













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

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

ONE-WEEK TRANSCRIPT TURNAROUND

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

Transcript of Proceedings

July 03, 2023

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council v.

EF-210011

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

Sarah Fitzgibbon, CCR Vice President



The Premier Advantage™
PDF transcript bundle contains:

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

State of Washingt Energy Facility Site Evalua	
In the Matter of the Application Of:)))
SCOUT CLEAN ENERGY, LLC, for Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC,) Docket No. EF-210011
Applicant.)
DISCOVERY CONFERENCE	
July 3, 2023	
Taken Remotely Via	Zoom

Reporter: Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR



1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	Judge Adam Torem
4	Lisa Masengale Alex Shiley
5	J. Richard Aramburu, Tri Cities Cares
6	Applicant Horse Heaven Wind Farm, LLC, Willa Perlmutter,
7	Ariel Stavitsky, Dave Kobus
8	Benton County, Aziza Foster
9	Yakama Nation, Jessica Houston
10	Counsel for the Environment, Sarah Reyneveld
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on 2 Monday, July 3, 2023, via Zoom, at 3:20 p.m., before 3 Christy Sheppard, Certified Court Reporter, CCR, RPR; 4 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had, to wit: 5 6 7 <<<<< >>>>> 8 9 JUDGE TOREM: Good afternoon everyone. 10 This is Judge Torem in the matter of the Horse Heaven 11 Wind application. Today's date is July 3rd, 2023. It's 12 now 3:20 in the afternoon, on a nice Monday afternoon. 13 We have one issue in front of us today. There's a 14 motion to compel the testimony of Scout Clean Energy's 15 Dave Kobus that was filed on June 23rd by intervenor Tri 16 Cities Cares and Mr. Aramburu is on the line to represent 17 for that purpose. 18 Also on the line for the Applicant, who are opposing 19 the motion to compel and the accompanying letter -- or 20 the request for sanctions from TCC. We have Willa 21 Perlmutter. We have established she's accompanied today 22 by Ariel Stavitsky and Dave Kobus of Scout Clean Energy. 23 We have other parties on the line that are not

24

25

Foster on the line. Counsel for the Environment Sarah Reyneveld is on the line. And on behalf of the Yakama Nation we have Jessica Houston, another attorney from their Office of Counsel. That's all the parties that we need.

For the public listening in today, as was indicated in the notice, there's not going to be an opportunity for public comment. This is strictly a procedural matter and a discovery issue that's come to my attention that needs to be resolved hopefully today, and whatever ruling I might come to I'm hoping to reduce to a short, written order that's likely to be published -- well tomorrow is a holiday, July 4th, so likely on the 5th.

Mr. Aramburu, again, you filed your motion on June 23rd. I have the applicant's opposition that was filed on June 28th, I believe it was, and then you filed a reply shortly before this conference this afternoon.

Can you summarize quickly for us so we are all on the same page in a few words what it is you are seeking.

MR. ARAMBURU: Our motion -- just a second. We are having some computer difficulties here. Pardon me. We are having some trouble hearing the other parties.

So the summary of the motion, it's in front of all the parties, and it does not need a lot of additional

work. We believe that Mr. Kobus' testimony is relevant to the proceedings here; that his deposition is appropriate to be taken; that due to the lengthy refusal to make Mr. Kobus available for the deposition sanctions should be ordered, and because of the late filed motion for protective order, which should be denied, costs and expenses related to that should be awarded as well.

And then, in addition, we have the procedural aspects of the motion itself -- of the proceeding itself. We have asked that Mr. Kobus be made available at a time convenient to TCC counsel, which is getting to be a problem because of the testimony requirements, and we have some reasonable period of time to use his deposition for purposes of preparing testimony during the course of the hearings.

So everybody has read this. I don't know if you want anything more.

JUDGE TOREM: You know what, that will be fine, Mr. Aramburu. I just wanted to get us on the same page as to the relief you are seeking, and then I will ask the Applicant to, again, state where they are willing to grant that relief without me standing in.

I understand there was a question of scope of the deposition and then opposition to the sanctions. So, Ms. Perlmutter, in the same level of detail as Mr. Aramburu

just provided, if you can summarize the Applicant's position and where I'm not needed and perhaps where I am on this.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Thanks so much, Your Honor. At the outset I would like to note that I was not served with the reply brief that Mr. Aramburu apparently filed this morning. Ms. Stavitsky sent it on to me just about an hour ago, so I had no ideas that there was anything that I needed to respond to other than what was in the motion.

That said, I do want to just flag very briefly a couple of things. First of all we have not and have never refused to make Mr. Kobus available. We would like to put some limits on the scope of his deposition consistent with what the Court has always said, which is that the role of TCC is limited to some issues, to some specific issues. I understand that those issues are to be broadly construed, but at this point the only thing we have gotten from TCC has been we are going to ask him about everything, everywhere all at once.

We would also note a couple of other things. One is that the Court had said that -- this is with regard to the request for TCC to have an additional three weeks after the signing of Mr. Kobus' deposition for them to then submit additional testimony. We suggest that that's

not necessary.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, the Court has already made it very clear that pretrial testimony is really to be the chief source of discovery for the parties' principal positions. And obviously, maybe not obviously, but Scout Clean Energy is, of course, filing prefiled testimony like everybody else. To the extent that TCC asked for an additional three weeks after Mr. Kobus signs, I just wanted to point out that in Exhibit B to my opposition, to our opposition to the opening motion, Mr. Aramburu specifically said that he did intend to file the motion to compel. That was on June 2nd. And I think the Court might be mistaken or maybe there is a discrepancy, but we received the motion to compel on June 25th. In other words, more than three weeks after the first time that Mr. Aramburu said that he intended to file a motion to compel. And, also, that was the very same day that the Court admonished the parties to file any motions for discovery promptly.

We suggest that the delay here is really TCC's, to the extent that they are looking for additional time in which to submit testimony.

I would also point out that in the Court's letter from June 30th, which I guess was the end of last week, the Court specifically indicated that -- or reminded the

parties that the second prehearing conference order doesn't set a deadline or cutoff, that the parties continue to take discovery from each other after the deadline for the prefiled testimony. And, indeed, the Court opened the door, left open the door for the possibility that, quote, if significant new information is discovered the parties can supplement their prefiled testimony.

So to the extent that TCC is looking for three weeks sort of reopening of a window that just doesn't -- not only is it inappropriate, but it also doesn't make sense.

I would also point out that with regard to the motion for sanctions, Your Honor, I hope it's clear from the materials that we provided to you that we really have been trying to hard to get the parties to a place of agreement, or sort of mutual respect to move forward with this deposition, and we have been shut down at every opportunity.

In fact, I feel, frankly, a little foolish about having suggested alternate ways that we could get at just what it is that TCC is looking for. In other areas of my practice, certainly informal discovery is routine. This offer to have -- to answer questions submitted in writing, candidly, I mean, I thought was possibly a way to break the log jam.

To the extent that there's any request for sanctions, those are so -- I don't want to say draconian, but those are so harsh and should be limited to special cases, just not every case where if somebody disagrees with the position being taken by a different party.

And then I guess the last thing that I would say, this is -- I think it's a little bit problematic is with regard to our request for a protective order. I do think TCC is incorrect in saying we should have filed it sooner. I think we could have filed it sooner, but it's not as -- inasmuch as there was -- after the initial request for deposition while the parties I felt were still talking, there was no point to the deposition notice, therefore there was no reason to file a motion for a protective order.

As I noted in our opposition, certainly the rules contemplate an either or approach, but in what I have seen in the reply that we got just a few minutes ago, TCC is citing to CR 30(h), but 30(h)(3) specifically carves out an extension for the kind of protective order that we are seeking, where there are limits put upon the extent of questioning and at deposition. And I think, frankly, TCC may not have been entirely forthcoming or perhaps they were mistaken, but there is an opportunity within CR 30(h)(3) that specifically carves out an exception for

30(d), 30(d) then gives a judge an opportunity to set guardrails, the kind of guardrails that were limiting.

Candidly, I have to be upfront with you which is that 30(d) does seem to imply that those motions have to be made during the course of the deposition. I would suggest that for judicial economy that that's something certainly the Court could look at here.

