year. Are you aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you been working with EFSEC concerning the preparation of the final impact statement?
A. They're doing it. We're -- we filed comments on the DEIS for what we would expect them to consider to change or incorporate in the final EIS, but that's all in the record.
Q. Have there been further communications regarding the final impact statement?
A. Only through data requests where they're actually asking us for things that they feel they need in order to make the determinations they need for the final EIS, yes.
Q. Has EFSEC indicated to you when they expect to issue the final impact statement?
A. When we asked to extend the EFSEC process to the point of a final document that's ready to be provided to the governor, we discussed that the final EIS would be part of that record that they create, along with the site certification agreement that would go along with that.

So I don't know exactly -- exactly
when the final EIS is going to be completed.
Q. Have you asked them?
A. Oh, yeah.
Q. And what did they say?
A. It depends. They still are doing evaluations. And those were documented in the recent data requests 7 and 8 . We've provided information, and we still owe them a document for data request 7 .
Q. What's that?
A. The transportation impact analysis.
Q. Okay. And is there going to be any additional visual impact analysis provided?
A. We did do additional, and it has
been provided in response to data request 7 .
Q. And that's been provided to EFSEC staff?
A. Yeah, it's on the docket.
Q. Okay.
A. In fact, the Yakima Nation have requested some points of interest that -identified points of interest for us to do visual simulations, which we did.

MR. ARAMBURU: Okay. I think that's
all the questions \(I\) have right now. Thank you, Mr. Kobus.

EXAMINATION
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Hello, again, Mr. Kobus. I'm Shona Voelckers from the Yakima Nation. Same ground rules apply, of course, to this conversation. And as I'm sure you expect, I'm going to jump around a bit.
A. Okay.
Q. Does Exhibit 1 reflect any efforts by Scout to avoid impacts to the Yakima Nation's traditional cultural properties?
A. The intention is that we desire to know what those impacts are, and have, in fact,
requested those to be identified to the fullest extent.

For those we've heard and evaluated, we've actually made an attempt to redesign the project in consideration of those. And our intent is to continue to work with the Yakima Nation to come to hopefully an agreeable compromise.
Q. Are those attempts reflected anywhere in Exhibit 1?
A. I'm going to say not. I don't think they are.
Q. Have you reviewed the confidential TCP report submitted into the adjudication record by Jessica Lally?
A. The most recent, yes.
Q. It was just recently because - -
A. Yeah.
Q. The -- but the report itself?
A. Yeah.
Q. Does Exhibit 1 reflect any efforts by Scout to minimize impacts to the Yakima Nation's traditional cultural properties?
A. We have continued to maintain the fullest extent of the development of the project, and have not yet reduced impacts. There are settlement discussions in progress with the parties associated with the permit. We do intend to mark up the document as part of the post-adjudication redline to make those concessions in accordance with those settlement agreements that, you know, we would like to have done prior to the end of adjudication.
Q. So as we sit here today, there's nothing within Exhibit 1 that reflects an effort by Scout to minimize impacts to Yakima Nation's traditional cultural properties, correct?
A. (No verbal response.)
Q. Is it fair to say those efforts have not been yet incorporated into the application?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
You can answer, if you can.
THE WITNESS: I need to back up a step. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Sure.
A. I was attempting to engage with

Jessica Lally literally the first week I
started working for Scout back in 2018 .
There was some information available that indicated Webber Canyon was important to the Yakima Nation. And we did pull back and allowed additional margin related to Webber Canyon because we knew that to be the case.

But recent discussions, no, they have not been incorporated into the application as it stands today.
Q. So as we sit here today, just so I'm clear, there isn't something in Exhibit 1 that you could point me to right now that reflects an effort by Scout to minimize impacts to TCP?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. It's been asked and answered -- asked and answered. But you can respond.

THE WITNESS: There has been an effort all along to attempt to optimally design the project and not load up the west end of it because we know that there are important TCPs there.

You know, as it stands, there's also airspace restrictions that kept us away from the west as well. But, you know, I have to admit that in what we applied for,
there, yes, there was consideration for Yakima TCPs.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. But there's nothing -- I just want to make sure \(I\) understand your answer clearly to my question.

There's nothing that we could point to today as we sit here that demonstrates Scout's efforts to minimize impacts to Yakima Nation traditional cultural properties?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked
and answered. You can answer again.
THE WITNESS: The only thing I could point to -- well, \(I\) can't point to, but the only thing \(I\) can respond with is, there are things we intentionally didn't include in consideration of Yakima TCPs.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. But it's no to my question on whether that is reflected in Exhibit 1 as a document?
A. Not as a document, no.
Q. So that's not reflected in the application that EFSEC has, that's knowledge that you hold personally?
A. And it's in the layout of the project. As I said, there are things we could have done that we chose not to.
Q. And have you provided information about what you could have done that you chose not to?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: At that stage of the project, we had a letter from the Yakima Nation that said, we will not converse with the applicant until it is part of the EFSEC process, and we will consult government to government. And so that was when conversation ceased.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Okay. So is there anything external to the exhibit in front of you that you could point to that documents that?
A. They're confidential. No, I couldn't point to them. They're part of ongoing settlement negotiations.
Q. And you're aware that there's not an active settlement negotiation as of today, correct?
A. I wouldn't put it that way. I would say we've made a proposal that was rejected and not countered. But \(I\) would say we're still intending to negotiate, and we've requested to do that, and our intention is to continue to try.
Q. But it does take two parties to continue a settlement discussion, correct? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.

Argumentative. You can answer. THE WITNESS: Yeah, we would like the Yakima Nation to come to the table. Yeah. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. And does Exhibit 1 reflect any efforts by Scout to mitigate impacts to Yakima Nation's traditional cultural properties? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked and answered. Answer if you can, or you want to answer again.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. I'm going to clarify my question. I have not asked about mitigation yet.

So does Exhibit 1 reflect any
efforts by Scout to mitigate impacts to Yakima

Nation's traditional cultural properties?
A. I believe we've offered very robust mitigation that benefits Yakima Nation as well, yes.
Q. That mitigates impacts to traditional cultural properties?
A. I believe so, yeah.
Q. And how do you understand me to be using that term?
A. I understand that the identification of traditional cultural properties is a complex concept. And with, you know, all respect to the Yakima Nation, we need that articulated to the fullest extent. And that's what we hope to come to the table with, and have precise, concise conversations about things that are possible.

You know, but declaring the whole thing is a TCP that's unmitigable doesn't help.
Q. So I just want to make sure I'm not using terms that we're not clear on.

Do you know what \(I\) mean when \(I\) say, "legendary sites"?
A. Yes.
Q. And you know what \(I\) mean when \(I\) say,
monumental sites"?
A. Not real clear on the distinction between the two.
Q. How do you understand me to be using the words, "legendary sites"?
A. Sites that the Yakima Nation believes since creation have been utilized and passed down from generation to generation what the significance is and how they've been utilized and what their value is to the culture.
Q. Okay. And you said you reviewed Jessica Lally's TCP report that generally summarizes --
A. Yes.
Q. -- the project's impact to TCPs?
A. Yes.
Q. So based upon your review of that, is it fair to say that there isn't anything in Exhibit 1 that contains commitments by Scout to mitigate impacts to Yakima Nation's traditional cultural properties that have been identified by Jessica Lally?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to form.
You can answer, if you can.

THE WITNESS: Well, my understanding is the mitigation is no wind turbines on Horse Heaven Hill. So I can't work with that. So the site has to be permitted in accordance with EFSEC and, you know, we're asking for the current infrastructure that's in the application. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. You mentioned the discussion between Scout and Yakima Nation about any -- about alterations to the project design --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that were proposed.

