| | | Page 1 |
|----|----------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | BEFORE | THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD |
| 2 | | OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | EDWARD BINTZ, | |
| 5 | Appe | ellant, |
| 6 | v. | Appeal No. |
| 7 | DEPARTMENT OF | NATURAL RESOURCES 2024-04 |
| 8 | AND ENVIRONMEN | TAL CONTROL, |
| 9 | Appe | ellee. |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | HEARING |
| 12 | DATE: | Tuesday, January 28, 2025 |
| 13 | TIME: | 9:01 a.m. |
| 14 | BEFORE: | Dean Holden, Chair |
| 15 | | Deborah Wicks, Member |
| 16 | | Robert Mulrooney, Member |
| 17 | | Randall Horne, Member |
| 18 | LOCATION: | DNERC |
| 19 | | 89 Kings Highway |
| 20 | | Richardson and Robbins Building |
| 21 | | Dover, DE 19901 |
| 22 | REPORTED BY: | Blake Robinson |
| 23 | JOB NO.: | 7077448 |
| 24 | | |
| | | |

| | Page 2 | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | APPEARANCES | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | ON BEHALF OF APPELLANT EDWARD BINTZ: | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | JANE BRADY, ESQUIRE | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Halloran Farkas Kittla | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 5722 Kennett Pike | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Wilmington, DE 19807 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | mjb@hfk.com | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | 302-257-2011 | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | ON BEHALF OF APPELLEE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL: | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | SAWYER TRAVER, ESQUIRE | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Department of Justice | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | 820 North French Street | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Wilmington, DE 19801 | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | sawyer.traver@btlaw.com | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | ON BEHALF OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARD: | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | A. ZACHARY NAYLOR, ESQUIRE | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Delaware Department of Natural Resources and | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Environmental Control (DNREC) | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | 89 Kings Highway | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Dover, DE 19901 | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Page | e 3 | |
|----------|------|---------|----|-----|----|-----|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|----|------|------|--|
| 1 | | | A | P | P | E | A | R | A | N | С | E | S | (C | on | 't) | | |
| 2 | ALSO | PRESENT | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Janella | Sá | app |), | Ac | im£ | lni | st | cra | at: | iv∈ | e P | Ass | is | tant | _ | |
| 4 | | Brandon | Н | ols | tc | on, | , <i>P</i> | Adn | nir | nis | st | rat | civ | <i>r</i> e | As | sist | tant | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | Page 4 |
|----|-----|----------------|--------|
| 1 | | EXHIBITS | |
| 2 | NO. | DESCRIPTION | ID/EVD |
| 3 | | (None marked.) | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| | | | |

1 PROCEEDINGS

2.0

THE CHAIR: Good morning. My name is

Dean Holden, Chairperson of the Delaware Environmental

Appeals Board.

Before we be begin today, for those of you attending in person, please silence your electronic devices. For those of you joining on the phone or online, please mute your microphones unless you're addressed by the board.

For the purpose of today's hearing of the Delaware Environmental Appeals Board is to consider Mr. Edward Bintz's motion to compel production of the entire record for the secretary in Appeal 2024-04.

The appeal filed by Mr. Bintz challenges two federal consistency certifications issued by DNREC to the US Army Corps of Engineers in connection with the project in development by US Wind to create an offshore wind farm for power generation.

Notice of today's hearing in the auditorium at DNREC's offices at 89 Kings Highway, Dover, Delaware, and by virtual access was posted on the State of Delaware Secretary of State's public meeting calendar on which the boards -- and on the

1 | board's website.

In addition, public notice of this hearing was published in the News Journal and the Delaware State News.

The Delaware Environmental Appeals

Board is a quasi judicial body created by the General

Assembly to hear appeals of decisions of the Secretary

of DNREC. The way the board fulfills its duties and

responsibilities, including conducting hearings is

established and governed by the Delaware Code, board's

regulations, and case law.

I will now introduce board members and the board staff, other board members participating in this hearing and constituting a quorum pursuant to 7 Del Code Section 6007 are Ms. Deborah Wicks, Mr. Robert Mulrooney, and Mr. Randall Horne.

I would also like to introduce the board's assigned Deputy Attorney General, Zach Naylor, and the board's administrative assistants, Janella Sapp and Brandon Holston. The appellant is represented by the Honorable Jane Brady.

Would you please introduce yourself for the record?

MS. BRADY: Yes. Thank you. My name

1 is Jane Brady. I'm here representing Mr. Bintz.

2.0

THE CHAIR: Thank You. The appellee is represented by Deputy Attorney General Sawyer Traver at today's proceedings.

I ask that Counsel take this opportunity to introduce themselves to the board and for the record.

MS. TRAVER: Yes, my name is Sawyer

Traver, Deputy Attorney General with the Department of

Justice here today representing DNREC.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Brady will have up to 20 minutes to argue in favor of motion to compel and may reserve any portion of that allotted time for rebuttal. That will be followed by 20 minutes for DNREC to argue against the motion. Ms. Brady will be permitted 10 minutes for rebuttal argument.

Board members may ask questions during argument or after the allotted time. The board may deliberate in executive session after the arguments have concluded. The board may issue an oral decision thereafter but will issue a written order following this hearing.

Ms. Brady, you may now proceed.

MS. BRADY: Thank you and good morning.

This is a hearing as you said on a motion to compel that was filed by Mr. Bintz to require the Department of Natural Resources to provide the entire record to this board and to him as he brings a motion or an appeal of a decision by the secretary.

2.0

The Delaware Coastal Management Plan specifically is intended to ensure protection of Delaware's coastal areas from environmental damage and to preserve its use for recreation and scenic and aesthetic enjoyment.

7 Delaware Admin Code 2201 requires that the proposed activities that are subject to federal approval that might reasonably have foreseeable effects on Delaware's coastal area are to be reviewed by DNREC for consistency between that federal approval and Delaware's rules and regulations.

Mr. Bintz filed a substantive appeal of the finding of consistency that the Department of Natural Resources made, but he found the record submitted to this board and available to him to be significantly lacking, and so he filed this motion to compel.

7 Delaware Code 6008 states that when this board holds a public hearing of an appeal of a

final decision of the secretary, the record before the board shall include the entire record before the secretary. 7 Delaware Admin code similarly states that the record before the board includes the entire record before the secretary.