I guess the last thing is that certainly we do not concede the amounts that are being asked for by TCC. I know that's one of the things that they represented in the motion, they replied to our opposition, and we are not by any stretch of the imagination agreeing that those would be appropriate numbers for sanctions. Thanks so much.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you,
Ms. Perlmutter, a little bit more detail than I
anticipated, but I appreciate you laying out thoroughly
the Applicant's position.

Mr. Aramburu, I'm sure that you are wanting to respond to many of the details there, but, again, your motion and the declaration and exhibits do speak for themselves, but I do want to give you a chance, briefer than Ms. Perlmutter was, if you have anything you want to say in reply.

MR. ARAMBURU: I want to first of all

say that I did not understand this to be oral argument on the motion. We didn't ask for oral argument and none was appropriate.

Your Honor, I have been doing this for a long time. People take depositions. They understand the scope of the case, which you have set forth issues for us to be broadly construed. The idea that a party -- that counsel representing a deponent is entitled to some sort of list of questions, or to dictate to the party seeking the deposition how that deposition should be taken, whether there should be written questions or not, is entirely contrary to the entire scope of our discovery rules, which were adopted more than 50 years ago.

So we have seen nothing but delays from the Applicant here. The deposition of Mr. Kobus, who is Mr. Know It All by his own reference and characterizations is entirely appropriate to address questions that are tied to the issues that we have here. There's no reason for any more detail than that. And as your Your Honor knows, during the course of depositions there are objections made. I don't think there's going to be that many objections here, but objections are made and sometimes they have to be ruled on by the Court, or in this case the presiding administrative law judge. That's the ordinary course of depositions.

And there is no procedure that I have ever heard of that allows a party, during the course of the deposition, and this is what was requested in the protective order, to tell a witness not to answer a question because that lawyer thinks that somehow it's not within the scope of questions to be asked. That is -- there's no authority cited in the response to that, what is largely an outrageous proposition. And that part of the protective order shouldn't -- certainly should not be considered or granted.

We intend to be respectful Mr. Kobus. We intend to keep within the parameters of Prehearing Order No. 2. We have seen no grounds by which any protective order should be granted.

It talks about oppression, expense, embarrassment. There's none of that that's involved here, nor do we intend to have any questions in that regard. So we think the order should be granted. There should be a reasonable time to use the fruits of the deposition to prepare testimony, and we think that sanctions and expenses, given this long, drawn out process, should be granted.

And I hope I didn't go on too long, Your Honor. That concludes what I have to say.

JUDGE TOREM: Stay with me for a

moment, Mr. Aramburu, before you hit the mute button. The one piece that I don't think I saw in anybody's motion was a reference to CR 26(i) as a required counsel conference before a court would entertain sanctions. Did you characterize any of the discussions you have had with Stoel Reeves and the Applicant's counsel to have been a 26(i) conference, Mr. Aramburu?

MR. ARAMBURU: Oh, yes. And we had -all of our backs and forths about this issue have been
recorded by both sides. We had extensive back and forth
regarding this. We are fully beyond what is required
under Civil Rul 37 to consult. We have done that. That
is expressed by the record that we have here, so that has
been fully met. And we have been, in my view, cautious,
and in terms of going about this and making sure that we
made -- we expressed our concerns, so we fully met that
requirement, Your Honor.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. I just hadn't seen an explicit reference to 26(i) in the reading I had done to this point. And, in my practice, typically that's one of the first things that I see, at least in the civil practice that I see as an administrative law judge when someone is seeking sanctions, but I will strongly imply that I wanted to make sure that we are on the same page for that and getting out there.

Ms. Perlmutter, I want to give you a chance to respond and tell me if you don't think the requirements for CR(26)(i) have not been met by the back and forth that both sides have documented.

MS. PERLMUTTER: Your Honor, I want to keep this short, of course. Yeah, we absolutely -- this is not a knee jerk reaction. This is a substantive reaction. We absolutely do disagree with any allegation that there's been meet and confer under 26(i). That is what I was trying to accomplish with my communications with Mr. Aramburu. And, as I said, all we -- in fact, we sent in the reply in the opposition and all we received was no, no, no. We would say that there was no good faith attempt whatsoever to try to get this hashed out, at least on the part of TCC.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Well, that's what we are going to do today. At the very least we are going to get a deposition scheduled, and I am going to hear from TCC a little bit more and give some guidance as to what's going to happen at that conference. I am going to make sure I'm available, Mr. Kobus is available, and both sides are available to do something sooner rather than later so it's meaningful for the remaining rounds -- remaining round of testimony that TCC might be filing, and consider any extensions needed to allow the record to

be created.

Ms. Perlmutter, would you also clarify for me, Mr. Kobus a not a witness with prefiled testimony in the first round filed by the Applicant; is that correct?

MS. PERLMUTTER: That's correct.

JUDGE TOREM: And do you anticipate having him file testimony as due on -- I think your last round would be July 12th; is that correct? Is he going to be filing any testimony?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Your Honor, I don't believe he is, but I defer to Ms. Stavitsky on that, but I do not believe we intend to prefile testimony for him.

Can I ask Ms. Stavitsky to weigh in, please?

JUDGE TOREM: Yes, please.

MS. STAVITSKY: Yes, certainly, Your Honor. At this time we don't expect to, in part for the reasons we will explain. We don't believe there are additional -- we believe that all the relevant issues should be covered under our other witnesses.

JUDGE TOREM: Okay. And, Mr.

Aramburu, I know that prefiled testimony doesn't give you an opportunity necessarily to call someone as an adverse witness, was there anything that TCC planned on doing as far as calling Mr. Kobus as a witness? I would imagine it would be difficult to get prefiled testimony from him,

especially if you haven't yet been able to meet with him for the deposition. What's the intent here?

MR. ARAMBURU: Judge, this situation is very unusual because the Applicant has filed a lengthy, lengthy application for site certification, and has amended that site certification, but there are no witnesses that have been identified to speak to the contents of that site certification application.

And in ordinary course the Applicant brings forth witnesses to describe the materials that they have submitted and stand to -- stand for cross-examination with respect to that application. That hasn't been done here. And I think it's a major defect in the proceedings here because they are essentially holding -- they are trying to keep anyone from asking questions about the -- the site certification application.

So, no, there hasn't been any effort. I think that the proceedings to this point have been defective. I was expecting to see some witness that said I participated in this and here are the witnesses and experts whoever they are that were responsible for these sections in the application. That has not happened. I think that's a major defect.

But in answer -- in more of a short answer to your question, yes, I intend to ask this witness who

1 identifies himself as Mr. Know It All to -- with regard to questions -- with regard to contents of elements of 2 3 the application for site certification. 4 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. That helps clarify. 5 6 MS. STAVITSKY: Your Honor, if I may? JUDGE TOREM: Is this Ms. Stavitsky? 7 Yes, Your Honor. 8 MS. STAVITSKY: 9 JUDGE TOREM: Go ahead. 10 MS. STAVITSKY: Just to clarify one 11 point, I'm not sure exactly what is unusual about the 12 process, and I'm speaking with respect to Applicant's 13 approach to the prefiled testimony. That's actually 14 exactly what we aim to do in our prefiled testimony is provide various witnesses that each cover their 15 16 respective sections of the application and, you know, 17 which witness goes with which section and it's actually 18 explicitly outlined in the testimony that we have 19 submitted, so just to provide that context. 20 exactly the approach that we have gone through with our 21 submissions thus far. 22 JUDGE TOREM: I understand that, Ms. 23 Stavitsky. I think what I'm hearing from Mr. Aramburu is 24 that Scout Clean Energy came to the Council with Mr. 25 Kobus as the main proponent and spokesperson for this

application back in February of 2021. He presented all of the material at the informational meeting, as well as at the council meeting in which this application was filed, and did come off as the spokesperson for Scout until we got into further stages of things, and now the litigation and adjudication he may or may not be part of the Applicant's case in chief, as I understand Mr. Aramburu's position, the chief spokesperson and the person with the most knowledge of the application when this whole thing started two plus years ago.

I understand the desire to speak with Mr. Kobus and learn whatever Mr. Aramburu thinks is going to be the differences between what's already been prefiled testimony and what might be in the application that's not yet addressed in TCC's mind.