Have you discussed any alterations to the project design contained in Exhibit 1 with anyone else outside Scout and your legal counsel?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form and foundation. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: We are negotiating a settlement with counsel for the environment.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. And is any of that discussion reflected within Exhibit 1?
A. No.
Q. Is any of that discussion reflected
in any materials available to EFSEC right now?
A. The settlement negotiations, we're
intending to keep them confidential until it's
executed. We have provided our version of that
to the AG and it's under review.
Q. Which is consistent with how some
it's wrong.
there's isn't anything that EFSEC has to review
to incorporate any project design changes in
their review of the application today?
Q. Okay. So they're aware that it's coming?
A. Yes.
Q. And do those project changes include anything besides what you've been discussing with counsel for the environment?
A. We have not discussed any of the negotiations or proposals with the Yakima Nation with any other parties. That was confidential with Yakima Nation.
Q. Okay. But the project designs that you -- putting that aside, right, we'll move on from that.
A. Okay.
Q. Is there any other project design that you are currently contemplating aside from what has been proposed in confidential conversations with Ms. Reyneveld?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are those other design alterations?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
You can answer, if you can.
THE WITNESS: Until we submit them
to EFSEC, they're still a work in progress. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Have they been shared externally outside of Scout? legal and technical consultants.
Q. Okay. So you've discussed different design alterations than what's in Exhibit 1 , but they've not been shared external to scout and legal counsel?
A. Correct. We're waiting for all the parties, all things to progress as they should until the time we're ready to identify them.
Q. Okay. So EFSEC staff does not have them?
A. No, they do not.
Q. And EFSEC's counsel does not have them? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You mean council or counsel? MS. VOELCKERS: Thank you. We'll
take both in turn.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. EFSEC's legal counsel doesn't have them?
A. To my knowledge, that's correct.
Q. And the council that will decide and make a recommendation to the governor, the EFSEC council, not legal counsel, they don't
have a copy of any of the project designs that are being discussed?
A. Yeah. Just to be clear, we don't interface with the council, only through the monthly meetings or if they do a tour of the site. That's the only interface we have with council members.
Q. Okay. I appreciate the clarification.

So then to be clear, as we go into an adjudication hearing, the material that they have in front of them is Exhibit 1?
A. Correct.
Q. Without alterations to the design?

MS. PERLMUTTER: I'm going to object
as to form when you say that they have in
front of them. We've just been talking
about at least two entities. So if you
could clarify that, that would be good. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Well, I'm going to take it as whole entity. EFSEC as an entity, staff, legal counsel, everyone.

As we sit here today, they only have the project design contained in Exhibit 1 in front of you?
A. That's correct.
Q. When do you anticipate giving them the proposed design alterations?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to form and foundation. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I have to defer to
legal counsel on that as to how that's going to be unveiled in the EFSEC adjudication.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Okay. So it's a legal strategy on when that information is available?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. I'm not going to get into a whole back-and-forth on the lack of alternatives because \(I\) think that was covered a lot, but I do want to just understand kind of can versus can't in terms of what could be possible.

So -- and I understand there's a lot of, you know, economic interest, business interest. That's your job, not mine.

But can the project move forward without the solar field?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to form.

THE WITNESS: It's possible. Is it optimal? No.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Can the project move forward without the northwest solar field, same answer?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form
and foundation. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Same answer.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Can the project move forward without the southwest solar field?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form and foundation.

THE WITNESS: Same answer, yeah. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Can the project move forward without any solar fields?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Same objection. Form and foundation.

THE WITNESS: Same answer, yes.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. So is it fair to say that the solar portion of the project is what moves it towards optimal, but the solar fields themselves are not necessary for the project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: It's in the eye of the beholder as far as the offtake potential. If they say they want 100 megawatts solar overbuild on the east side, we're going to try and make it work.

And so, you know, we have a market we intend to meet. And we want to optimize and make this as big as we can, of course, we're within the constraints of what's in the application. But that's our business is bringing the market what they need. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Could you market the project without the solar fields?
A. It's possible, but not optimal.
Q. Understood. Okay. We can move on from that part.
A. Yeah.
Q. I heard a couple of times from you today that Scout has ongoing discussions with potential offtakers, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Offtaker is the right word?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And it sounded like, but correct me if I'm wrong, those discussions have gone so far as to have potential offtakers make requests about the project design; is that correct?
A. That's correct. The offtakers identify what's desired to meet their needs, and then we attempt, where possible, to structure the project if we want to meet their need.
There's -- I mean, there's a whole spectrum, there's a whole smorgasbord of things that you can do to optimize and. The first one that has the best deal relative to our bids, we'll be happy with.
Q. So is it fair to say than an offtaker could make a suggestion or request that's kind of further out from what others are asking, so you might not honor that request? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to form. You can answer. THE WITNESS: We might not be able to honor that request. So we would say, this is what we can do and this is what it'll cost. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Because you're getting input from multiple offtakers, so you can balance that input?
A. Sure, sure. I mean it's no secret, you know, Atlas Agro is trying to build a fertilizer plant in Richland. They're going to need power. They have to have clean energy. And there's very unique needs that they have given where they are, where they're interconnecting, and the demand that they need to provide for that facility.