2.0

The plain meaning of words controls in Delaware law and there is no ambiguity in the word "entire." It means whole, all, everything.

The state is correct in its response in a couple of respects. First, it notes that the Environmental Appeals Board regulations do not define what the entire record is. That is true as far as I could find.

But the state then engages in a flawed argument that the entire record need only contain the documents that the secretary is required to review in making a determination of consistency.

Therefore, the state argues that they need only provide what essentially is in the chronology, only those items that without which the secretary's decision would be procedurally flawed.

That's not -- but is that what the entire record is meant to mean? I don't think so.

Indeed there is guidance as to what the entire record

should mean in federal regulations and case law.

2.0

The Administrative Procedure Act at the federal level uses the word whole record as opposed to entire record and requires the whole record to be submitted by an agency when a ruling is on appeal.

Like this board, it is not expected that the parties create a new record when determining if the decision was supported or not supported by substantial evidence. Rather, the board relies on the record that is presented, which is supposed to be all of the information that was before the agency when the agency made the decision.

The federal government provides guidance to federal agencies on what the entire whole record should be. It should be the paper trail that documents the agency's decision making process and the basis for the agency's decision.

That guidance includes describing some of the types of documents and materials that are relevant to the process of the agency's decision and were -- whether they support the decision or not.

And I believe attached as an exhibit is a copy of the US Department of Justice Environment and Natural Resource Division guidelines for agencies on

what would comprise the whole record.

2.0

In Citizens to Preserve Overton Park
vs. Volpe, The United States Supreme Court held that a
portion of the record was not the whole record.

We know the entire record, the whole record is not before this board, and we know that there was significant additional information that was provided to DNREC after the public comment period expired and before the secretary made the decision that is challenged in this underlying matter.

How do we know that? Because DNREC says so. First, there's a three-month gap in the documented information included in that portion of the record the state provided. We know that during that time the state was seeking new information and clarification that was utilized by the secretary in making his decision.

For instance, the state acknowledges that the Delaware Coastal Management Plan requires the agency to coordinate with network partners, and they represented that they were going to do so in public statements at the time of public comment. But they claim they don't have to include those reports from those partners in the record.

Further in one document provided by DNREC, the agency acknowledged that they sought and received additional information following the close of the public comment period regarding significant environmental concerns, including location of the offshore cables and decommissioning of the project.

2.0

However, the request and responses nor the specific information that was included in those responses is provided as part of your record.

Now, why is this information important? This board needs to determine when challenged if a secretary's decision is substantially supported by the evidence that the secretary considered.

But if you don't know what all of that evidence is, whether it is contradicted, whether there are differences of opinion between those partners we discussed earlier, you can't do your job and neither can Mr. Bintz fairly prosecute his underlying claim.

Appellants are only permitted to introduce evidence that is included as part of the record when challenging the secretary's decision. How is he to learn if there were contradictions with the interpretations of the information provided by one of those network partners or by the applicant themselves

is a fair extrapolation of the actual facts that were presented? He cannot and neither can this board.

Mr. Bintz's underlying claim is that the secretary failed to take into account reasonably foreseeable coastal zone effects as required by the Delaware Coastal Management Plan.

In fact, he addresses several aspects of what the Coastal Management Plan is to protect that were not addressed specifically in the secretary's order.

Such a consideration touches on virtually every determination with regard to consistency. What information was available, if there were gaps in that information relevant to an aspect of the impact on the coastal zone is not known.

Further, an appellant has the burden to establish the decision was not supported by substantial evidence. They cannot possibly meet that burden if they don't know what evidence was considered by the secretary in making the decision that's being challenged. And that's where the state is right again.

Mr. Bintz does not know whether other evidence was before the secretary because the state

won't tell him. The state makes an absurd demand on appellants to identify the documents they're claiming are not part of the record.

2.0

If it were not for the particular facts in this case, we would not be able to identify that we know there are documents that were considered by the secretary that are not in the record that the agency presented to this board. Not every applicant might be so fortunate.

The Federal Administrative Procedures Act, Section 10127 identifies some of the materials that comprise the record: all notices; all correspondence between the agency and the parties; exhibits, documents, and testimony submitted into evidence; and all recommended orders, summaries of evidence, and findings; and all interlocutory and final orders of the agency shall be included in the record.

Delaware case law makes clear that in reviewing an agency's decision, the reviewing party, whether it's the court or this board, is to conduct a -- hold on, I can't read my writing -- searching and careful analysis of the evidence. That is not possible on the record that has been presented to you

in this matter.

2.0

Now, I have no doubt that each one of you would like to make and wants to make the right and proper decisions in your appeals and to afford the members of the public who have fair reason to challenge a decision the secretary makes a good opportunity to do so.

But this board needs to clarify that the entire record is the whole record and that this board and appellants are entitled to know what information was available to the secretary before he made the decision you're being asked to endorse and the appellant is challenging.

Now, I won't presume to advise you what specific information you might designate, but I do offer these Federal Administrative Procedure Guidelines as a guide.

Let me say one more thing. We are not seeking to supplement the record. We are asking the state to complete the record, the record that existed. We are not asking additional information be placed in it. We are asking for the state to provide the information that was before the secretary when he made his decision.

That is the only fair way that you can make a decision you can feel comfortable is supported and the only fair way that any appellant who wants to challenge the decision of a secretary can do that.

I know this may be an expansion on what has been typically done, and to be candid as attorney general, I didn't always attend the -- I've attended EAB hearings but hadn't paid the kind of critical attention to the rules as I did for preparing for this matter.

And it seems to me that it would behoove this agency -- this board, rather, to review what you want to see and hear in these matters and define what you want the entire record to comprise.

And I suggest to you it should be far more than what the chronology includes and what is required simply to make sure that the secretary checks the mandatory boxes.

You should know what was there, whether it was contradicted, whether -- in making your determination, whether the agency's decision was substantially supported by the evidence before it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Brady.

2.0

1 MS. TRAVER: Thank you.

2.0

Good morning, board members. As stated earlier, my name is Sawyer Traver here today representing the Appellate DNREC.

The appellant today moves to compel DNREC to file reports and analyses and e-mails and correspondence that he alleges have been omitted from the entire record here.