I do think it's appropriate to make him available for the deposition particularly because he's not filing any testimony in this matter, and that's a choice for the Applicant. I think in past practice sometimes the proponent of the project that signed the application and presented it to the Council has testified. I don't know that that's a rule or a requirement, certainly not a requirement, but it may not have happened in every application, but it has in the past, at least, on occasion.

So Mr. Aramburu will, as you are willing to product Mr. Kobus, get access to him and be able to ask him a reasonable range of questions as described today. Discovery is intended to lead to relevant information. It may not be admitted or brought forth at hearing, but it can be used to help round out TCC's case in opposition to this application.

I think today the best thing to do is figure out when this can be made to happen. My understanding is the original deposition notice was sent out for early this -- early last month and Mr. Kobus was not available, and did not answer the notice of deposition, and here we are a month later still trying to get that scheduled.

Given the amount of other things that have happened between now and the original deposition notice, I'm surprised this hasn't happened but I guess it's understandable at some level given the other business, and I hate to do this on the record but let's get our calendars out and find a time that works sooner rather than later.

I will ask Ms. Perlmutter and if you will have Mr. Kobus speak for himself, what are the limitations on availability coming up and whether -- we have a national holiday tomorrow to observe. There's testimony due from the other parties on Wednesday, and then we have a few

days -- another ten days perhaps for the responding parties, TCC, and everybody else that's on the line to file their reply, but the Applicant is going to be getting ready to produce testimony on Wednesday of next week. I get it. It's busy. When would Mr. Kobus be available?

First, actually, let me ask Mr. Aramburu, are you wanting him available in the days ahead or are you wanting to focus on testimony first and then try to take care of this before we get to hearing August 9th and 10th or 10th and 11th? Mr. Aramburu, what's the desired timeline other than June 5th was it and now every day that goes by is another difficulty for you?

MR. ARAMBURU:

Every day that goes by, yes, indeed it's a further difficulty for us in terms of preparing. And one of the difficulties we have at this stage of things is that, as I indicated in my previous communications, we want to use Mr. Kobus' deposition testimony to assist other witnesses in testimony that they may have. And given the schedule that we have at this point that's going to be very difficult. It is simply impossible for us to try to schedule because of the needs of pulling together testimony due on July 14 to do it before then, and we need a reasonable amount of preparation time.

Thank you, Your Honor.

So I would suggest that the first date for testimony for Mr. Kobus' deposition should be July 20. I don't want to wait too long, but we just can't do it next week, Your Honor. It's just impossible with the schedule that you have set. We think July 20 would be a reasonable date. That will give us time to get our testimony in and then focus on the deposition.

JUDGE TOREM: All right. Mr.

Aramburu, I appreciate that. Can I give you some polite pushback as to maybe we could carve out a few hours earlier so that you get this information in a more meaningful time frame? My only polite question here really is, you filed a notice of deposition for June 5th which would have implied to me you were ready to go with whatever questions on that date. I'm willing to push it out to that -- after testimony is done, if that's what the relief you are seeking, but I just was assuming that you were ready to go when you noted the deposition for a month ago.

MR. ARAMBURU: Yes, we were ready to go with some general questions. We didn't finish those because we have been put off ever since then by the delays from the Applicant. I am out of the office a couple of days next week. I think we can possibly look to the 18th of July, but no sooner than then, Your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I mean, we tried to set up a reasonable schedule for use of the testimony and doing all of these things and now we are backed up against a very severe limitation for testimony to be in by the 14th, and that's a major job. I have to be out of the office for a couple days, and so I think any -- I think July 20 is a reasonable date. Wе could do it July 18. I believe July 19 is the EFSEC Council meeting, so I would say I really think the 20th is a good date that allows us to recover from the process of presenting all of this testimony and get ready for Mr. Kobus' deposition, so we would request that as the date. Okay. I understand the JUDGE TOREM: evolution of how things have gone and people's schedules being what they are, including yours, so I wanted to hear the answer to that, Mr. Aramburu, and then give it the full consideration and respect.

I'm available a lot of the time on the 18th if I was needed. The 19th could be made to work for my availability if needed to respond to anything during the deposition. The 20th is a little bit more limited, but still a possibility given certain time windows.

Let me hear from Ms. Perlmutter as to the scheduling if Mr. Kobus is available on any of those three days from the 18th through the 20th of July or if not, why not.

MS. PERLMUTTER: I will need to

1 check -- we can ask Mr. Kobus directly. I would note two things, Your Honor. One is that I'm actually going to be 2 3 on a flight on the 19th and it's -- it's going to pretty 4 much mess up my whole day. And then on the 20th, I'm available but it looks like we already have a deposition 5 scheduled for that date in this matter, the deposition of 6 Jason Fedora is scheduled for the 20th. 7 8 JUDGE TOREM: And what's the timing 9 for that one? 10 MS. PERLMUTTER: Let me just take a 11 The notice says that it's going to be at nine a.m. look. 12 on the 20th. 13 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. And, Mr. 14 Aramburu, I take it that's your deposition notice or is 15 that from another party? 16 MR. ARAMBURU: That's a deposition 17 notice from the Yakama Tribe. 18 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Let me then 19 ask --20 MR. ARAMBURU: We may be attending 21 that as well, but that's a notice from them. I'm sorry I 22 didn't consult the deposition schedule from the Tribe. 23 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Well, I obviously don't get copies of the notices of deposition, nor should 24 25 I, but let me ask Ms. Houston if you anticipated how long

1 the deposition of this person would be on July 20th at 2 nine a.m.? 3 MS. HOUSTON: Good afternoon, Your 4 Honor, I think we actually noted it for all day, but 5 based on our deposition of another WDFW employee which only went about half a day, I anticipate it might be 6 7 along those lines in terms of timing, but I can't say for 8 sure. 9 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. I'm wondering if 10 we try to get in Mr. Kobus that afternoon if that would 11 work, but I am going to come back to the July 18th date 12 as well given the deposition timing for that witness. 13 Mr. Kobus you are on the line and hearing all of 14 this. We are talking about your schedule. Can you 15 enlighten us to your availability July 18th, 19th, and 16 20th? 17 MR. KOBUS: Yes, Judge Torem, are you 18 able to hear me? 19 JUDGE TOREM: I can. 20 MR. KOBUS: Okay. I will make myself 21 available on either of those days. 2.2 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. So all three of 23 those days could be made to work for you? 24 MR. KOBUS: That's correct. 25 JUDGE TOREM: All right. Thank you.

1	Mr. Aramburu, given the discussion we have had and Ms.
2	Perlmutter's travel arrangements on the 19th, would you
3	prefer to schedule this for the afternoon of the 20th
4	since it's not your deposition in the morning with the
5	Fish and Wildlife employee, or would you rather it be on
6	the 18th where as far as I know there are no other
7	competing depositions?
8	MR. ARAMBURU: Well, Your Honor, I do
9	want a little opportunity to recover from our filings of
10	the prior week, so can we do it on the 21st? How is that
11	for everyone? That's open on my schedule.
12	JUDGE TOREM: I can accommodate being
13	available probably from noon onward on the 21st on
14	Friday.
15	Mr. Kobus, would that afternoon work for you?
16	MR. KOBUS: That would be acceptable
17	to me as well, Judge Torem.
18	JUDGE TOREM: Okay. It sounds like we
19	have got a date on July 21st, and if you set that for
20	actually, I could do from 12 p.m. onward. Mr. Aramburu,
21	what would be your preference to begin your deposition
22	and how long of timing are you asking Mr. Kobus to be
23	available on that Friday afternoon?
	1

length of depositions we don't know the length of the

MR. ARAMBURU: When one speaks of the

24

25

1 Here's what I would like to do. I know you 2 want to be available to resolve any issues that may come 3 up, so I would suggest that we start the deposition at 4 eleven o'clock. You would be available at noon, and then 5 we schedule for possibly three or four hours. know at this point, but I think Mr. Kobus should be 6 available at least until five. 7 8 JUDGE TOREM: All right. 9 Perlmutter, is that available and acceptable to the 10 Applicant? 11 MS. PERLMUTTER: Yes, it is, Your 12 Honor. 13 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Great. And, Mr. 14 Kobus, if you will carve out that afternoon from eleven 15 a.m. until five p.m. and hopefully it won't take quite that long for your deposition, is that something you are 16 17 going to be able to do? MR. KOBUS: I will do that. 18 19 you, Judge Torem. 20 JUDGE TOREM: All right. So I am 21 going to ask Mr. Aramburu to set up a notice of 22 deposition, and for this particular one file a copy with 23 EFSEC so I get a copy and have it on my calendar. 24 make myself available for telephone standby. Off the 25 record I will make Mr. Aramburu -- I will send you a

separate email and copy Ms. Perlmutter and perhaps the other attorneys with my cell phone number and make myself available during that time frame. While I'm hoping the phone doesn't ring on that Friday, we will see what happens.