And so they're likely to engage with us and say, we want you to do this, and if you do it, then we will sign an agreement.
Q. How many potential offtakers, you don't have to be exact here, but, in general, how many potential offtakers have provided input on the project design contained in Exhibit 1?
```

                    MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to form.
    ```
You can answer.
                    THE WITNESS: I'm going to say, to
the best of my knowledge, none. Because
our application was created in our concept
    of what the market's going to desire.
    And we pushed the bubble out to get
        the maximum flexibility. And then our
        intent is to remain as nimble as possible
        to be able to optimize to eventually sell
        the maximum extent of the energy from this
        project that we can.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Have you made enough progress with a potential offtaker to have any sort of agreement that's contingent on the project being permitted?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to form. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: No. They will not -they have indicated they -- no one wants to agree to procure something without a permit. They have to have certainty. They have to have line of sight certainty on that permit.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Right. But earlier, you discussed an exclusivity agreement with a turbine provider. Do you have any agreement with a potential offtaker --
(The Court Reporter requested clarification.) BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Do you have any tentative agreements with potential offtaker or offtakers that commits them to purchasing the project once it is permitted?
A. No.
Q. And you talked now and earlier about optimal project.
A. Yes.
Q. And \(I\) just want to be clear, when you're using "optimal" today, you mean optimal economically?
A. That's correct. Well, I need embellish that a little bit. Optimization also includes lowest environmental impact, most efficient and reliable interconnection to the grid. All of that figures into the optimization. You know, it has to be minimized to the extent practical related to the SEPA criteria.
Q. As you sit here today, is it your testimony that the project is designed to have the lowest environmental impact?
A. We specifically chose this site for its low relative environmental impact. And we've done everything practical to design the site to minimize that impact, avoid where necessary, and, in fact, provide mitigation for where it can't be avoided.
Q. And when you say that you are providing mitigation where something can't be avoided, you're referring to environmental impacts, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And if you're saying that something -- environmental impact can't be avoided, is that, it can't be avoided and the project still exists, or it can't be avoided for the optimal project?
A. It can't be avoided as a project exists. For example, we're going to have one acre of permanent impact to shrub step. We can't avoid it.
(The Court Reporter requested clarification.)

THE WITNESS: To shrub step habitat, and we can't avoid it. So I've got to mitigate for that one acre of permanent
impact.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Why can't you avoid it?
A. It would be economically infeasible to, you know, for example, route a conductor -a whole series of conductors several miles around a one-acre shrub step impact.

So we believe that we can mitigate, onsite is preferred, and we do have a site identified in our habitation mitigation plan, but that's a case where it would just be unreasonable to avoid that one acre. And, you know, we feel that's acceptable.
Q. Unreasonable, but not impossible?
A. Right.
Q. So is it fair to say that when the Exhibit 1 discusses avoidance of environmental impacts and says that something cannot be avoided, does that really mean that it's unreasonable from a business perspective to avoid that impact?
A. That's what it means, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

You talked about the benefit of going to EFSEC, and I think you used the term
"one stop shop"?
A. Correct.
Q. I would certainly agree that by going to EFSEC you're saving administrative burden by applying to them rather than multiple regulators.

My question, though, is about your understanding. Is it your understanding that EFSEC can override all other permitting entities with oversight of the project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. And irrelevant. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: EFSEC has preemptive authority. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Even over permits required under federal law?
A. No, they cannot preempt federal.
Q. And what about permits required under state law, apart from Benton County's own regulations?

MS. PERLMUTTER: I'm going to object on foundation grounds. Calls for legal conclusion. And it is also specifically


BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. You said you've been working on the water supply for the project for a couple of years now.
A. Yeah.
Q. Is it fair to say it's been hard to find water in this area?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
You can answer it.
THE WITNESS: No, it's not hard. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. It's not hard to find extra water?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked
and answered. You can answer it. And to form.

THE WITNESS: There are water
sources available. I'll give you an
example. The Welch's grape juice plant in
Kennewick, they've got a tremendous well
there. And it's not under contract.
Somebody owns it. It's not available to
us.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Is it fair to say that you have to find water to purchase for the project?
A. Anything other than drilling your own hole, you have to purchase, yeah.
Q. And drilling your own hole is not necessarily an option?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: It's too risky to
drill wells up on the site. If you look
over the landscape, you'll see farmers that
have green trees and you'll see farmers
that don't. The ones with green trees have wells. The others don't.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. I guess what I'm getting at is that it's not easy to find new water sources that have not already been appropriated by someone else?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. Asked and answered. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Well, anybody that has
substantial water resource is in the business of making revenue from it. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. By selling it?
A. By selling it, yeah.
Q. To folks that need it for new development?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation and form. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Irrigators. There's
lots of wells up there for irrigators.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Are you aware that new commercial development cannot be permitted until an applicant has demonstrated available water to support the development?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Relevance. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Well, it sounds
reasonable.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Both for construction and operation of the development, right?
A. Yeah, sounds reasonable.
Q. And you know that under EFSEC's own regulations, projects are required to demonstrate legally available water in support of their applications?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls
for a legal conclusion. You can answer, if
you can.
THE WITNESS: As part of our application process, yes, we have to answer the questions, where is your water coming from?

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Is it fair to say that you
understand that you would have to answer that question whether you were going through the county permitting process or EFSEC?
A. I believe that would be true, yeah.
Q. Prior to obtaining a permit?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Identifying the source prior to obtaining your permit, yeah. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Yeah. And to be clear, I'm not talking about any contracts. I'm just talking about demonstrating available water.

You understand that you have to demonstrate that there's water available for the project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls
for a legal conclusion. You can answer it.

THE WITNESS: We would not get to this stage in our development without having a line of sight on water supply. Not only one, but multiple, so we have contingencies. And we're going to continue to go after the cheapest one that's most convenient to the site.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Was that a "yes" to my question, though?
A. I think it was.
Q. If we could turn to page \(2-87\) of Exhibit 1 .
A. Okay.
Q. Sorry, I lost my page here. Just take a sec.

So the bottom of page 2-87 talks about construction water supply, and then it continues on page 2-88. So if we could turn there. Middle of third line down, it says -are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. It says:

As an alternative to the City of
Kennewick, the project may source water from
either another local off-site public utility, private irrigator, or wells. As an example, refer to the Port Walla Walla availability of water for hire letter in Appendix J.
A. Yes.
Q. So that refers to Appendix J as an example.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any other letters from other potential water sources that would demonstrate legally available water for the project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. But you can answer.

THE WITNESS: We are in negotiations with other parties. Do \(I\) have a signed agreement? No.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. And there isn't any other documents to share at this time that demonstrate available water for the project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form. And I think asked and answered. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you
ask it again?
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. There aren't any other documents that could be shared at this time that would show additional available water for the project?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Repeat the objection. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: We have a land use license with Department of Natural

Resources for an existing well site.
That's a public record.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Where would I find that publicly?
A. I'm sure it's available by request from Department of Natural Resources. I mean, I can provide it to you.
Q. You can provide it?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Okay. Any other documents?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
You can respond.
THE WITNESS: No. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Does the land use license agreement with DNR cover construction water or operation water?
A. The land use license is to use that portion of state land. And the intended purpose is to reactivate a well that exists there, but we have to negotiate the terms, and that is a work in progress.
Q. So the well is not currently being used to exercise a water right?
A. Not current, no.
Q. So is it possible you might need to go to ecology to resolve any -- to use that well, to determine if it has a valid water right?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
And calls for speculation. But you can answer, if you can.

THE WITNESS: Department of Natural
Resources has assured us they have water rights that can be transferred to reactivate that well.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. That's what \(I\) was going to ask.

Thank you.
A. Okay. We have water solved. I shouldn't have --
Q. Is it solved or are you working on it?
A. We're working on it. We believe -well, Port of Walla Walla in a pinch, yeah. They have ample water.
Q. I'm not disagreeing with your use of the word "solved." I'm just trying to understand what is held within your knowledge at Scout and what is available to the rest us to understand in terms of the source of the water for the project.
A. I'm speaking to publicly available documents. We have the agreement with the Port of Walla Walla and we have a land use license with Department of Natural Resources.
Q. And you understand that to cover all water needs for the project?
A. It is --

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. Construction
and operational needs, yeah, for the life BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Have you had any conversations with EFSEC staff in this back-and-forth on the FEIS about how to provide that information so they can analyze the impacts of the project on water resources?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I've had conversations with them about what we have provided in the ASC redline as believing that satisfies the requirements for a permit application for water supply for the full term of the project. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. EFSEC staff have not requested additional information from you regarding the water supply for the project at this time?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Correct. They have
not. They feel they have enough. They've said to me they have what they need. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Based upon Appendix J?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form
and foundation.
THE WITNESS: That's correct. I'm not going to give EFSEC the land use license for DNR because it's not an agreement to lease the well. So I have to get that done before \(I\) can notify EFSEC. BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. And to be clear, Appendix J isn't a water use agreement, correct?