Appellant's vague requests to supplement the record are unsupported by the law and would drastically expand the meaning of the record before the secretary on appeal to the EAB.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Traver, would you move the mic just a little bit closer? Thank you.

MS. TRAVER: Accordingly, DNREC respectfully requests that the EAB deny Appellant's motion to compel today.

The record filed with the EAB in this matter is complete and the entire record. The Delaware Coastal Management Programs, the DCMP, policies prescribe what must enter the record for the secretary's federal consistency review, and each of those items has been provided to Appellant here.

It's important to consider in this case

that the federal consistency review process is distinct from environmental permitting also done by DNREC, where you would have a public hearing with testimony and hearing officer's report. Here, federal consistency review is the state's part of the federal approval process and inherently more limited.

2.0

So the state in this matter was reviewing a US Army Corps of Engineers permit for federal consistency and US Winds' Outer Continental Shelf plan for BOEM.

For the Army Corps of Engineer permit, the DCMP policies require from the applicant a statement of consistency certification, a copy of the application, the detailed description of the proposed activity, an assessment relating to the probable coastal zone effects, and a brief set of findings derived from that assessment indicating that the proposed activity is consistent with the DCMP's policies.

From DNREC what is required is coordination with network program partners, public notice, and its federal consistency review response in writing.

Similarly for the outer continental

shelf plan, the applicant had to provide a copy of its application plan certification and supporting information. And DNREC had to, again, provide that public notice and its federal consistency review response.

2.0

The DCMP policies do not require that reports or correspondence be reviewed in connection with the issuance of the federal consistency concurrences, nor were any reports prepared here.

The DCMP had regular calls with its network program partners, and the concerns and comments made on those calls were compiled into the written federal consistency decisions that were issued in this matter.

Further, introducing correspondence into the record would be inappropriate here, as the emails were not part of the record in this matter and, again, that would dramatically expand the scope of the EAB's review in all cases.

Because all items required for review by the DCMP's policies have been provided to Appellant here, the record is administratively complete.

Next, the appellant's brief cites the Federal Administrative Procedure Act in support of his

argument that DNREC must file the entire record with the EAB.

2.0

2.2

However, the APA presumes that an agency has filed the complete record in an appeal and requires a party contesting the completeness of the record to rebut this presumption with first reasonable nonspeculative grounds for the belief that the documents were considered by the agency and not included in the record.

And second, identification of the allegedly omitted materials with specificity, not merely identifying broad categories of documents and data likely to exist.

Appellant's request here is exactly the speculative non-specific request for documents this presumption wards against.

Appellant incorrectly theorizes that reports and analyses must exist that have been omitted from the record. However, federal courts have held that a petitioner's belief that certain documents may exist fails to overcome the presumption of a complete record. And that's a site from footnotes 16 of my brief.

Further, Appellant fails to assert any

reasonable nonspeculative grounds for his belief that reports and correspondence were relied upon by the agency and not included with the record.

The materials that US Wind submitted pursuant to the requirements of the DCMP policies were provided at the record in this matter. And those materials together with the public comments submitted and conversations with the DCMP's network program partners as recorded in the final written consistency concurrences comprise the entire record in this matter, and all of that has been provided to Appellant.

Appellant's arguments are too speculative and non-specific to rebut the presumption that DNREC has provided the entire record in this matter here.

In sum, Appellant's motion to compel is overly broad, unsupported by the law, and DNREC again respectfully requests that it be denied. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Brady?

MS. BRADY: Yes.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Brady?

MS. BRADY: Yes. Thank you.

So I submit the state doesn't really

2.0

address the issue, which is not what must enter the record. She keeps citing to the obligation that the secretary has to do certain specific things, but the record that you're required to receive doesn't say provide us with proof you considered all the things you have to. It says the entire record.

2.0

And so if the secretary rejects information, doesn't give it as much weight, has it, doesn't consider it, and we know -- then that is relevant. Whether he checks all the boxes when he makes the decision is not the question that is put to you by the language in your regulations and the law. The entire record should be before you for you to make a determination.

The -- she said that we're not -- oh. She said you're expanding the scope of the EAB review if you grant our request. No. We're letting you do your job.

The scope of your review is to be the entire record and whether it's substantially -- the secretary's decision is substantially supported by that record, whether it's support -- and whether that information that was considered supports the ultimate decision or not.

And there will be many times that there will be contradictory, conflicting, and different opinions. Heck, in the proposal to go under the bay for the connection to these cables to a substation, the EPA and National Fisheries both recommended against doing that. The state granted it a permit to do that.

So we know there's stuff -- there's information in the record that the secretary may not regard as compelling his decision, but it's part of the record, and it should be provided.

And we do rebut the presumption here. That presumption is in the absence of anything else, but we know that there was requests for additional information, that it was provided, and we don't know what that information is.

We only have the secretary summary in his opinion about the location. We know it was regarding the location of the cables, and we know it was regarding the decommissioning. We know it was about that, but we don't know what information was provided. You don't know what information was provided.

You can't avoid an obligation to

provide information the secretary relied upon by not writing it down.

2.0

So if there's a practice that the network partners don't provide their input in writing or there's a practice that the staff who talk to those network partners don't write memos to the secretary about what that network partner says, that's avoiding their duty to show that the record supports -- what the record entails that supports or doesn't support the secretary's decision.

So my assessment is that the entire record is not being addressed. It's not being provided to you, that the state is not addressing what the entire record should be, but only what the minimal mandatory aspects should be. And whatever is required by the Federal Consistency Guidelines or the DCMP, that's what we have to give you.

And that's not what the law and the regulations say. They say you're entitled to the entire record. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Brady.

Questions from the board?

MR. HORNE: So what I'm interpreting and understanding is that basically all documents

| 1 | received relative to this project constitute the |
|---|--|
| 2 | record. The fact that they may not have been |
| 3 | considered is important because they weren't |
| 4 | considered or they were chosen not to be considered. |

5 Is that correct?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

6 MS. BRADY: I think whether they were 7 rejected --

Ms. Brady, your mic's off. 8 MR. HORNE: Thank you.

MS. BRADY: Whether they were rejected or accepted, the agency receives that information. That makes it before the secretary. They consider it an agency decision.

So the case law looks at what is in the record is what is before the secretary. information could they call upon in making their determination? And then your obligation is to find that that information in the whole either does or does not substantially support the subject.