As for the scope of the deposition, Mr. Aramburu, let's talk a little bit about that. I can put it in the written order but I think today would be helpful to give some guidance verbally.

MR. ARAMBURU: If you are going to be involved in the course of the deposition this will probably be vie Zoom or some other format, so it would probably be appropriate to figure out a way that you could be involved in the Zoom hearing or otherwise be as a part of the recorded testimony.

JUDGE TOREM: And I can certainly be called by telephone, or I can use my cell phone application of Zoom if need be, so whatever arrangement you think is acceptable. If you want to do an off the record, you know, check of that technology at some agreeable time beforehand I'm willing to do that as well to make sure things work. You let me know, Mr. Aramburu, if -- obviously, I am not going to show up wherever it is in person, but I can be available by Zoom or phone.

MR. ARAMBURU: My intention originally

1 and my intention now is to do this via Zoom. Then I will make 2 JUDGE TOREM: Okav. 3 sure the cell phone is charged and the Zoom app will be 4 available if a link is sent to me after a phone call to 5 find me, and we will make sure that happens. MR. ARAMBURU: Let me ask the parties, 6 as I understand, Mr. Kobus is a resident of the 7 Tri-Cities area, so there's a possibility we might do the 8 9 deposition live at an appropriate location in Tri-Cities. 10 Does anyone have an objection to that as an alternative? 11 MS. PERLMUTTER: Yes, I do actually. 12 I know this is very rare to object and demand a Zoom 13 deposition, I but I will actually be in Salt Lake City 14 that day. 15 MR. ARAMBURU: Well, I noticed that 16 the Applicant has four lawyers that are continuously 17 involved, so I would like the option of taking the 18 deposition in person, which is the standard course. 19 MS. PERLMUTTER: Understood, and we 20 would appreciate your consideration on this. I will be 21 the one handling Mr. Kobus' deposition. 22 MR. ARAMBURU: Okay. I would be happy 23 to talk to you about that offline. 24 JUDGE TOREM: Ms. Perlmutter, this is

I would hope if Mr. Kobus is available that

Judge Torem.

25

2.2

day in the Tri-Cities and if there was a way to get an associate to be present that that could be made to work. It might facilitate the handling of documents better than Zoom might be, at least on his end, and we could sort out if you can find a way to do that, fantastic. If it is going to be all by Zoom I think it might take longer, frankly, for these things to happen.

I think, as the parties know, my personal preference is to do these things in person and we have some other limitations on the adjudication in that regard already, if the deposition could be done face to face that might make it easier on Mr. Kobus and less stressful, particularly if an associate can be there with him.

I'm not directing that. I'm suggesting it might just smooth things along here.

MS. PERLMUTTER: We can make it work, Your Honor. I will note that I think we all, I don't want to just say me, we have all gotten accustomed to Zoom depositions, but certainly we can make somebody available there, most likely me. I will make other arrangements for travel.

JUDGE TOREM: Again, I don't know what your trip to Salt Lake City is about and I don't need to. If it's important, do it. If it's something that can be compromised and you prefer to be the one, Ms. Perlmutter,

then so be it. Again, I'm making a suggestion and not an order in that regard.

MS. PERLMUTTER: We will figure it out, Your Honor. It's a business conference, but I will figure it out.

will. I appreciate the tenor today because the tenor in writing has not been something that I think bodes well for how litigation could go in this. I appreciate the friendly, candid responses today, and I hope that we are at least diffusing some of the tension that comes right out of the pages that were filed and electronically leaking out on my screen. I hope that every party would take some of that shrillness out and just focus on what the mission is here, to get the relevant information in front of the requesting party and make it happen.

Let's turn to the scope of that relevant information now. It sounds as though, Mr. Aramburu, that you are seeking background on how the application was prepared. It sounds as though you are seeking information on how the application came to be amended. That seems like a pretty general ballpark of what you are asking for; am I correct?

MR. ARAMBURU: Yes. We haven't formulated our individual questions. We have been busy

with testimony and other things but, yes, we will have questions about the original and amended application.

And, yes, we will ask those questions.

JUDGE TOREM: And given the application preparation role that Mr. Kobus had, at least as to my understanding, Ms. Perlmutter, is there some particular area that you are seeking to not have inquired into by TCC?

MS. PERLMUTTER: Your Honor, first of all, this is the most we have ever had articulated as the basis for the questions that TCC intends to ask. In my limited experience in EFSEC proceedings, it sounds to me as though the issues around the preparation and amendment of the application go outside the scope of what the Court has already identified as TCC's role, and so it was our hope and our request that the scope of the deposition be limited to the things that were specifically identified for this intervenor, so that would be the extent of the impact on wildlife on the landscape and together with Benton County the land use issues.

JUDGE TOREM: I'm not sure I'm willing to limit it to only those issues because TCC clearly is working in alignment with some other parties and they have witnesses as to how the application was developed. There's a number of issues that everybody knows I have

limited from the adjudication, and I hope that not a lot of time would be spent on those, but it may be that Mr. Kobus' role in preparing the whole scope of the application provides the needed background and foundation for him to be able to answer the further questions that Mr. Aramburu will craft, specifically regarding those areas that Mr. Aramburu's client has stated and has a significant interest in this application that will come out during the adjudication.

I appreciate that the Applicant is looking to the orders on the scope of intervention of this particular party, and I'm not saying that's wrong. I'm saying I'm not going to prelimit the questions to those areas because there will be some background and other things that Mr. Kobus brings that are not directly potentially related to only TCC's interest that I have narrowed in the adjudication orders.

I want to give Mr. Aramburu the appropriate latitude to find of what Mr. Kobus knows about the areas that TCC is interested in. Some of those may not be admissible evidence in the adjudication based on the scoping and the orders that I have issued, but they may be relevant information that allow his witnesses to comment on the areas that are relevant to them.

I hope that makes sense a little bit. As I say it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

out loud and listen to myself it's a bit of roundabout and almost circular logic, but I do want this deposition to not have a whole bunch of phone calls to me saying the Applicant thinks this is the outside of what TCC's going to be presenting in August of this year, but if they are looking for information that might influence that, I want Mr. Kobus to answer it under oath even though that he's not going to be a witness and it won't be held against him, it might be something that TCC cites to his knowledge and somebody else's opinion during the It very well may happen that way, Ms. adjudication. Perlmutter, and we could spend a lot more time arguing about that than actually just having the deposition, and that's my goal with today, to get it scheduled, get the information out there for all parties, and then we can sort it out later, a lot more later as to what's admissible at hearing.

That, to me, is where we should spend our time what's going to come before the Council at the adjudication, not the sort of recipe of how all that information was created. That's where I'm coming from, and I think the deposition would be a lot shorter if we are not arguing about specific questions. I mean, I'm not sure the harm that could come from Mr. Kobus answering a few questions in background about areas that

are not specifically designated for TCC to litigate.

Ms. Perlmutter, any questions kind of the ALJ's view on that?

MS. PERLMUTTER: We understand your position, Your Honor, and certainly we will do our very best to honor it as we move forward.

JUDGE TOREM: And, Mr. Aramburu, am I speaking out of turn here on how I'm directing your scope of the deposition, at least verbally here?

MR. ARAMBURU: No. No. We intend to be courteous. We intend to stick to the issues that we have here. We are not interested in some extensive long deposition ourselves, so I think this is going to go just fine, Your Honor. And if it doesn't for whatever reason, I'm pleased that you will be available to help the parties sort through any disagreements about questions.