A. Yes, it is a water use agreement.
Q. It's an agreement, a commitment to a certain amount of water?
A. Yes, it is.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
And argumentative.
THE WITNESS: It is an agreement.
Now, we'll have to negotiate what upgrades are necessary in order to do that and who pays for it.

But they've -- that letter is a
statement of capability to provide what we've identified as our need for the life of the project.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. A statement of capability, right?
A. Yeah, yeah. That's what's required.
Q. But not a water use agreement in term of the specifics of what scout will be paying for or what improvements Scout will be making in exchange for a specific amount of water?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form. And argumentative. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: That's correct. We have not inked out that final agreement for all of the terms necessary to be able to access that water.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Appendix J only references water for construction activities. Have you had additional conversations with the Port of Walla Walla about their ability to provide water for operations?
A. It's part and parcel, all the same, yeah.
Q. Was that just an accidental omission from the letter in Appendix J? MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.

Foundation. You can answer. THE WITNESS: Well, the letter was
their words. We say in our application that it applies to water for construction and operations.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. And \(I\) think the letter speaks for itself, to be fair. So I'm not going to ask you again to guess. And \(I\) think the ASC speaks for itself in terms of your position.

But has there been a discussion between Scout and Port of Walla Walla about whether or not they have sufficient water for full operation of the project?
A. Yes. I had personal discussions with them myself. The operational needs for water are very small. In fact, in order to have the most impactful case in the ASC we said we might need three panel washes a year. Well, we might need zero.

MS. VOELCKERS: I have an exhibit. (Exhibit 2 was identified.)

MS. VOELCKERS: I'm going to have to apologize for those on the Zoom. If you'd like, I can email this to you. It was also provided for Mr. Ritter's deposition. It is a letter from Mr. Ritter to EFSEC dated

January 31st, 2022 .
Do folks need me to email a copy of that? Okay. Not hearing anything on the Zoom.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Mr. Kobus, I'm going to direct your attention to the second page.
A. Okay.
Q. And I know you've been in a lot of conversations with WDFW over the years.

But look at that last statement before the map.
A. Okay.
Q. It refers to a meeting in February of 2022 between WDFW, EFSEC, and the applicant. Do you recall if you were at that meeting?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Do you recall being provided a copy of this figure in front of you?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Did Scout make any alterations to the project design in response to the February 2022 meeting?
A. Yes, we have committed to
alterations in the design relative to discussions in this meeting. We have not literally agreed to avoid the red circles entirely.
Q. What alterations were made?
A. We've changed the routing of overhead cables that -- to not go across canyons, to go around. We've moved turbines back from some of the canyons that were of interest to WDFW for, you know, raptor use areas or ferruginous hawk areas.

I mean, ultimately, we're in settlement negotiations to reduce even further with the CFE. But, you know, what we've indicated to WDFW is that their recommendations related to ferruginous hawk are premature. They're not relative to publish peer-reviewed documents and not part of the guidelines -existing guidelines related to ferruginous hawk mitigation -- avoidance and mitigation.
Q. And by -- yes?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Go ahead. I'm just
warning him I'm about to object.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. And by guidelines, are you referring
to the 2009 wind turbine guidelines?
MS. PERLMUTTER: I'm going to make a standing objection that this really is outside the scope of the Yakima Nation's participation. I'm not going to instruct him not to answer. We don't need to get a ruling. But your questions are now subject to an ongoing objection.

MS. VOELCKERS: I'm going to clarify the objection. Your objection is that the impacts of ferruginous hawks are not relative to the Yakima Nation's concerns?

MS. PERLMUTTER: I am -- per the second prehearing order by Judge Torem, it says:

Except as it directly pertains to
Yakima Nation's legendary, monumental, or burial sites per the WACs, Yakima Nation shall limit its participation and coordinate its presentation of evidence relating to visual impacts, light and glare with the county, and counsel for the environment, who shall jointly take lead party status for that issue, and coordinate presentation of evidence regarding
recreation or recreational land use, transportation, and road safety issues with the county who's the lead party on those issues.

As I say, I'm not going to instruct him not to answer, but \(I\) do object to this entire line.

MS. VOELCKERS: And to be clear, the objection is that questions about the ferruginous hawk impacts are inconsistent with what you just read?

MS. PERLMUTTER: That's correct.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. You referenced guidelines. Were you referring to the 2009 wind turbine guidelines?
A. That's correct. That's the latest available.
Q. Guidance?
A. WDFW -- well, wind power guidelines, that is the latest version, official version.
Q. And when you referred to peer-reviewed articles, what did you mean by that?
A. All of this information was predicated on information Jim Watson had
provided, which was not in peer-reviewed documents. To my knowledge, still is not.
Q. So is it -- is it fair to say that the majority of the turbines identified in this figure are still sighted within the red-circled port use areas?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.

You can answer.

THE WITNESS: They're consistent with what's in our updated redline application, yes.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. So Scout has not removed any portion of the corridor siting areas in response to the February 2022 meeting?
A. Well, I'm trying to be very clear. As we talked about various concepts and we were working towards resolving issuing related to ferruginous hawk and related to raptor use areas, with respect to what WDFW has provided, we have provided comments to the DEIS that, you know, are very clear that, you know, if ferruginous hawks occupy a nest site, we will be responsive to that occurring. We're not going to take turbines away for a

20-year-year-old nest site that doesn't even exhibit any of twigs remaining that were part of that nest.
Q. And why not?
A. Because the hawks aren't using the nest. You know, if -- well, as you can see, you know, there are more nest sites out here than they've identified in these three core areas. So they're not even saying avoid. They're also drawing perfect circles around agricultural fields which, you know, we all know the ferruginous hawks aren't foraging in the middle of the wheat fields.

And it's just an impractical,
idealistic extent. We're not going to respond to that kind of conjecture and that kind of scenario where they say that you can't use half of the project site because one time many years ago there might have been a nest there.

We do our own surveys. There has
been no ferruginous hawk occupied nests for the last two years anywhere near here.
Q. And when you say impracticable -- or impractical, you're talking about from a business perspective, right?
A. Yeah. That's -- we don't have to recover the species. We just have to build the best project with reasonable mitigation.
Q. It's not your job to recover the species?
A. It's no one's job to recover the species --
Q. It's not WDFW's --
(Parties speaking simultaneously.)
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. It's not WDFW's job?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Argumentative. Lack of foundation. Calls for speculation. If you can answer, you can.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I believe WDFW is
very interested in recovering the species.
That's why they designate it as endangered.
But you cannot recover the species
on the back of the next project that comes along. It's unreasonable.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. And so just so I'm clear, because you did talk about some things that were done in response.

There are no turbines moved outside of these red exclusionary areas in response to WDFW's recommendations in February of 2020?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form. And asked and answered. You can answer it.

THE WITNESS: Remains to be seen. We're still in the process of optimizing the project site. And there may be turbines that we decide not to construct in the first buildout of the project that are in those red circles. But as I say, it's a work in progress.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. So, then, is it fair to say that the work in progress may mean that there is additional voidance of impacts to ferruginous hawks based upon development of the project after the permit is issued?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form. Asked and answered. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: That is my intention, yes.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Based upon business goals to optimize the project?
                    MS. PERLMUTTER: I'm sorry?

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Based upon business goals to optimize the project?
A. We are continuing to evaluate the layout. And there are likely to be cases where deciding not to build a particular turbine site has various benefits, visual benefits, wildlife benefits, and other benefits that would make us decide not to build a particular turbine. But I can't, at this stage, identify what those are. And based on legal counsel, wait for the right time.

THE COURT REPORTER: Is there a good time for a break?

MS. VOELCKERS: Yeah. I only have a few questions, but I'm happy to take a break.

THE COURT REPORTER: No, go ahead.
MS. VOELCKERS: I just want to make
a few statements for the record.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. As we sit here today, do you have any reason to dispute a statement that the ferruginous hawk --
(A recess was taken.)
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Just a few more questions for me.

If \(I\) were to represent to you today, which \(I\) am, that the ferruginous hawk is a treaty reserved resource of the Yakima Nation, would you have any basis on which to dispute my statement?
A. No, I wouldn't have any.
Q. If I were to represent to you today that the ferruginous hawk is an integral element of at least one traditional cultural property identified within Jessica Lally's TCP report, would you have any basis on which to dispute me?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form
and foundation. You can answer it, if you can.

THE WITNESS: I mean, I can't recall exactly what was said about it, but \(I\) can tell you that we have the best available science on the ferruginous hawk. We do surveys. We've committed to do them annually.

We know that there are no occupied
nests within the last two years on the site. And beyond that, I can't recall precisely what was said about it in her exhibit.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. So as we sit here today, you have no reason to dispute the statement that I'm making on the record, which is that the ferruginous hawk is an integral element of at least one traditional cultural property of the Yakima Nation?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form
and foundation. If you can answer it, you can.

THE WITNESS: I have no reason to
dispute it.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. I'd like to turn back to the Exhibit 1, page 2-8.
A. Okay.
Q. And it's actually the next page, but it doesn't have a page number.

My understanding is that these are the DNR parcels in the vicinity of the project? (The Court Reporter requested
    clarification.)
    BY MS. VOELCKERS:
    Q. In the vicinity of the project; is
    that correct?
    MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form
        and foundation.
        THE WITNESS: But \(I\) can answer?
        MS. PERLMUTTER: Yeah, sorry.
        THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's how we
    designate the DNR state trust lands, with
        the blue.
        BY MS. VOELCKERS:
        Q. You referenced earlier land use
        agreement with DNR for one of the wells that
        they have on a parcel.
            A. Yes.
            Q. Is that parcel included on this
        page?
            A. No.
            Q. How far away from the project site
        is the parcel that's the subject of the land
        use agreement with DNR?
            MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form.
            You can answer. Sorry.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. The land use agreement that you referenced earlier today?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Repeat the objection. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: It is this blue you
see just off the very edge.
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. This one?
A. Right here.
Q. Right here?