MR. HORNE: This is where I'm having a little confusion.

MS. BRADY: Yeah.

MR. HORNE: So there's going to be a lot of stuff submitted back and forth that has

absolutely nothing to do with anything. But there are things that, as you say, are presented that could have been considered and may have been determined not to be relevant, so they're -- they didn't provide those.

MS. BRADY: Right.

MR. HORNE: Are you suggesting that everything or just what was used or specifically excluded in making the decision?

MS. BRADY: So I think everything in the sense that that is the record. So if it was a request, what time are you going to have a Zoom to have a call? No. But if it's the content of the Zoom call, yes.

They -- and there's an obligation for the state to preserve what it does, the record that it creates. And they're suggesting that, you know, oral conversations, you know, that federal regs even include notes of that, internal summaries of evidence.

So that's part of what is before the secretary within the agency in making the recommendations, interlocutory, or final decisions.

MR. HORNE: Okay. And from your standpoint, would you agree that there are documents that were not included because you or DNREC as the

- case may be determined that they weren't relevant to the decision making process?
- MS. TRAVER: No. I think the DCMP sets
 forth the documents that are relevant to the
 secretary's review.
- 6 MR. HORNE: This is clearly where our 7 issue is, right here; right?
 - MS. BRADY: So the federal laws and the case law that looks at it does not distinguish what the secretary determines is relevant and what is in the record. So there could be a conflict of interest or a --
- MR. HORNE: Sure.
- MS. BRADY: -- a prejudice or a bias in deciding what is relevant. That's why with FOIA, any kind of public review of the government action, the entire record is the entire record.
- MR. BINTZ: Can I weigh on just for a sec?
- MR. HORNE: Sure. The --
- 21 MR. BINTZ: Anything that you can do to
- 22 clear the air.

8

9

10

11

12

- MR. BINTZ: Yeah. Well, we had -- we
- had mentioned in the brief that there's a three-month

gap. So pretty much what -- what DNREC is reviewing via the DCMP is information submitted by US Wind, so of course it's going to have the US Wind perspective --

MR. HORNE: Sure.

2.1

MR. BINTZ: -- as opposed to a more objective review by -- by DNREC. And we don't have anything reflecting that objective review, you know, by DNREC other than the conclusion itself.

And to me that's -- that's, you know, an important part of what it takes to review what the analysis was and -- and does it, you know -- is it -- does it constitute substantial evidence for the position they took?

MR. MULROONEY: Ms. Brady, you talked about coordination with network partners. I guess that's correspondence and documents related to that coordination. What would that look like? I'm not sure I understand what network partners would be and what documents --

MS. BRADY: Well, the Coastal
Management Plan requires that they consult with
network partners. The state can tell you exactly who
they consulted with.

I can't because we don't have that record, but it would be agencies, organizations that have an interest in and expertise regarding any aspect of the project that they would want to hear from.

And I don't know, are they defined in

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

And I don't know, are they defined in the code there, network partners, Ma'am?

MS. TRAVER: I am not sure if they're defined in the code.

MS. BRADY: I don't think they are.

MS. TRAVER: But the -- I would assume they are. I would hope. The concurrence letters list the agencies that DNREC coordinated with.

MR. MULROONEY: So they're state agencies and external organizations as well?

MS. BRADY: They can be. Yes.

MR. MULROONEY: Could be.

MS. BRADY: In fact -- yes. In fact they only list the divisions within DNREC, but there may be reports and analysis from those divisions that we don't have.

MR. MULROONEY: Okay.

MS. BRADY: They simply talked to them or they got a report from them. I suspect there's a lot of internal analysis and communication relating to

Page 30

what ultimately the decision was that has not been revealed.

MR. MULROONEY: So for DNREC -- so that communication or the information that you're -- the feedback you're getting from network partners, that would or would not have been part of the decision making process?

MS. TRAVER: It was part of the decision making process, the comments that were received --

THE REPORTER: Ms. Traver, would you turn your mic on? Sorry.

MS. TRAVER: Sorry.

Yes. It was part of the decision making process. The comments received from the network program partners were incorporated into the final consistency concurrences.

MR. MULROONEY: Okay. So that -- were those records provided as part of the overall?

MS. TRAVER: There aren't reports.

There aren't records in that sense.

MR. MULROONEY: Then what would it be?

23 | Correspondence or --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

24

MS. TRAVER: It was my understanding

from speaking with DNREC is that records that there
were regular phone calls that all of the network
program partners would participate on.

MR. MULROONEY: Okay. So nothing documented then in terms of in writing?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

MS. TRAVER: Not that I've reviewed.

THE CHAIR: Is there a listing of who within those different network partners participated?

MS. TRAVER: I could absolutely get that for you.

THE CHAIR: Is that in the current document provided to date?

MS. TRAVER: No. No. And let me rephrase. I can get a list of who all the network program partners are. I am not sure who participated on every call. I can see if they have that information.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions? Have more?

Ms. Brady, you mentioned a three-month gap in documents. Could you tell us a little bit more about that?

MS. BRADY: That's between -- well, that's between when public comment period expired and

when the secretary issued the order.

2.0

And we know that there were things happening in that time, clearly. That's when they were seeking out the other opinions from the network partners. That was when they were evaluating the information, asking US Wind for additional information, considering what they've said, and deciding about the location.

Even changing a little bit of the project about the location or getting assurances about the location of the cables as well as -- sorry, I forgot my mic -- as well as the decommissioning because there's been a lot of concern in the public about the costs of decommissioning and whether there should be a bond up front and that kind of thing.

And the federal government undermined some of the other projects on the east coast by saying you didn't have -- that they overrode the state's requirement of a decommissioning bond.

And so that was a particular area of concern for the public, but we don't know what their response was and all the details of what that was, what information was provided that might have affected or influenced the secretary's decision.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

2.0

2.2

Ms. Traver, the -- in my reading of the secretary's consistency -- the order or the consistency determinations, there seems to be a number of additional requirements that are within it that weren't included in the documents submitted by US Wind.

Is the record that's been provided for this appeal, does it contain the backup documents that were utilized or the department opinions that were utilized to determine those that were included in the submission?

MS. TRAVER: I'm not sure I understand. You say the secretary's order contained additional requirements?