JUDGE TOREM: And, Mr. Aramburu, just for the record, you have never been anything less than courteous in all the interactions we have had in prehearing conferences or otherwise during the course of this adjudication. I have no other expectation than that's how it will go when this deposition goes forward on Friday the 21st of July at eleven a.m. I'm counting on that my phone is not going to start ringing off the hook at twelve noon.

I want to take the record -- the motion and response under consideration and issue something in writing over the next couple of days. If you don't see it on Wednesday it just means I'm still thinking about it and that my outdoor hiking tomorrow on July 4th has meant that I didn't do any work on the holiday. So I'm going to try to get to this in the next few days. Certainly, by the end of the week you will have my ruling on any other specifics regarding sanctions or other things that are raised in the motions.

So we have got a date. We have got a time. We have had a general discussion of the scope and expectations from the ALJ.

Mr. Aramburu, anything else that TCC needs today?

MR. ARAMBURU: No. And given our schedule here, Your Honor, a few extra days to work through the ruling on the motion certainly is just fine with us. So, no, we will be prepared for our deposition of Mr. Kobus at eleven a.m. on July 21st.

JUDGE TOREM: What I would invite is if you have anything you think you can get out of the way with interrogatories or requests for admission, and maybe that's asking already too much because of what's going on between now and then, but that might help set up on an expedited reply from Mr. Kobus to shorten up the

1 deposition, but, again, you may not have time to do that and the Applicant may not have time to respond. 2 3 not the litigant but the judge on the other side of the 4 bench is going oh, wouldn't that be easy, so it's a different thing where I'm sitting than where you are. 5 Mr. Aramburu, with that, anything else today? 6 7 MR. ARAMBURU: No. Thank you for setting up the conference today, Your Honor. 8 9 JUDGE TOREM: Okay. Let me ask Ms. 10 Perlmutter if she has any questions or anything else, 11 quidance, that she needs before I issue the written order 12 on everything else later this week. 13 MS. PERLMUTTER: No, Your Honor. 14 JUDGE TOREM: All right. I hope it 15 was an hour well spent and we've moved the ball forward 16 on this. 17 Did any of the other parties, Benton County, have 18 anything, they have a question, Ms. Foster? 19 No, we don't have any MS. FOSTER: 20 questions, Your Honor. I guess would let Ms. Perlmutter 21 that Benton County would likely have questions for Mr. 22 Kobus as well during the deposition. 23 JUDGE TOREM: All right. And you have 24 heard what the scope recommendations are from me, so I 25 hope if you are going to participate that it's all

1 within, and that you will coordinate with Mr. Aramburu as the lead counsel that's been asking for this. 2 3 MS. FOSTER: Yes, Your Honor. 4 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you, Ms. Foster. Anything else, Ms. Reyneveld? 5 Any questions? MS. REYNEVELD: Nothing from me, 6 7 Judge. Thank you. All right. 8 JUDGE TOREM: Thank you. 9 And, Ms. Houston, any questions, concerns from the Tribe? 10 MS. HOUSTON: No questions or concerns 11 from Yakama Nation, but I would also like to note that 12 it's possible that we might have questions for Mr. Kobus 13 as well. 14 JUDGE TOREM: Understood. So, again, 15 if you are participating in the deposition please 16 coordinate with Mr. Aramburu so there's not any duplication. 17 And I don't know if it's practice for all of you to 18 19 serve a joint notice of deposition or separate notices 20 but formalize that to the Applicant that those questions 21 might be coming. 22 And, Ms. Perlmutter, given those indications from 23 the County and from the Yakama Nation, any other 24 questions the Applicant may have? 25 MS. PERLMUTTER: No, we don't, Your

1	Honor. Thank you.			
2	JUDGE TOREM: All right. I hope it			
3	doesn't add too much complexity to have multiple parties,			
4	but if they coordinate hopefully things are done in a			
5	reasonable time on Friday the 21st.			
6	Thank you all. Mr. Kobus, thank you for arranging			
7	your schedule and being forthcoming today. With that,			
8	it's 4:10 p.m. and this conference is adjourned.			
9				
10	(Conference concluded			
11	at 4:10 p.m.)			
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				



1	STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR,) ss a certified court reporter			
2	County of Pierce) in the State of Washington, do hereby certify:			
3 4				
5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me and completed on July 3, 2023, and thereafter was transcribed			
6	under my direction;			
7	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of any			
8	such attorney or counsel and that I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof; That I am herewith promptly delivering the same to			
10	Andrea Grantham.			
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my signature on July 17, 2023.			
12				
13				
14	(hsister Theopard			
15	Christy Sheppard, CCR, RPR			
16	Certified Court Reporter No. 1932 (Certification expires 05/06/24.)			
17				
18 19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				



	1
10th	20:10,11
11th	20:11
12 28	5:20
12th	15:8
14 20):24
14th	22:4
18 22	2:7
18th	21:25 22:17,24 24:11,15 25:6
19 22	2:7
19th	22:18 23:3 24:15 25:2
	2
2 12:	12
	1:2,5 22:6
2021	
_	3:2,11
	22:8,20,24 23:4,7,12 24:1,16
21st	25:10,13,19 34:23 35:19 38:5
23rd	3:15 4:15
25th	7:14
26(i)	13:3,7,19 14:9
28th	4:16
2nd	7:12
	3
3 3:2	
	10:1,4
	•

23
4
4:10 38:8,11
4th 4:13 35:5
5
50 11:13
5th 4:13 20:12 21:13
9
9th 20:10
Α
• m 22:44 24:2 26:45 24:22 25:40
a.m. 23:11 24:2 26:15 34:23 35:19 absolutely 14:6,8
acceptable 25:16 26:9 27:19
access 19:2
accommodate 25:12
accompanied 3:21
accompanying 3:19
accomplish 14:10
accustomed 29:18
add 38:3
addition 5:8
additional 4:25 6:23,25 7:8,21 15:18
address 11:17
addressed 18:15
adjourned 38:8
adjudication 18:6 29:10 32:1,9,17, 21 33:11,20 34:21
administrative 11:24 13:22
admissible 32:20 33:17
admission 35:22
admitted 19:5

admonished 7:18

adopted 11:13

30(h)(3) 9:19,25

30th 7:24

37 13:12

3rd 3:11

3:20 3:2,12

7:10,16 10:19,25 13:1,7,8 14:11

15:21 16:3 17:23 18:12 19:1 20:7,

25:1,8,20,24 26:21,25 27:6,10,22,25

28:6,15,22 30:18,24 32:6,18 34:7,

10,17 35:14,15 36:6,7 37:1,16

11,14 21:9,20 22:15 23:14,16,20

Aramburu's 18:8 32:7 area 28:8 31:7 areas 8:21 32:7,13,19,24 33:25 arguing 33:12,23 argument 11:1,2 Ariel 3:22 arrangement 27:18 arrangements 25:2 29:21 arranging 38:6 articulated 31:10 aspects 5:9 assist 20:19 associate 29:2.13 assuming 21:17 attempt 14:14 attending 23:20 attention 4:9 attorney 3:25 4:3 attorneys 27:2 August 20:10 33:5 authority 12:6 availability 19:23 22:19 24:15 awarded 5:7 **Aziza** 3:25 В

back 13:10 14:3 18:1 24:11

backed 22:3

background 30:19 32:4,14 33:25

backs 13:9 **ball** 36:15

ballpark 30:22

based 24:5 32:21

basis 31:11 begin 25:21 behalf 4:2

bench 36:4

Benton 3:25 31:20 36:17,21

bit 9:7 10:16 14:19 22:20 27:7 32:25

33:1

bodes 30:8 break 8:25 briefer 10:22 briefly 6:11

brings 16:9 32:15 **broadly** 6:18 11:7 brought 19:5

bunch 33:3

button 13:1

business 19:17 30:4

busy 20:5 30:25

C

calendar 26:23 calendars 19:19 call 15:22 28:4 **called** 27:17 calling 15:24 **calls** 33:3 **candid** 30:10