A. Yeah.
Q. So west of the project?
A. West of the project.
Q. Okay. Thanks. Okay.
A. It's two miles west of Highway 221 on Sellards Road.

MR. ARAMBURU: Could I ask, on our
official exhibit, that you put a little red
dot or little arrow next to that for us?
Would that be possible?
THE WITNESS: Sure.
MR. ARAMBURU: I don't mean to
interrupt here, but...
THE WITNESS: Do you have --

MS. PERLMUTTER: Actually, no. It's
a fountain pen.

THE WITNESS: (Witness complied.)

I'll put an asterisk by it right there.
How's that? You can see it?
BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Yes.
A. It's called Gould well, G-o-u-l-d. I'm hesitant to talk about it because we don't have an agreement and it's not in the ASC and it's not within our site control. It's going to be part of our amendment process post-adjudication.
Q. And \(I\) think \(I\) heard earlier that it is an ongoing process in terms of the water?
A. Yes.
Q. But you can provide that land use license?
A. I can provide the land use license.
Q. And you plan to amend the ASC again?
A. As negotiations progress -- well, first of all, we do have to amend the ASC post-adjudication, okay. And we may have subsequent amendments to it after that. So at the appropriate time, when negotiations come to
fruition and lease agreements are executed with DNR, then the intention would be to certainly include that within the impacted area for the project.
Q. And when you say we have to amend it after the adjudication, it being the ASC --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- do you mean after the recommendation of the council, between when the adjudication ends and the recommendation is -can you be more specific about your understanding of the timeline for additional updates to the ASC?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to form and foundation. But you can answer. THE WITNESS: My understanding is EFSEC deliberations require the results of adjudication and the corresponding redline of the application for commitments that were made during the adjudication process. So the council, when they do their deliberations, they have to have that available to them.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. So those updates would be made
before the council is finished deliberating so they would have that information?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form. Foundation. And asked and answered. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm going to have to change my answer because DNR keeps insisting that they will not execute agreements until the final EIS is available because they will point to the final EIS as their SEPA process for land use decisions.

And so 1 can say for certainty that that has to occur first. So the final EIS is going to have to come out before we can amend it to include this.

BY MS. VOELCKERS:
Q. Okay. And this is my first time in an EFSEC proceeding, so my knowledge is based upon how SEPA normally works at the county level.

How will the information about the water source of the project be incorporated in the FEIS if the ASC is not updated before the FEIS is issued?
A. They're going to have to deliberate
on what's in there now. They can't deliberate on promises. They're going to have to deliberate on what's in the application at the time they review it.

MS. VOELCKERS: I might have
questions depending on what else is asked today, but \(I\) don't at this time.

MS. FOSTER: This is Ms. Beyer.
EXAMINATION
BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Kobus. My name is \(Z\) Foster. I'm an attorney for Benton

County. Hope to make this a little bit shorter for you, but all the same rules apply. You're still under oath. Let's not try to talk over each other.
A. I understand.
Q. Perfect.

So you said earlier that you have an agreement with the Department of Defense; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that agreement, you had to specify via GPS coordinates as to the location of each turbine, correct?
A. That's correct. Those are consistent with our filings with FAA for determinations.
Q. Okay. So you, throughout the course of the deposition today, you mentioned, you know, the project layout may change or you may change the layout. What do you mean when you say that?
A. Change the micrositing.
Q. What do you mean when you say "change the micrositing"?
A. Well, when we prepared the application, we didn't know precisely where we would end up pinpointing where the turbines would be because there's a lot of things that can influence their precise placement.

So what we did is everywhere there was a turbine, we expanded the micrositing to include a 500-foot area, wherever there was infrastructure, we expanded it to 200 feet, so that we would have flexibility within those micrositing corridors.

So the application is very
conservative in that it includes those entire micrositing corridors even though there's
only -- could be just one wire underground in a 200-foot wide area for the length of that conductor placement.
Q. Okay. So to clarify, then, when you're talking about changing the layout, you're not talking about changing the placement of the turbines?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. But you can answer.
THE WITNESS: It could include the turbines, but the intent is to not move the turbines outside of the micrositing corridor because then we have to change the micrositing corridor, which is an increase in impact.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. Right. I understand that.

What I'm trying to get at, though, is if you change the coordinates of the turbines, do you have to go back and get an amended agreement with the DOD?
A. You do have some degree of freedom that you can move the turbines. With DOD, it was 190 feet of flexibility. With FAA, it's one arc second.
Q. So let's go just based off the assumption that the turbines are going to be located in the general vicinity of your last DOD agreement. Actually, I'm going to pause on that one.

How many property owners do you currently have lease agreements with?
A. I believe the number's around 40.
Q. Do you have lease agreements with property owners that won't host a turbine or the supporting infrastructure?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: We have one lease
agreement where we added a section and a
half of property that they did not want turbines on. So we agreed to add the property, but added the condition that turbines could not be on that one and a half section.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. But, otherwise, if you have a lease agreement with a property owner, some portion of the Horse Heaven Wind Farm, be it a turbine, a battery, a solar array, or supporting
infrastructure, will be going through that property?
A. There are some leases we have that, no, we may not, and we'll likely give up those leases. So we have more leases than infrastructure.
Q. It just depends on the ultimate layout?
A. It depends on the ultimate layout, yes.
Q. Do you know -- and this is where we're going back to based upon the most recent application to the DOD where you specified the turbine layout.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know about how many parcels will house turbines?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection as to
form. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't know the
parcel count. I mean, we've got some
landowners that have 7,000 acres, we've got
others that have 700 under lease. I mean,
I -- and a section of land could have several parcels on it, so... BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. Exactly. That's what I'm getting at.

You don't know how many turbines are going to be per parcel?
A. I know per siting restrictions you generally can't get more than four turbines on a full section of land. But parcel-wise, parcels can be subdivided. And, I guess, it's using the parcel term is what's difficult to answer. Because in our ASC, we have every single parcel identified. Every single legal parcel.
Q. Right.
A. Yeah.
Q. In your conception, how many acres is a section of land?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.

THE WITNESS: 640 acres. A section
of land is 640 acres.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. So it's possible that one parcel, talking boundaries here, one parcel can encapsulate more than 640 acres?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.

Foundation.
THE WITNESS: No. County -- the way the counties identify parcels, it's section by section, and some sections can be subdivided.

MS. FOSTER: Just, Ms. Perlmutter, I would appreciate it if you just leave your objections to the form of my question. BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. So going back to you.

So your testimony, then, is that you cannot have a parcel larger than 640 acres?
A. That's how the parcels are identified legally, yes.
Q. Okay. So, then, I'm trying to just get a firm count here.

So your testimony would be that at max for one parcel could maximum have four turbines on it?
A. A section of land.
Q. Right. But --
A. Not a parcel. It doesn't make sense to talk about parcels because a parcel can be five acres on a section of land. And then, of course, there's other parcels that make up the full 640 .

But generally by the restrictions of turbine placement, you can only squeeze four turbines on a section of land which could be a single parcel.
Q. Is it your understanding that the Horse Heaven Wind Farm project will need to comply with Benton County's conditional use permit criteria?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls
for a legal conclusion. And relevancy.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: We already have a ruling. BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. What's your --
A. That we are in compliance with land use requirements.
Q. Are you referring to council order number 883?
A. Yes.
Q. So it's your understanding that that order stands for the proposition that you comply with Benton County's conditional use permit criteria?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Relevance. And calls for a legal conclusion.

MS. FOSTER: Once again, Ms. Perlmutter, I'm going to ask you that limit the speaking objections. You may object to the form of my question.

MS. PERLMUTTER: I'll make my objections.

THE WITNESS: The land use consistency states that we are consistent with the process the county utilizes for conditional use permits.

We identified our compliance in the ASC to every single one of those CUP criteria in existence when we filed our application.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. So it's your understanding that EFSEC has already ruled that Scout is in compliance with Benton County's conditional use permit criteria?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked and answered. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: No, I disagree. We
are consistent. We have a ruling that says we are consistent. But EFSEC can preempt county requirements. BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. I think we may be talking over each other here. I agree that -- with you that the order says that you're consistent.

However, doesn't the order also
state that one of -- or \(I\) should say, doesn't -- isn't one of the issues for this adjudication whether or not the project complies with Benton County's conditional use permit criteria?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Argumentative. And calls for a legal conclusion. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: One of the issues is -- yes, that is one of the issues. And we would anticipate if the County has conditions to place on the project, they will work through EFSEC to make those known.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. So it's your understanding of how a conditional use -- how this process works that
the only steps left are to condition the project?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you do not believe that there can be a finding that the project does not comply with the conditional use permit criteria?
A. That is my belief, yes.
Q. Are you -- are you familiar with the conditional use permit criteria?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. So if I said to you that one of the criteria if we sum it up is essentially compatibility with permitted uses, you would agree with me on that?
A. Yes.
Q. This is where \(I\) think the parcel question -- why we're talking about parcels.

Because as we've been discussing, like you said, there can be smaller parcels than 640 acres, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Are you aware of the average parcel size for the land that you hold leases with for the -- of the landowners that you hold leases with?
    A. Never tried to calculate it.
        Q. Okay.
        A. It's immaterial.
        Q. Why is it immaterial?
        A. Because you follow the legal
        description for the property, and it is what it
        is. I mean, it's -- if a parcel size is
        smaller and a different owner, it could have
        different restrictions on it or different
        setback applications to it. But we deal with
        legal property descriptions.
            Q. Don't you think the parcel size is
        important to determine how many turbines you're
        putting on one parcel?
            MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
        Argumentative. You can answer if you can.
        THE WITNESS: It's immaterial. You
        determine what your buildable area is to
        place turbines, and then you put them in
        desired places relative to all of the
        criteria you're trying to meet relative to
        placing those turbines, and it falls out
        where it falls out.
            It's immaterial what parcel it's on.
            You follow the criteria for desired
```