THE CHAIR: Yeah. Correct. I mean, it speaks about -- let me see where that was. So it speaks about restrictions in addition to other mitigation and monitoring effects to protect natural resources. Right? And that's on page 3 of 8.

And and to me it reads that DNREC has taken all the submissions that came from the applicant and the input and correspondence with the network partners and come up with this list of additional

1 | mitigation and monitoring efforts. Right?

To me, it doesn't seem like the record that's been submitted to date provides the backup for how those were determined.

MS. TRAVER: Just glancing at this list, these look like standard Watershed Stewardship and Fish and Wildlife requirements. I assume it would've come up in conversation with those partners.

MR. HORNE: And is that -- is that not why this is a conditional concurrence because they've added -- no?

MS. BRADY: It's conditional because the state had not yet granted or made the determination on the pending permits for beach construction subaqueous and wetlands permits.

And so it conditioned the consistency on those permitting processes, which are also now on appeal to this board and to the superior court because the appeal from the beach construction is directly to superior court.

MR. BINTZ: And let me supplement it.

On page 8 -- starting on page 8 of the conditional concurrences, they add just -- I think what you were -- where you were heading on this, is that there

are new conditions that are added, for example, for the -- to protective Bethany Beach firefly, which is an endangered species, they put in a requirement that there be no permanent lighting.

That is nowhere to be found in the US Wind materials. They were providing during construction that they would not I -- I guess it was time of year restrictions. So during the summer they couldn't do lighting. But this is a different requirement.

And -- and so you'll see eight additional conditions here that are over and above what is required elsewhere.

And -- and there's no explanation as to your question. There's no backup to support of for how in the record right now as to how they arrived at those.

THE CHAIR: Right. Ms. Traver, I mean, it seems to me that if -- to produce these additional conditions and things that were added that are outside of the record, the documents that have been been submitted to date, it would be tough that that occurred just through a phone call and then made its way into the secretary's order. Right?

Page 36

To me, there seems to be -- there's got to be some documents of the development of this that led to the ultimate document.

2.0

MS. TRAVER: All I can say is reports weren't required. No reports were submitted.

MS. BRADY: I think that first part is correct. Reports aren't required. You know, the only thing that's required is you check three boxes, really, maybe four.

But that's not the question before this board on this motion nor is it the question before any reviewing board or court. The question is whether they complied with the regs and the law, which requires the entire record be here for you to make a determination.

MR. HORNE: So you've -- in your definition of the entire record, you've relied on some federal law, case law?

MS. BRADY: Yes. They use the term whole record but they --

MR. HORNE: My question is, why does your definition take precedence over DNREC's definition out of the DCMP?

MS. BRADY: Well, DNREC doesn't have a

definition. There is no definition in Delaware law of
what the entire record is, and I encourage this
board --

MR. HORNE: No. But she's saying they have submitted what the DCMP requires be submitted.

MS. BRADY: That's correct. They have submitted what is required, but that is not the record.

MR. HORNE: Okay.

2.0

MS. BRADY: That is simply what boxes have to be checked. That is the minimum that the secretary has to do or the decision is negated. I mean, absolute minimum the secretary has to do or the decision is negated.

Your job is to find out -- and your duty is to find out if there's a substantial evidence to support that decision. And you can't do that if you don't know what evidence was before the secretary.

MR. BINTZ: And the DCMP does not speak to a record. It lists the -- or it identifies information that US Wind is required to submit with its application. It never uses the word record or purports to say that what US Wind is submitting is the record. It's just what they're required to provide.

Page 38

| 1 | And there was follow up as reflected in |
|----|--|
| 2 | the concurrence letter asking for additional |
| 3 | information, and we know that was provided and we |
| 4 | you know, that may well have been other things and |
| 5 | and, you know, that are very relevant to to the |
| 6 | decision made here. |
| 7 | MR. MULROONEY: So I'm not an attorney, |
| 8 | but in my prior life when I worked for a company, we'd |
| 9 | be involved in lawsuits and there'd be a |
| 10 | MS. BRADY: Sorry for you. |
| 11 | MR. MULROONEY: Well, it was part of |
| 12 | the job. |
| 13 | MS. BRADY: Darn lawyers. |
| 14 | MR. MULROONEY: It was but it was |
| 15 | part of the |
| 16 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's the fun |
| 17 | part. |
| 18 | Yes. But there is athere'd be a |
| 19 | discovery process, and I would have to identify |
| 20 | MS. BRADY: Right. Right |
| 21 | MR. MULROONEY: and preserve any |
| 22 | documents that would be related to that particular |

case. Are you asking for discovery process for this

23

24

or is --

MS. BRADY: No. No. There is no discovery before this board.

2.0

MR. MULROONEY: Okay.

MS. BRADY: What is required before this board, though, is the entire record. And so that's why I suggest -- and, you know, again, I have worked with agencies a lot of my career. I never paid the kind of critical attention to this particular issue until now when I was asked to help Mr. Bintz.

And it seems to me it would behoove this agency to identify what you expect the agency to provide in terms of the entire record, much like the federal guidelines and US Department of Justice have done. Give Zach a little more work to do. But to help assure that DNREC knows what you expect and what you're entitled to.

And it's not -- one of the things they include in the federal guidelines is notes. Because if they have a conversation or they take notes about what one of the divisions wants in this, or there's an e-mail, that's evidence that's before the secretary in making that decision within the agency. That should be preserved.

And it's not onerous. Agencies do it

- every day all the time, but it's not discovery. It's
 what -- they have an obligation to prove to you
 there's substantial evidence to support the
 secretary's decision.
 - And if all you ever get is what they have to do and one sided piece of the information and not all of it, you can't do your job right. And that's what the courts and other agencies have and federal government has recognized.
 - MR. MULROONEY: Okay. Thank you.
- 11 THE CHAIR: Ms. Wicks?
- MS. WICKS: No. I'm fine. Yeah. You answer my questions.
- 14 THE CHAIR: Mr. Horne?
- MR. HORNE: So our job in this case is
- 16 | to make a determination of the appeal; correct?
- MS. BRADY: Ultimately, yes.
- 18 MR. HORNE: Yeah. But the appeal
- 19 | specifies certain things that he identifies as being
- 20 | not correctly or completely or whatever word you want
- 21 to use evaluated?