candidly 8:24 10:3

care 20:10 **Cares** 3:16

carve 21:10 26:14 **carves** 9:19.25

case 9:4 11:6,23 18:7 19:6

cases 9:4 cautious 13:14

CCR 3:3

cell 27:2,17 28:3

certification 16:5,6,8,16 17:3

Certified 3:3 chance 10:22 14:1 characterizations 11:16

characterize 13:5 charged 28:3

check 23:1 27:20 chief 7:3 18:7.8

choice 18:18 Christy 3:3 circular 33:2

cited 12:7 **cites** 33:9 **Cities** 3:16 **citing** 9:19

City 28:13 29:23 **civil** 13:12,22 **clarify** 15:2 17:5,10

Clean 3:14,22 7:5 17:24

clear 7:3 8:13 client 32:7

comment 4:8 32:23

communications 14:10 20:18 compel 3:14,19 7:12,14,17

competing 25:7 complexity 38:3 compromised 29:25

computer 4:21 concede 10:9

concerns 13:16 37:9,10

concluded 38:10 concludes 12:24 confer 14:9

conference 4:17 8:1 13:4,7 14:20 30:4 36:8 38:8,10

conferences 34:20

consideration 22:16 28:20 35:2

considered 12:9 consistent 6:15 construed 6:18 11:7 consult 13:12 23:22 contemplate 9:17 contents 16:8 17:2 context 17:19 continue 8:3 continuously 28:16

contrary 11:12 convenient 5:11

coordinate 37:1,16 38:4

copies 23:24 **copy** 26:22,23 27:1

correct 15:4,5,8 24:24 30:23

costs 5:6

council 17:24 18:3,21 22:8 33:19

counsel 4:1,4 5:11 11:7 13:3,6 37:2

counting 34:23

County 3:25 31:20 36:17,21 37:23

couple 6:12,21 21:24 22:5 35:3

court 3:3 6:15,22 7:2,12,18,25 8:5 10:7 11:23 13:4 31:14

Court's 7:23

courteous 34:11,19

cover 17:15 covered 15:19 CR 9:19,25 13:3 CR(26)(I) 14:3

created 15:1 33:21

cross-examination 16:11

cutoff 8:2

craft 32:6

D

date 3:11 21:1,6,15 22:6,9,11 23:6 24:11 25:19 35:11

Dave 3:15,22

day 7:17 20:12,15 23:4 24:4,6 28:14

days 20:1,8 21:24 22:5,23 24:21,23

35:3,7,16

deadline 8:2,4

declaration 10:21

defect 16:13,23

defective 16:18

defer 15:11

delay 7:20

delays 11:14 21:23

demand 28:12

denied 5:6

deponent 11:8

deposition 5:2,4,13,24 6:14,24 8:17 9:12,13,22 10:5 11:10,15 12:2,19 14:18 16:2 18:17 19:10,12,15 20:19 21:2,7,13,18 22:11,20 23:5,6,14,16, 22,24 24:1,5,12 25:4,21 26:3,16,22 27:6,11 28:9,13,18,21 29:11 31:16 33:2,13,22 34:9,13,22 35:18 36:1,22 37:15,19

depositions 11:5,20,25 25:7,25

29:19

describe 16:10

designated 34:1

desire 18:11

desired 20:11

detail 5:25 10:16 11:19

details 10:20

developed 31:24

dictate 11:9

differences 18:13

difficult 15:25 20:22

difficulties 4:21 20:17

difficulty 20:13,16

diffusing 30:11

directing 29:14 34:8

directly 23:1 32:15

disagree 14:8

disagreements 34:16

disagrees 9:4

discovered 8:7

discovery 4:9 7:4,19 8:3,22 11:12

19:4

discrepancy 7:13

discussion 25:1 35:12

discussions 13:5

documented 14:4

documents 29:3

door 8:5

draconian 9:2

drawn 12:21

due 5:3 15:7 19:24 20:24

duplication 37:17

Ε

earlier 21:11

early 19:10,11

easier 29:12

easy 36:4

economy 10:6

effort 16:17

EFSEC 22:7 26:23 31:12

electronically 30:12

elements 17:2

eleven 26:4,14 34:23 35:19

else's 33:10

email 27:1

embarrassment 12:15

employee 24:5 25:5

end 7:24 29:4 35:8

Energy 3:22 7:6 17:24

Energy's 3:14

enlighten 24:15

entertain 13:4

entire 11:12

entitled 11:8

Environment 4:1

essentially 16:14 figure 19:8 27:13 30:3,5 grant 5:22 established 3:21 **file** 7:11,16,18 9:14 15:7 20:3 26:22 evidence 32:21 **filed** 3:15 4:14,15,16 5:5 6:7 9:9,10 **Great** 26:13 15:4 16:4 18:4 21:13 30:12 evolution 22:13 **filing** 7:6 14:24 15:9 18:17 exception 9:25 filings 25:9 Exhibit 7:9 find 19:19 28:5 29:5 32:19 exhibits 10:21 guidance 14:19 27:9 36:11 fine 5:19 34:14 35:17 **expect** 15:16 finish 21:21 expectation 34:21 Fish 25:5 expectations 35:12 half 24:6 **flag** 6:11 expecting 16:19 flight 23:3 expedited 35:25 focus 20:9 21:7 30:14 expense 12:15 foolish 8:19 **expenses** 5:7 12:21 happy 28:22 formalize 37:20 experience 31:12 hard 8:15 **format** 27:12 experts 16:20 harm 33:24 formulated 30:25 explain 15:17 harsh 9:3 forthcoming 9:23 38:7 explicit 13:19 **hashed** 14:14 forths 13:9 explicitly 17:18 **hate** 19:18 forward 8:16 34:6.22 36:15 **expressed** 13:13,16 Foster 4:1 36:18,19 37:3,4 extension 9:20 heard 12:1 36:24 foundation 32:4 extensions 14:25 frame 21:12 27:3 24:13 27:14 33:17 **extensive** 13:10 34:12 frankly 8:19 9:22 29:7 hearings 5:15 **extent** 7:7,21 8:9 9:1,21 31:18 Friday 25:14,23 27:4 34:23 38:5 Heaven 3:10 extra 35:16 friendly 30:10 held 33:8 F front 3:13 4:24 30:16 helpful 27:8 **fruits** 12:19 **helps** 17:4 face 29:11 full 22:16 hiking 35:5 facilitate 29:3 fully 13:11,14,16 **hit** 13:1 fact 8:19 14:11 holding 16:14 faith 14:14 G fantastic 29:5

general 21:21 30:22 35:12

give 10:22 14:1,19 15:21 21:6,9 22:15 27:8 32:18

goal 33:14

good 3:9 14:13 22:9 24:3

granted 12:10,14,18,22

grounds 12:13 guardrails 10:2

guess 7:24 9:6 10:8 19:16 36:20

Н

handling 28:21 29:3

happen 14:20 19:9 29:7 30:16 33:11

happened 16:22 18:23 19:14,16

hear 14:18 22:14,22 24:18

hearing 4:22 17:23 19:5 20:10

holiday 4:13 19:24 35:6

honor 6:5 8:13 11:4,19 12:23 13:17 14:5 15:10,16 17:6,8 20:14 21:4,25 23:2 24:4 25:8 26:12 29:17 30:4 31:9 34:5,6,14 35:16 36:8,13,20

37:3 38:1

hook 34:25

February 18:1

Fedora 23:7

feel 8:19

felt 9:12

hope 8:13 12:23 28:25 30:6,10,13 31:16 32:1,25 36:14,25 38:2

hoping 4:11 27:3

Horse 3:10 hour 6:8 36:15

hours 21:10 26:5

Houston 4:3 23:25 24:3 37:9,10

- [

idea 11:7 ideas 6:8

identified 16:7 31:15,17

identifies 17:1

imagination 10:12

imagine 15:24

impact 31:19

implied 21:14

imply 10:4 13:24

important 29:24

impossible 20:22 21:4

inappropriate 8:11

including 22:14

incorrect 9:9

indications 37:22

individual 30:25

influence 33:6

informal 8:22

information 8:6 19:4 21:11 30:15, 17,20 32:23 33:6,15,21

informational 18:2

initial 9:11

inquired 31:7

intend 7:11 12:11,17 15:12 16:25

34:10,11

intended 7:16 19:4

intends 31:11

intent 16:2

intention 27:25 28:1

interactions 34:19

interest 32:8,16

interested 32:20 34:12

interrogatories 35:22

intervenor 3:15 31:18

intervention 32:11

invite 35:20

involved 12:16 27:11,14 28:17

issue 3:13 4:9 13:9 35:2 36:11

issued 32:22

issues 6:16,17 11:6,18 15:18 26:2

31:13,20,22,25 34:11

J

jam 8:25

Jason 23:7

jerk 14:7

Jessica 4:3

job 22:4

joint 37:19

judge 3:9,10 5:18 10:1,15 11:24 12:25 13:18,23 14:16 15:6,14,20

16:3 17:4,7,9,22 21:8 22:12 23:8,13, 18,23 24:9,17,19,22,25 25:12,17,18 26:8,13,19,20 27:16 28:2,24,25