setbacks associated with the parcel.
When we filed this application, we believe we were in compliance with the conditional use criteria. And we actually stated everywhere we were in compliance and how we were in compliance.

And that's still the case. We're maintaining that. We have not asked EFSEC for preemption of what the CUP criteria were at the time we filed our application. BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. So are you aware of the use -vaguely aware of the just outright permitted uses -- I'm going to take a step back here.

Do you know the zoning designation
for the land upon which the Horse Heaven Wind Farm is located?
A. Sure, GMA Ag.
Q. And are you just vaguely aware of the outright permitted uses in the GMA Ag land?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Form and foundation. I'm sorry, form -objection as to form.

THE WITNESS: Very aware, yes. BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. So if I represented to you that, in general, most uses within the GMA Ag lands have about one to three structures per parcel, would you have any reason to dispute me on that?
A. No, I wouldn't.
Q. Okay. So if we're comparing -- so if we're looking at compatibility, right, which is size and scope, in effect, doesn't it then become very important what the parcel size is because we want to compare how many structures the Horse Heaven Wind Farm is putting on a parcel versus how many structures are in a traditional permitted use?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. Also, irrelevant. But you can answer.

THE WITNESS: It's immaterial. I
mean, as identified with the Nine Canyon project, the assessors determined that the space the turbines occupy has no effect on zoning at all.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. We're not talking about zoning, Mr. Kobus. I'm talking about number of
structures per parcel.
A. There is no criteria for number of structures per parcel.
Q. So you think that has no relevancy
to a compatibility determination?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Argumentative. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't believe it
does.
BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. What is your conception of a compatibility determination?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Relevancy. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Wind projects were a permitted use when we filed our application on GMA Ag lands. In fact, GMA Ag lands are a priority for placement of wind turbines because they've already despoiled the land to the maximum extent. All that can grow there is what they plant. It's the perfect place to put wind turbines.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. Wind turbines were permitted use?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Don't you mean they were a conditional use?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Is it your conception that a permitted use is the same thing as a conditional use?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Relevance.
THE WITNESS: No, they're different. BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. Then why did you did say wind turbines were a permitted use?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Argumentative. You can answer the question.
THE WITNESS: I think it's a silly
distinction you're trying to make. Sorry. BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. That's -- no, that's fair.
Is the conditional use has to satisfy conditions, right?
A. That's right. That's what it means, conditional use.
Q. And a permitted use is just allowed outright?

```
    A. Outright. You can do it --
    Q. So you --
    (Parties speaking simultaneously.)
            (The Court Reporter requested
        clarification.)
            THE WITNESS: I understand what an
        outright permitted use is. Like minor
        solar is an example of an outright
    permitted use on GMA Ag lands.
    BY MS. FOSTER:
    Q. And to you, a use that is allowed
    with conditions and use that is allowed --
    permitted outright, that's a minor distinction?
    A. No, I didn't say that. I said --
        MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
            (The Court Reporter requested
    clarification.)
            MS. PERLMUTTER: Argumentative. You
    can answer.
            THE WITNESS: Permitted use is
    permitted use. If then you want to talk
    about the distinction between outright
    permitted and conditional, I fully
    understand what that means.
            But, in general, when I say wind
```

turbines were a permitted use, that's a true statement. So, I guess, I don't understand what you're trying to get at. So maybe if you could rephrase.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. Well, you said that wind -- I mean, I don't want to be testifying here, but $I$ could submit to you that if you look at the Benton County code in effect at the time at which you submitted your application, if you looked under the permitted uses, would you have found a wind turbines farm?
A. Not a farm, no. Individual -- I think it was up to two turbines at the time. But more than that, in essence, a wind farm required a conditional use permit. No question about it.
Q. Okay. I think we've gone to a good understanding on that. So $I$ don't mean to repeat myself, but $I$ just want to make sure that we're clear.

When looking at the project as a whole, you could not tell me a general idea of wind turbines per parcels?
A. No. As I said, my thumb rule is you
can generally put four wind turbines on a section of land, which is 640 acres.
Q. And is -- okay.

Is the Horse Heaven Wind Farm, in general, following your rule of, will there be four wind turbines per section?

MS. PERLMUTTER: I'm going to
object. Mischaracterizes testimony. But answer as best you can.

THE WITNESS: I don't know of any that have more than four. I know of a lot of sections that have four. And there's a lot that have less. And I don't -- I don't understand the distinction.

BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. Well, in general, could you tell me the average wind turbines per section?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: I can't.
BY MS. FOSTER:
Q. You can't. Okay.

MS. FOSTER: I think that is all the questions $I$ have for you today, Mr. Kobus. Thank you.

BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Just a couple of follow-up questions. Would you turn to page -THE COURT REPORTER: Can you come down here?

MR. ARAMBURU: I'm sorry. THE WITNESS: 2-18, right? BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Yes. Excuse me. 2-156-- excuse me, 158.
A. I'm there.
Q. The number two criteria for conditional use permits in Benton County is set forth at the bottom of page 2-158, you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe that a six-acre, 150-megawatt lithium-ion battery installation would endanger the health, safety, and welfare of the surrounding community to an extent greater than that associated with other permitted uses?
A. I absolutely believe that's the case, it will not.
Q. And that's despite the fact that you've indicated that lithium-ion batteries are subject to fires and --
A. Everything is subject to fire. It's a reasonable risk for the technology.
Q. But have you considered whether --
A. They built these batteries at City of Richland sites just recently. These are commercially available technology, and they are safe. They are not unreasonable danger to the health and safety of the public.
Q. Has the National Fire Protection

Association adopted new guidelines for
lithium-ion fires?
MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation. You can answer, if you can.
THE WITNESS: I understand there's evolution of the NFPA requirements, but we're not obligated to follow every new requirement that evolved since our permit application.

We identify the standards that were available at the time of our application, and that's what we follow. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. And up in this area, the GMAA area, right, generally allows agricultural?
A. Correct.
Q. Generally allows farmhouses?
A. Correct.
Q. Agricultural sales of products?
A. True.
Q. All those things?
A. (Witness nodded head up and down.)
Q. Is this more or -- is six-acre lithium-ion battery going to endanger the health and safety of the people up there more or less than those uses?
A. This will not be accessible to the general public. So, no, it won't endanger them.
Q. And if there's a runaway fire that starts a fire in crop land up there, will that be a greater impact on the people than the uses that are there now?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection to
foundation. You can answer, if you can.
THE WITNESS: I can't speculate on
how big a fire's going to be. BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. But --
A. Nobody can. These are self-contained units that have structural steel that contains these batteries. And, I mean, yeah, things can melt, but it's not common. It's a rare event. So $I$ have no qualms about that we will not materially endanger.
Q. Have you seen the videos of the fire -- the lithium-ion fire that lasted for four days down in Glendale, California?
A. I can neither confirm nor deny that I've seen that video.
Q. Are you aware that there was water on that fire for four continuous days and didn't put it out?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Objection.
Foundation. Answer if you can.
THE WITNESS: I'll believe you, if
that's what you say. I don't know.
BY MR. ARAMBURU:
Q. Well, have you made an investigation to determine whether or not this six acres of lithium-ion batteries poses a greater threat to people in the community than the
A. We've gone on record saying we comply. That's what this document is telling you.
Q. Yeah, I understand what you said.
A. Okay. We were on record saying we comply. And I'm personally affirming that $I$ believe it, so...