5

6

8

9

- MS. BRADY: Not included in the record.
- 23 | Right. So there -- the underlying --
- MR. HORNE: My point is --

1 MS. BRADY: Right. 2 -- are we -- in your mind, MR. HORNE: 3 do we have to have the entire record and review the secretary's determination on the entire -- based on 4 5 the entire record or just the points that he brings up 6 in his appeal? MS. BRADY: So I think you need the 7 8 entire record, and that's because that's what the law 9 requires. 10 MR. HORNE: My question is what are 11 we -- what are we determining? MS. BRADY: Okay. So his particular 12 13 appeal says that there were aspects of what the DCMP 14 is designed to protect that were not specifically addressed in the secretary's order. And he's 15 identified a few of those, but we don't know if 16 17 there's something in the record about that or not. 18 If you were to try -- I see where 19 you're going with this logically. If you were to try 2.0 and say --21 I feel better. MR. HORNE: 2.2 MS. BRADY: If you were to try and say, 23 okay, in this case we need information related to

these three or four things and what you have.

1 MR. HORNE: Exactly.

MS. BRADY: And then in this case, we need what you need in this -- the agency is not going to develop practices that preserve the record that you need in advance of knowing what you need or want.

And so that's why the defined scope of what the agency should have available and retain for purposes of your determination of substantial support or not.

And, again, the litigants are limited in what they can argue to this court on what's in the record. And they decide what the record is unless you tell them what the record is.

Their practices I think over time have developed to be that means whatever we absolutely have to consider, and they haven't adopted practices that collect and preserve the kind of information that should be part of the record historically.

And I respect that. I just think -- and so I know that what I'm saying today is a change in how this board approaches what's provided to them and the expectations of the board.

But I think it is an appropriate time

2.0

to look at this and as I said, look at the regs that USDOJ adopted for the federal natural resources. See if they're helpful.

But I think it would be -- it's not going to be tonight, immediate, but I think it will give guidance to the state agencies about what information for all the boards, labor board, everybody, what -- because they do preserve e-mails between people that are discharged from work and all that.

They have a lot more of a record that they see in those board hearings than you see in this one particular. But it would help them adopt the practices that comply with the law. That's the law. That's the reg. It's what it says.

MR. HORNE: Okay.

THE CHAIR: A any last questions from the board? Is there a motion to go to executive session?

MR. HORNE: Motion to go to executive

session.

THE CHAIR: Second?

MR. MULROONEY: Second.

THE CHAIR: All in favor?

| | Page 44 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye. |
| 2 | (Off the record.) |
| 3 | THE CHAIR: Is there a motion from the |
| 4 | board? |
| 5 | MS. WICKS: Yes. I make a motion to |
| 6 | grant the motion to compel. |
| 7 | THE CHAIR: Second? |
| 8 | MR. HORNE: Second. |
| 9 | THE CHAIR: Is there any discussion on |
| 10 | the motion? All right. We'll do a roll call vote. |
| 11 | Ms. Wicks? |
| 12 | MS. WICKS: Yes. |
| 13 | THE CHAIR: Mr. Mulrooney? |
| 14 | MR. MULROONEY: In favor. |
| 15 | THE CHAIR: Mr. Horne? |
| 16 | MR. HORNE: In favor. |
| 17 | THE CHAIR: And I also vote in favor, |
| 18 | so the motion carries unanimously. We will regs |
| 19 | require that a written order will be issued within 90 |
| 20 | days. |
| 21 | MS. BRADY: Thank you. |
| 22 | THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. |
| 23 | MS. BRADY: It's been a pleasure. |
| 24 | THE REPORTER: Just before we go off, |
| | |

| | Page 45 |
|----|---|
| 1 | let me get transcript orders. So I'm going to start |
| 2 | with Ms. Brady. |
| 3 | Ms. Brady, would you like to order |
| 4 | transcript? |
| 5 | MS. BRADY: No. |
| 6 | THE REPORTER: No. Ms. Traver, would |
| 7 | you like to order transcript? |
| 8 | MS. TRAVER: No. We'll be in touch if |
| 9 | we do. |
| 10 | THE REPORTER: Okay. And, Mr. Naylor, |
| 11 | would you like to order a transcript? |
| 12 | MR. NAYLOR: Yeah. Janella will take |
| 13 | care of it. Of course. |
| 14 | THE REPORTER: Thank you. |
| 15 | (Whereupon, at 10:11 a.m., the |
| 16 | proceeding was concluded.) |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

1

CERTIFICATE

I, BLAKE ROBINSON, the officer before whom 2 3 the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing 4 proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; 5 6 that the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified 8 transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the 9 10 best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am 11 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; 12 13 and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of 14 any counsel or attorney employed by the parties 15 hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the 16 outcome of this action. Kul Kulin

17

18

19

20

BLAKE ROBINSON

Notary Public in and for the State of Delaware

2.1

22

2.3

2.4

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

6 | 7 |

I, JENNA STERN, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from the digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