29:22 30:6 31:4,21 34:7,17 35:20 36:3,9,14,23 37:4,7,8,14 38:2

judicial 10:6

July 3:2,11 4:13 15:8 20:24 21:2,5, 25 22:6,7,24 24:1,11,15 25:19 34:23

35:5,19

June 3:15 4:14,16 7:12,14,24 20:12

21:13

K

kind 9:20 10:2 34:2

knee 14:7

knowledge 18:9 33:10

Kobus 3:15,22 5:4,10 6:13 7:8

11:15 12:11 14:21 15:3,24 17:25 18:11 19:2,11,22 20:5 22:23 23:1

24:10,13,17,20,24 25:15,16,22 26:6, 14,18 28:7,25 29:12 31:5 32:15,19 33:7,24 35:19,25 36:22 37:12 38:6

Kobus' 5:1 6:24 20:19 21:2 22:11 28:21 32:3

L

Lake 28:13 29:23

land 31:20

landscape 31:19

largely 12:7

late 5:5

latitude 32:18

law 11:24 13:22

lawyer 12:5

lawyers 28:16

laying 10:17

lead 19:4 37:2

leaking 30:13

learn 18:12

left 8:5

length 25:25

lengthy 5:3 16:5

letter 3:19 7:23

level 5:25 19:17

limit 31:22

limitation 22:3

limitations 19:22 29:10

limited 6:16 9:3 22:20 31:12,17 32:1

limiting 10:2

limits 6:14 9:21

lines 24:7

link 28:4

list 11:8

listen 33:1

listening 3:25 4:6

litigant 36:3

litigate 34:1

Page 45Index: litigation..parties **litigation** 18:6 30:9 **offline** 28:23 morning 6:7 25:4 live 28:9 motion 3:14,19,24 4:14,20,24 5:5,9 onward 25:13,20 6:10 7:10,11,14,16 8:13 9:14 10:11, location 28:9 open 8:5 25:11 21 11:2 13:3 35:1,17 log 8:25 opened 8:5 motions 7:18 10:4 35:10 logic 33:2 opening 7:10 move 8:16 34:6 long 11:4 12:21,23 21:3 23:25 25:22 opinion 33:10 moved 36:15 26:16 34:12 opportunity 4:7 8:18 9:24 10:1 multiple 38:3 15:22 25:9 longer 29:6 mute 13:1 lot 4:25 22:17 32:1 33:12,16,22 opposing 3:18 **mutual** 8:16 loud 33:1 **opposition** 4:15 5:24 7:9,10 9:16 10:11 14:12 19:6 Ν M oppression 12:15 **option** 28:17 narrowed 32:16 made 5:10 7:2 10:5 11:21,22 13:16 oral 11:1,2 19:9 22:18 24:23 29:2 **Nation** 4:3 37:11.23 **order** 4:12 5:6 8:1 9:8,15,20 12:3,9, main 17:25 national 19:23 12.13.18 27:8 30:2 36:11 major 16:13,23 22:4 necessarily 3:24 15:22 ordered 5:5 make 5:4 6:13 8:11 13:24 14:21 needed 6:2,9 14:25 22:18,19 32:4 orders 32:11,17,22 18:16 24:20 26:24,25 27:2,22 28:2,5 **nice** 3:12 29:12,16,19,20 30:16 ordinary 11:25 16:9 noon 25:13 26:4 34:25 makes 32:25 original 19:10,15 31:2 **note** 6:5,21 23:1 29:17 37:11 making 13:15 30:1 originally 27:25 noted 9:16 21:18 24:4 material 18:2 outdoor 35:5 **notice** 4:7 9:14 19:10,12,15 21:13 materials 8:14 16:10 outlined 17:18 23:11,14,17,21 26:21 37:19 matter 3:10 4:8 18:18 23:6 outrageous 12:8 noticed 28:15 meaningful 14:23 21:12 outset 6:5 notices 23:24 37:19 means 35:4 number 27:2 31:25 Ρ meant 35:5 **numbers** 10:13 meet 14:9 16:1 **p.m.** 3:2 25:20 26:15 38:8,11 meeting 18:2,3 22:8 0 pages 30:12 mess 23:4 parameters 12:12 oath 33:7 met 13:14,16 14:3 Pardon 4:22 **object** 28:12 mind 18:15 part 12:8 14:15 15:16 18:6 27:15 objection 28:10 minutes 9:18 participate 36:25 **objections** 11:20,22 **mission** 30:15 participated 16:19

observe 19:24

office 4:4 21:23 22:5

occasion 18:25

offer 8:23

participating 3:24 37:15

parties 3:23 4:4.23.25 7:18 8:1.2.7. 15 9:12 19:25 20:2 28:6 29:8 31:23

33:15 34:16 36:17 38:3

mistaken 7:13 9:24

month 19:11,13 21:19

moment 13:1

Monday 3:2,12

parties' 7:4 prepared 30:19 35:18 Q party 9:5 11:7,9 12:2 23:15 30:13,16 preparing 5:14 20:16 32:3 32:12 present 29:2 **question** 5:23 12:4 16:25 21:12 past 18:19,24 36:18 presented 18:1,21 People 11:5 questioning 9:22 presenting 22:10 33:5 people's 22:13 questions 8:23 11:9,11,17 12:6,17 presiding 11:24 16:15 17:2 19:3 21:15,21 30:25 period 5:13 pretrial 7:3 31:2,3,11 32:5,13 33:23,25 34:2,16 Perlmutter 3:21 5:25 6:4 10:16,23 36:10,20,21 37:5,9,10,12,20,24 pretty 23:3 30:22 14:1.5 15:2.5.10 19:21 22:22.25 quickly 4:18 23:10 26:9,11 27:1 28:11,19,24 previous 20:18 29:16,25 30:3 31:6,9 33:12 34:2,4 quote 8:6 principal 7:4 36:10,13,20 37:22,25 prior 25:10 Perlmutter's 25:2 R problem 5:12 person 18:9 24:1 27:24 28:18 29:9 raised 35:10 problematic 9:7 personal 29:8 range 19:3 procedural 4:8 5:8 **phone** 27:2,4,17,24 28:3,4 33:3 rare 28:12 34:24 procedure 12:1 reaction 14:7.8 **piece** 13:2 proceeding 5:9 read 5:16 **place** 8:15 proceedings 3:4 5:2 16:13,18 31:12 reading 13:19 planned 15:23 process 12:21 17:12 22:9 ready 20:4 21:14,18,20 22:10 pleased 34:15 produce 20:4 reason 9:14 11:18 34:14 **point** 6:18 7:9,23 8:12 9:13 13:20 16:18 17:11 20:21 26:6 product 19:1 reasonable 5:13 12:19 19:3 20:25 21:5 22:1,6 38:5 polite 21:9,12 project 18:20 position 6:2 9:5 10:18 18:8 34:5 reasons 15:17 promptly 7:19 received 7:14 14:12 positions 7:4 proponent 17:25 18:20 recipe 33:20 possibility 8:6 22:21 28:8 proposition 12:8 recommendations 36:24 possibly 8:24 21:24 26:5 protective 5:6 9:8,15,20 12:3,8,13 record 13:13 14:25 19:18 26:25 potentially 32:15 provide 17:15,19 27:20 34:18 35:1 **practice** 8:22 13:20,22 18:19 37:18 provided 6:1 8:14 recorded 13:10 27:15 prefer 25:3 29:25 **public** 4:6,8 recover 22:9 25:9 preference 25:21 29:8 published 4:12 reduce 4:11 prefile 15:12 pulling 20:23 Reeves 13:6 prefiled 7:6 8:4,7 15:3,21,25 17:13, purpose 3:17 14 18:13 reference 11:16 13:3,19 purposes 5:14 refusal 5:3 prehearing 8:1 12:12 34:20 **push** 21:15