MR. ARAMBURU: Okay. Thank you.
MS. PERLMUTTER: I have no
questions.
MS. FOSTER: I have no questions.
MS. VOELCKERS: I have no further questions.

MR. ARAMBURU: Just one more thing, which is not a question.

There was mention during -- I think
it was your question, Shona, concerning the land use permit for the DNR property.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah.
MR. ARAMBURU: Counsel, could you
distribute that to the parties so we have it and we not let it go?

MS. PERLMUTTER: I certainly can't
do it now.

MR. ARAMBURU: Oh, no. I'm not asking now. But within a few days.

MS. PERLMUTTER: We've received the request. I don't anticipate a problem, but that's not my call. We'll take it under advisement. I don't expect a problem.

MR. ARAMBURU: And a few days is just fine. Thank you.
(THEREUPON, the deposition of DAVID KOBUS concluded at 4:35 p.m.)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 184:21, 186:8, 215:2, | reformulate [1] - | 11:12, 133:2 | 136:22, 137:18, 155:4 | reverberates [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 215:6, 218:15 } \\ \text { recorded }[1] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 19 \\ & \quad \text { refrain }[1]-46 \end{aligned}$ | REMEMBERED ${ }_{[1]}$ - $5: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { require }[2]-52: 25, \\ & \text { 190:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:3 } \\ & \text { review [11] - 14:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 218:13 } \\ & \text { recover }[4] . \end{aligned}$ | refresh [1]-31:18 <br> regard [2]-45:10, | removed [1] - 180:13 renew [1] - 71:24 | $\begin{gathered} \text { required }[16]-25: 14, \\ 36: 23,53: 12,54: 19, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 6,87: 17,88: 7 \\ & 88: 8,88: 10,146: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $182: 4,182: 6,182: 19$ $\text { recovering }[1] \text { - }$ | 112:14 regar | $\begin{aligned} & \text { renewable }[2]-8: 12 \text {, } \\ & \text { 107:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 18,95: 20,100: 19, \\ & 121: 16,130: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148: 7,148: 12, \\ & 148: 14,192: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 182:17 recrea | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 20,172: 16, \\ & 178: 25 \end{aligned}$ | repeat [5] - 54:20, 73:14, 169:8, 188:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:6, 133:10, } \\ & \text { 161:17, 161:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reviewed }[6]-132: 5 \text {, } \\ & \text { 139:13, 146:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 179:1 recrea | $\begin{aligned} & \text { region }[3]-90: 1, \\ & 92: 17,109: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:20 } \\ & \text { rephrase }[1]-209: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:21, 174:1, 209:16 } \\ & \text { requirement }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 177:17, 179:22, 180:1 <br> Reyneveld [2] - 2:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:1 } \\ & \text { red }[5]-177: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { regional }[7] \text { - 17:15, } \\ \text { 89:20, 89:23, } 90: 12 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { replace }[1] \text { - 34:11 } \\ & \text { report [4] - 139:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 212: 20 \\ \text { requit } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:15 } \\ & \operatorname{RFP}_{[1]}-92: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 180:5, 183:2, 183:11, | 91:1, 91:2, 115:1 | 139:19, 146:13 | 54:8, 121:5, 130:1 | FPs [1] - 90:14 |
| 188:19 | regions [1] - 14: | 185:14 | 162:15, 172:11, | RICHARD [2] - 2:3, |
| Red [5] - 35:23, 36:14, 36:19, $36: 2$ | Registered ${ }_{[1]}$ - 5:5 | REPORTED ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 199:18, 201:3, 212:18 |  |
| 36:14, | regularly [1] - 95:1 |  | 135: | Richard [1] - 5: |
| red-circled [1] | regul | Reporter [16] - 5:5 | RESERVED ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 19:20, 19:24, 20 |
| 180:5 | 161:22, 162:16 | 5:6, 5:7, 5:8, 24:23 | 216:11 | 156:7, 212:8 |
| redesign [1] - 139:4 | 165:2 | 69:15, 100:24 | erve | ck [1] - 18:5 |
| Redline [1]-4:10 | regulators [1] | 8: | resolve [1] - 170:14 | Ige ${ }_{[1]}-10: 25$ |
| redline [12]-11:24, | 161:6 | 15 | resolving [1] - | right-of-way [1] - |
| 12:16, 12:17, 15:14, $30: 20,60 \cdot 2,11$ | rejected ${ }_{[1]}$ - 144: | 208.16, 218.3 | 180:18 | 18:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30: 20,60: 2,60: 11 \\ & 62: 11,140: 5,172: 10 \end{aligned}$ | related [14]-13:9 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 208:16, } 218: 3 \\ \text { REPORTER } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { resource }[6] \text { - } 78: 6 \text {, } \\ 79: 21,90: 20,93: 13, \end{array}$ | rights [8]-116:18, 117:10, 117:11, |
| 180:10, 190:18 | 54 | 1:22, 59:19, 184:1 | 164:21, 185:6 | 117:13, 117:19 |
| - 16:1 | 14 | 184:19, 211: | urces [4] | 118:1, 118:3, 170:22 |
| redlines [2]-13:21 | 17 | reports [2]-112:8 | 169:12, 169:1 | risk [2] - 131:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:9 } \\ & \text { reduc } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180: 18,180: 19 \\ & 218: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 112:13 } \\ \text { repre } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:21, 171:18 } \\ & \text { resources }[4]-92 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 212: 5 \\ & \text { risky }[2] \end{aligned}$ |
| 177:13 | relates [1] - 41 | 11:21, 89:22, 185: | 117:18, 117:21, 172:7 | 164:7 |
| reduced [1] - 140:1 reduction [1] - | relating [1] - 178:2 <br> relation [1]-10:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 185:10 } \\ & \text { representation }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { respect }[2]-145: 12 \text {, } \\ & 180: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ritter [2] - 4:11 } \\ & \text { 175:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 162:23 | relationship ${ }_{21]}$ $22: 6$ |  | respond [5] - 45: | Ritter's [1] - 175:24 |
| 57:12 <br> reevaluate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:6 } \\ & \text { relative }[10]-18: \\ & \text { 18:17, } 43: 17,155 \end{aligned}$ | 205:2 <br> represents | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 169:23, 181:15 } \\ \text { response [11] } \end{array}$ | RIVES [1] - 3:3 <br> Road [3] - 3:9, 19:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:11 } \\ & \text { refer }[4]-12: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:2, 177:1, 177:17, } \\ & \text { 178:12, 203:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:24 } \\ & \text { reproach }[1]-15: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 17,27: 23,33: 20 \\ & 43: 23,75: 19,138: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 188:17 } \\ & \text { road }_{[1]}-17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 70:4, 104:8, 168:3 | 203:2 | repropagation [1] - | 140:15, 176:23, 180:14, 182.25, 183.2 | roads [2]-120:24, |
| reference ${ }_{[1]}-16$ : referenced [3] - | relatively ${ }_{[1]}$ - 84: <br> releases [1] - 90: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:16 } \\ & \text { request [22] - 31: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 180:14, 182:25, } 183: 2 \\ \text { responsibility [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:9 } \\ & \text { robbing }[1]-80: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 179:14, 187:13, 188:3 | relevance | 36:15, 39:1, 53: | 129:1 | bust $\left.{ }^{1}\right]-145: 2$ |
| references [2] | 165:13, 200:2, 207:8 | $63: 4,65: 11,68: 3$ <br> $68: 14,68: 17,99 \cdot 5$ | responsible [4] - <br> 25:12, 60:5, 100:11 | Room [1]-1:12 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 132:12, 174:14 } \\ \text { referred }[1]-17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { relevancy }[3]- \\ \text { 199:11, 206:4, } 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:14, 68:17, 99:5, } \\ & 99: 7,99: 15,101: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 12,60: 5,100: 11, \\ & 135: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { route [2]-94:5, } \\ & 160: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| referring [5] - 79:21, | reliability [4]-25:13, | 105:12, 135:20 | esponsive [1] | routing [1] - 177:6 |
| 159:9, 177:25, | 42:6, 52:7, 52:15 | 137:20, 138 | 180:2 | RPR [3] - 1:22, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 179:15, 199:19 } \\ \text { refers }[3]-130: 6, \end{gathered}$ | reliable [1]-158:18 <br> relied [1] - 14:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 155:17, 155:19, } \\ & \text { 155:23, 169:16, } \end{aligned}$ | rest [2] - 74:S | $218: 2,218: 24$ |
| 168:6, 176:14 | rely [1] - 122:24 | REQUESTED ${ }_{[1]}$ 217:2 | restrictions [4] - <br> 141:23, 197:6, 199:2, | rule [3] - 19:6, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { reflect }[4]-138 \\ \text { 139:21, 144:15, } \end{gathered}$ | relying [1] - 118:9 <br> remain [2]-49:18, | requested $[14]$ | 203:9 | $\text { ruled }_{[1]}-200: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:24 } \\ & \text { reflected }[5]-139: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 157:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:23, 69:15, 100:24, } \\ & \text { 112:10, 138:7, 139:1, } \end{aligned}$ | restricts [1]-80:1 <br> result [1] - $38: 4$ | Iles [1] - 7:5 |
| 142:20, 142:23 | 181:2 | 144:4, 158:1, 159:21, | esults [2] - 148:19, | 92:2, 138:17, 192:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:25, 148:2 } \\ & \text { reflects }[2]-140: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remains [2] - 27:25, } \\ & \text { 183:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:3, 172:15, } \\ & \text { 186:25, 208:4, 208:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:17 } \\ & \text { revenue [3] - 24:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ruling }[3] \text { - 178:7, } \\ & \text { 199:14, 201:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 141:12 | remember [2] - | requests [4] - 39:18, | 105:20, 164:22 | run [3] - 21:6, 21:8, |