JENNA STERN

[10 - appeal] Page 1

| 1 | 7077448 1:23 | action 27:16 | advance 42:5 |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 10 7:16 | 8 | 46:12,16 47:8 | advise 15:14 |
| 10 7.10 10127 14:11 | 8 33:20 34:22 | 47:12 | aesthetic 8:10 |
| 10:11 45:15 | 34:22 | activities 8:12 | affected 32:23 |
| 16 20:22 | 820 2:14 | activity 18:15 | afford 15:4 |
| 19801 2:15 | 89 1:19 2:22 | 18:18 | agencies 10:14 |
| 19807 2:6 | 5:21 | actual 13:1 | 10:24 29:2,12 |
| 19901 1:21 | 9 | add 34:23 | 29:14 39:7,24 |
| 2:23 | _ | added 34:11 | 40:8 43:6 |
| 2 | 90 44:19 | 35:1,20 | agency 10:5,11 |
| _ | 9:01 1:13 | addition 6:2 | 10:12 11:20 |
| 20 7:12,14 | a | 33:18 | 12:2 14:7,13 |
| 2024-04 1:7 | a.m. 1:13 45:15 | additional 11:7 | |
| 5:14 | ability 46:10 | 12:3 15:21 | 20:4,8 21:3 |
| 2025 1:12 | 47:7 | 23:14 32:6 | 25:11,13 26:20 |
| 2201 8:11 | able 14:5 | 33:5,14,24 | 39:11,11,22 |
| 28 1:12 | above 35:12 | 35:12,19 38:2 | 42:3,7 |
| 29044 47:14 | absence 23:13 | address 22:1 | agency's 10:16 |
| 3 | absolute 37:13 | addressed 5:9 | 10:17,20 14:20 |
| 3 33:20 | absolutely 26:1 | 13:9 24:12 | 16:21 |
| 302-257-2011 | 31:9 42:16 | 41:15 | agree 26:23 |
| 2:8 | absurd 14:1 | addresses 13:7 | air 27:22 |
| 33830 46:17 | accepted 25:11 | addressing | allegedly 20:11 |
| 5 | access 5:22 | 24:13 | alleges 17:7 |
| 5722 2:5 | account 13:4 | admin 8:11 9:3 | allotted 7:13,18 |
| 6 | accurate 46:9 | administrative | ambiguity 9:7 |
| _ | 47:5 | 3:3,4 6:19 10:2 | analyses 17:6 |
| 6007 6:15 | acknowledged | 14:10 15:16 | 20:18 |
| 6008 8:23 | 12:2 | 19:24 | analysis 14:23 |
| 7 | acknowledges | administrativ | 28:12 29:19,24 |
| 7 6:14 8:11,23 | 11:18 | 19:22 | answer 40:13 |
| 9:3 | act 10:2 14:11 | adopt 43:13 | apa 20:3 |
| | 19:24 | adopted 42:17 | appeal 1:6 5:14 |
| | | 43:2 | 5:15 8:5,17,24 |

[appeal - board] Page 2

| 10:5 17:12 | area 8:14 32:20 | attached 10:22 | belief 20:7,20 |
|---|---|--|---|
| 20:4 33:9 | areas 8:8 | attend 16:7 | 21:1 |
| 34:18,19 40:16 | argue 7:12,15 | attended 16:7 | believe 10:22 |
| 40:18 41:6,13 | 42:11 | attending 5:6 | best 46:10 47:6 |
| appeals 1:1 | argues 9:18 | attention 16:9 | bethany 35:2 |
| 2:18 5:4,11 6:5 | argument 7:16 | 39:8 | better 41:21 |
| 6:7 9:11 15:4 | 7:18 9:15 20:1 | attorney 6:18 | bias 27:14 |
| appellant 1:5 | arguments | 7:3,9 16:6 38:7 | bintz 1:4 2:2 |
| 2:2 6:20 13:16 | 7:19 21:13 | 46:14 47:10 | 5:15 7:1 8:2,17 |
| 15:13 16:3 | army 5:17 18:8 | audio 46:8 47:3 | 12:18 13:23 |
| 17:5,23 19:21 | 18:11 | auditorium | 27:18,21,23 |
| 20:17,24 21:12 | arrived 35:16 | 5:21 | 28:6 34:21 |
| appellant's | asked 15:12 | available 8:20 | 37:19 39:9 |
| 17:9,16 19:23 | 39:9 | 13:13 15:11 | bintz's 5:12 |
| 20:14 21:13,17 | asking 15:19,21 | 42:7 | 13:3 |
| appellants | 15:22 32:6 | avoid 23:24 | bit 17:14 31:21 |
| 12:19 14:2 | 38:2,23 | avoiding 24:7 | 32:9 |
| 15:10 | aspect 13:14 | aye 44:1 | blake 1:22 46:2 |
| appellate 17:4 | 29:3 | b | 46:18 |
| PP | _> | , , , | l I |
| appellee 1:9 | aspects 13:7 | | board 1:1 2:18 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 | b 4:1 | board 1:1 2:18 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 | aspects 13:7 | b 4:1 back 25:24 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 11:6 12:11 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 assistant 3:3,4 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 basis 10:17 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application 18:14 19:2 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 basis 10:17 bay 23:3 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 11:6 12:11 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application 18:14 19:2 37:22 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 assistant 3:3,4 assistants 6:19 assume 29:10 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 basis 10:17 bay 23:3 beach 34:14,19 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 11:6 12:11 13:2 14:8,21 15:8,10 16:12 17:2 24:22 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application 18:14 19:2 37:22 approaches 42:22 appropriate | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 assistant 3:3,4 assistants 6:19 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 basis 10:17 bay 23:3 beach 34:14,19 35:2 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 11:6 12:11 13:2 14:8,21 15:8,10 16:12 17:2 24:22 34:18 36:11,12 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application 18:14 19:2 37:22 approaches 42:22 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 assistant 3:3,4 assistants 6:19 assume 29:10 34:7 assurances | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 basis 10:17 bay 23:3 beach 34:14,19 35:2 behalf 2:2,10 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 11:6 12:11 13:2 14:8,21 15:8,10 16:12 17:2 24:22 34:18 36:11,12 37:3 39:2,5 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application 18:14 19:2 37:22 approaches 42:22 appropriate 42:24 approval 8:13 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 assistant 3:3,4 assistants 6:19 assume 29:10 34:7 | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 basis 10:17 bay 23:3 beach 34:14,19 35:2 behalf 2:2,10 2:18 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 11:6 12:11 13:2 14:8,21 15:8,10 16:12 17:2 24:22 34:18 36:11,12 37:3 39:2,5 42:22,23 43:7 |
| appellee 1:9 2:10 7:2 applicant 12:24 14:8 18:12 19:1 33:22 application 18:14 19:2 37:22 approaches 42:22 appropriate 42:24 | aspects 13:7 24:15 41:13 assembly 6:7 assert 20:24 assessment 18:15,17 24:11 assigned 6:18 assistant 3:3,4 assistants 6:19 assume 29:10 34:7 assurances | b 4:1 back 25:24 backup 33:9 34:3 35:15 based 41:4 basically 24:24 basis 10:17 bay 23:3 beach 34:14,19 35:2 behalf 2:2,10 | 5:4,9,11 6:6,8 6:12,13,13 7:6 7:17,18,20 8:4 8:20,24 9:2,4 9:11 10:6,9 11:6 12:11 13:2 14:8,21 15:8,10 16:12 17:2 24:22 34:18 36:11,12 37:3 39:2,5 |