pushback 21:10

put 6:14 9:21 21:22 27:7

prelimit 32:13

prepare 12:20

preparation 20:25 31:5,13

regard 6:22 8:12 9:8 12:17 17:1,2

refused 6:13

29:10 30:2

related 5:7 32:16

relevant 5:1 15:18 19:4 30:15,17 32:22,24 relief 5:20,22 21:17 remaining 14:23,24 REMEMBERED 3:1 reminded 7:25 reopening 8:10 replied 10:11 reply 4:17 6:6 9:18 10:24 14:12 20:

reply 4:17 6:6 9:18 10:24 14:12 20:3 35:25

Reporter 3:3
represent 3:16
represented 10:10
representing 11:8

request 3:20 6:23 9:1,8,12 22:11 31:16

requested 12:3 requesting 30:16 requests 35:22

required 13:3,11

requirement 13:17 18:22,23

requirements 5:12 14:2

resident 28:7 resolve 26:2 resolved 4:10

respect 8:16 16:12 17:12 22:16

respectful 12:11 respective 17:16

respond 6:9 10:20 14:2 22:19 36:2

responding 20:1 response 12:7 35:1 responses 30:10 responsible 16:21 Reyneveld 4:2 37:5,6

ring 27:4 ringing 34:24

role 6:16 31:5,15 32:3 round 14:24 15:4,8 19:6 roundabout 33:1

rounds 14:23 routine 8:22

routine 8:22

RPR 3:3 **Rul** 13:12

rule 18:22

ruled 11:23

rules 9:16 11:12

ruling 4:10 35:8,17

S

Salt 28:13 29:23

sanctions 3:20 5:4,24 8:13 9:2 10:13 12:20 13:4,23 35:9

Sarah 4:1

schedule 20:20,23 21:4 22:1 23:22 24:14 25:3,11 26:5 35:16 38:7

scheduled 14:18 19:13 23:6,7 33:14

33:14

schedules 22:13 scheduling 22:22

scope 5:23 6:14 11:5,12 12:5 27:6 30:17 31:14,16 32:3,11 34:8 35:12 36:24

scoping 32:21

Scout 3:14,22 7:5 17:24 18:4

screen 30:13 **section** 17:17

sections 16:21 17:16

seeking 4:19 5:20 9:21 11:9 13:23 21:17 30:19,20 31:7

send 26:25

sense 8:11 32:25

separate 27:1 37:19

serve 37:19 **served** 6:6

set 8:2 10:1 11:6 21:5 22:1 25:19

26:21 35:24

setting 36:8

severe 22:3

Sheppard 3:3

short 4:11 14:6 16:24

shorten 35:25

shorter 33:22

shortly 4:17

show 27:23

shrillness 30:14

shut 8:17

side 36:3

sides 13:10 14:4,22

signed 18:20

significant 8:6 32:8

signing 6:24

signs 7:8

simply 20:22

site 16:5,6,8,16 17:3

sitting 36:5

situation 16:3

smooth 29:15

sooner 9:10 14:22 19:19 21:25

sort 8:10,16 11:8 29:4 33:16,20

34:16

sounds 25:18 30:18,20 31:12

source 7:4

speak 10:21 16:7 18:11 19:22

speaking 17:12 34:8

speaks 25:24

special 9:3

specific 6:17 33:23

specifically 7:11,25 9:19,25 31:17

32:6 34:1

specifics 35:9

spend 33:12,18

spent 32:2 36:15

spokesperson 17:25 18:4,8

stage 20:17

stages 18:5 **stand** 16:11

standard 28:18

standby 26:24

standing 5:22

start 26:3 34:24

started 18:10

state 5:21

stated 32:7

Stavitsky 3:22 6:7 15:11,13,15 17:6,7,8,10,23

Stay 12:25

stick 34:11

Stoel 13:6

stressful 29:12

stretch 10:12

strictly 4:8

strongly 13:24

submissions 17:21

submit 6:25 7:22

submitted 8:23 16:11 17:19

substantive 14:7

suggest 6:25 7:20 10:6 21:1 26:3

suggested 8:20

suggesting 29:14

suggestion 30:1

summarize 4:18 6:1

summary 4:24

supplement 8:7

surprised 19:16

Т

taking 28:17 talk 27:7 28:23

talking 9:13 24:14

talks 12:15

TCC 3:20 5:11 6:16,19,23 7:7 8:9,21

9:9,18,23 10:9 14:15,19,24 15:23 20:2 31:8,11,22 32:19 33:9 34:1

35:14

TCC's 7:20 18:15 19:6 31:15 32:16 33:4

technology 27:20

telephone 26:24 27:17

ten 20:1

tenor 30:7

tension 30:11

terms 13:15 20:16 24:7

testified 18:21

testimony 3:14 5:1,12,14 6:25 7:3, 6,22 8:4,8 12:20 14:24 15:3,7,9,12, 21,25 17:13,14,18 18:14,18 19:24 20:4,9,19,20,24 21:1,6,16 22:2,4,10 27:15 31:1

thing 6:18 9:6 10:8 18:10 19:8 36:5

things 6:12,21 10:10 13:21 18:5 19:14 20:17 22:2,13 23:2 27:22 29:7,9,15 31:1,17 32:14 35:9 38:4

thinking 35:4

thinks 12:5 18:12 33:4

thought 8:24

tied 11:17

time 5:10,13 7:15,21 11:4 12:19 15:16 19:19 20:25 21:6,12 22:17,21 27:3,21 32:2 33:12,18 35:11 36:1,2 38:5

timeline 20:12

timing 23:8 24:7,12 25:22

today 3:13,21 4:6,10 14:17 19:3,8 27:8 30:7,10 33:14 35:14 36:6,8 38:7

Today's 3:11

tomorrow 4:12 19:24 35:5

Torem 3:9,10 5:18 10:15 12:25 13:18 14:16 15:6,14,20 17:4,7,9,22 21:8 22:12 23:8,13,18,23 24:9,17, 19,22,25 25:12,17,18 26:8,13,19,20 27:16 28:2,24,25 29:22 30:6 31:4,21 34:7,17 35:20 36:9,14,23 37:4,8,14 38:2

travel 25:2 29:21

Tri 3:15

Tri-cities 28:8,9 29:1

Tribe 23:17,22 37:9

trip 29:23

trouble 4:22

turn 30:17 34:8

twelve 34:25

typically 13:20

U

understand 5:23 6:17 11:1,5 17:22 18:7,11 22:12 28:7 34:4

understandable 19:17

understanding 19:9 31:6

Understood 28:19 37:14

unusual 16:4 17:11

upfront 10:3

٧

verbally 27:9 34:9

vie 27:12

view 13:14 34:2

W

wait 21:3

wanted 5:19 7:9 13:24 22:14

wanting 10:19 20:8,9

ways 8:20

WDFW 24:5

Wednesday 19:25 20:4 35:4

week 7:24 20:5 21:3,24 25:10 35:8 36:12

weeks 6:23 7:8,15 8:9

weigh 15:13

whatsoever 14:14

wildlife 25:5 31:19

Willa 3:20

Wind 3:11

window 8:10

windows 22:21

wit 3:5

witnesses 15:19 16:7,10,20 17:15

20:19 31:24 32:23

wondering 24:9

words 4:19 7:15

work 5:1 22:18 24:11,23 25:15 27:22 29:2,16 35:6,16

working 31:23

works 19:19

writing 8:24 30:8 35:2

written 4:11 11:11 27:8 36:11

wrong 32:12

Υ

Yakama 4:2 23:17 37:11,23

year 33:5

years 11:13 18:10

Ζ

Zoom 3:2 27:12,14,18,24 28:1,3,12 29:4,6,19