| 79:1 runaway [2]-128:6, 213:18 running ${ }_{[1]}$ - 81:10 | se ${ }_{[1]}-92: 22$ season [2]-83:8, 83:10 <br> seasons [1]-92:19 | 69:18, 70:6, 89:14, 92:11, 120:17, 124:13, 131:1, 131:21, 132:10 | shortages ${ }_{[1]}$ - 91:11 shorter ${ }_{[1]}$ - 192:13 Shorthand [1]-5:8 shoulder [1]-53:16 | 126:20, 127:4, 128:3, 129:1, 137:9, 147:4, 151:6, 159:1, 159:4, 160:9, 164:8, 167:7, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S |  |  |  |  |
|  | 64:8, 67:13, 69:1 <br> 69:6, 75:14, 78:24, <br> 87:6, 92:10, 133:20, <br> 176:7, 178:14, 194:25 <br> secret $[3]$ - 75:25, <br> 76:1, 156:5 <br> section [23] - 13:5, <br> 13:6, 15:24, 16:8, <br> 60:2, 94:2, 94:17, <br> 122:9, 124:9, 195:15, <br> 195:20, 196:24, <br> 197:8, 197:17, <br> 197:19, 198:3, 198:4, 198:20, 198:24, <br> 199:4, 210:2, 210:6, 210:17 <br> sections [9]-13:9, 13:11, 13:14, 13:24, 14:20, 16:4, 120:19, 198:4, 210:12 <br> secured ${ }_{[1]}-130: 18$ see $[28]-7: 15,9: 25$, $16: 9,22: 25,23: 23$, $24: 3,57: 18,75: 4$ <br> 24:3, 57:18, 75:4, 81:17, 84:11, 84:15, <br> 87:19, 99:17, 100:15, 117:7, 120:25, <br> 124:13, 124:23, <br> 129:22, 130:16, <br> 131:6, 132:2, 164:9, 164:10, 181:6, 188:7, 189:5, 211:15 <br> seeing [1] - 84:1 <br> select $[1]-87: 24$ <br> selected [4]-87:16, <br> 88:7, 112:25, 114:8 <br> selection [1] - 88:14 <br> self [2]-125:1, 214:4 <br> self-contained [2] - <br> 125:1, 214:4 <br> sell [5] - 25:16, <br> 25:18, 34:19, 115:13, 157:5 <br> Sellards [1] - 188:17 selling $[4]-106: 2$, 118:19, 164:24, 164:25 <br> sending [1]-25:9 <br> sense [4]-29:22, <br> 82:23, 97:25, 198:22 sentence [17]-66:5, 66:15, 66:19, 67:7, 67:9, 67:14, 69:11, | ```135:7, 158:21, 191:11, 191:19 separate [6] - 32:8, 32:9, 33:1, 62:3, 67:11, 82:10 series [1]-160:6 serve \({ }_{[1]}\) - 93:3 SERVICE \({ }_{[1]}-1: 22\) service [6]-19:1, 21:3, 21:9, 21:16, 23:14, 122:18 services [4]-8:17, 25:14, 127:20, 129:6 Services [2]-1:12, 122:25 set [2]-211:14, 218:21 setback \({ }_{[1]}\) - 203:10 setbacks [2]-22:4, 204:1 setting [1] - 126:16 settlement \({ }_{[8]}\) - 140:2, 140:7, 143:22, 143:24, 144:8, 147:21, 148:4, 177:13 several [2]-160:6, 196:25 shall [3]-94:4, 178:19, 178:23 share \([3]\) - 19:17, 136:5, 168:21 shared [3]-149:24, 150:5, 169:5 sharing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 19:14 SHEET \({ }_{[1]}\) - 217:1 shift \({ }_{[2]}\) - 82:17, 110:15 shine \({ }_{[1]}-51: 5\) shines [1]-110:11 shining [3]-45:14, 45:15, 110:17 Shona [3]-3:8, 138:16, 215:18 shona@ yakamanation [1] - 3:10 shona@ yakamanation-olc. org [1] - 3:10 shoot [1] - 105:21 shop [2]-131:13, 161:1``` |  | ```186:2, 187:20, 189:11 sites [8]-34:13, 145:23, 146:1, 146:5, 146:6, 178:18, 181:7, 212:8 SITING [1]-1:2 siting [2]-180:14, 197:6 sitting [2]-20:1, 59:14 situation [3]-24:9, 26:22, 49:7 \(\boldsymbol{s i x}[10]-31: 2,59: 11\), 114:11, 124:23, 126:17, 127:8, 127:24, 211:18, 213:11, 214:23 six-acre [4] - 127:8, 127:24, 211:18, 213:11 six-hour \({ }_{[1]}\) - 114:11 size [15] - 46:7, 46:8, 46:16, 58:6, 59:7, 59:10, 71:14, 71:17, 92:6, 125:8, 202:23, 203:7, 203:12, 205:9, 205:10 slamming [1] - 63:12 slick [1] - 69:2 slim [1] - 91:12 slows [1] - 45:13 small [5] - 30:10, 30:11, 30:13, 108:6, 175:15 smaller [9]-28:2, 54:25, 71:14, 71:18, 97:11, 105:22, 107:24, 202:19, 203:8 smorgasbord [1] - 155:12 snapping [1] - 107:10 so.. [6]-54:20, 57:17, 113:18, 134:12, 196:25, 215:8 software [1] - 79:23 solar [74]-22:22, 23:4, 24:2, 39:22, 39:23, 40:7, 40:13, 40:24, 41:11, 43:3, 44:7, 44:13, 44:14, 46:9, 47:4, 49:10, \(50: 10,50: 12,50: 23\),``` |
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