| board's 6:1,10 | broad 20:12 | certificate 46:1 | chosen 25:4 |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 6:18,19 | 21:18 | 47:1 | chronology |
| boards 5:24 | btlaw.com 2:16 | certification | 9:20 16:16 |
| 43:7 | building 1:20 | 18:13 19:2 | cites 19:23 |
| body 6:6 | burden 13:16 | certifications | citing 22:2 |
| boem 18:10 | 13:19 | 5:16 | citizens 11:2 |
| bond 32:15,19 | c | certify 46:4 | claim 11:23 |
| boxes 16:18 | c 2:1 3:1 5:1 | 47:2 | 12:18 13:3 |
| 22:10 36:8 | cables 12:6 | chair 1:14 5:2 | claiming 14:2 |
| 37:10 | 23:4,19 32:11 | 7:2,11 16:24 | clarification |
| brady 2:3 6:21 | calendar 5:24 | 21:20,22 24:21 | 11:16 |
| 6:24 7:1,11,15 | call 25:16 | 31:7,11,18 | clarify 15:8 |
| 7:23,24 16:24 | 26:12,13 31:16 | 33:1,16 35:18 | clear 14:19 |
| 21:20,21,22,23 | 35:23 44:10 | 40:11,14 43:17 | 27:22 |
| 24:21 25:6,8 | calls 19:10,12 | 43:22,24 44:3 | clearly 27:6 |
| 25:10,22 26:5 | 31:2 | 44:7,9,13,15,17 | 32:3 |
| 26:9 27:8,14 | candid 16:6 | 44:22 | close 12:3 |
| 28:15,21 29:9 | care 45:13 | chairperson | closer 17:14 |
| 29:15,17,22 | career 39:7 | 5:3 | coast 32:17 |
| 31:20,23 34:12 | careful 14:23 | challenge 15:6 | coastal 8:6,8,14 |
| 36:6,19,24 | carries 44:18 | 16:4 | 11:19 13:5,6,8 |
| 37:6,10 38:10 | case 6:11 10:1 | challenged | 13:15 17:20 |
| 38:13,20 39:1 | 14:5,19 17:24 | 11:10 12:11 | 18:16 28:21 |
| 39:4 40:17,22 | 25:14 27:1,9 | 13:21 | code 6:10,15 |
| 41:1,7,12,22 | 36:18 38:23 | challenges 5:16 | 8:11,23 9:3 |
| 42:2 44:21,23 | 40:15 41:23 | challenging | 29:6,8 |
| 45:2,3,5 | 42:2 | 12:21 15:13 | collect 42:17 |
| brandon 3:4 | cases 19:19 | change 42:21 | come 33:24 |
| 6:20 | categories | changing 32:9 | 34:8 |
| brief 18:16 | 20:12 | check 36:8 | comfortable |
| 19:23 20:23 | certain 20:20 | checked 37:11 | 16:2 |
| 27:24 | 22:3 40:19 | checks 16:17 | comment 11:8 |
| brings 8:4 41:5 | 22.5 10.17 | 22:10 | 11:22 12:4 |
| | | | 31:24 |
| | | ral Solutions | |

| comments | concurrence | 9:17 13:13 | controls 9:6 |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| 19:12 21:7 | 29:11 34:10 | 17:22 18:1,5,9 | conversation |
| 30:9,15 | 38:2 | 18:13,22 19:4 | 34:8 39:19 |
| communication | concurrences | 19:8,13 21:9 | conversations |
| 29:24 30:4 | 19:9 21:10 | 24:16 30:17 | 21:8 26:17 |
| company 38:8 | 30:17 34:23 | 33:3,4 34:16 | coordinate |
| compel 5:12 | conditional | consistent | 11:20 |
| 7:12 8:1,22 | 34:10,12,22 | 18:18 | coordinated |
| 17:5,17 21:17 | conditioned | constitute 25:1 | 29:12 |
| 44:6 | 34:16 | 28:13 | coordination |
| compelling | conditions 35:1 | constituting | 18:21 28:16,18 |
| 23:10 | 35:12,20 | 6:14 | copy 10:23 |
| compiled 19:12 | conduct 14:21 | construction | 18:13 19:1 |
| complete 15:20 | conducting 6:9 | 34:15,19 35:7 | corps 5:17 18:8 |
| 17:19 19:22 | conflict 27:11 | consult 28:22 | 18:11 |
| 20:4,21 | conflicting 23:2 | consulted | correct 9:9 |
| completely | confusion | 28:24 | 25:5 33:16 |
| 40:20 | 25:21 | contain 9:15 | 36:7 37:6 |
| completeness | connection | 33:9 | 40:16 |
| 20:5 | 5:18 19:7 23:4 | contained | correctly 40:20 |
| complied 36:13 | consider 5:12 | 33:14 | corresponden |
| comply 43:14 | 17:24 22:9 | content 26:12 | 14:13 17:7 |
| comprise 11:1 | 25:12 42:16 | contesting 20:5 | 19:7,15 21:2 |
| 14:12 16:14 | consideration | continental | 28:17 30:23 |
| 21:10 | 13:11 | 18:9,24 | 33:23 |
| con't 3:1 | considered | contradicted | costs 32:14 |
| concern 32:13 | 12:13 13:19 | 12:15 16:20 | counsel 7:5 |
| 32:21 | 14:6 20:8 22:5 | contradictions | 46:11,14 47:7 |
| concerns 12:5 | 22:23 25:3,4,4 | 12:22 | 47:10 |
| 19:11 | 26:3 | contradictory | couple 9:10 |
| concluded 7:20 | considering | 23:2 | course 28:3 |
| 45:16 | 32:7 | control 1:8 | 45:13 |
| conclusion 28:9 | consistency | 2:11,21 | court 11:3 |
| | 5:16 8:15,18 | | 14:21 34:18,20 |

| 36:12 42:11 | decide 42:12 | delaware 1:2 | determinations |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| courts 20:19 | decide 42.12 deciding 27:15 | 2:20 5:3,11,22 | 33:4 |
| 40:8 | 32:8 | 5:23 6:4,5,10 | determine |
| create 5:19 | decision 7:20 | · · · | 12:11 33:11 |
| | | 8:6,11,23 9:3,7 | |
| 10:7 | 8:5 9:1,21 10:8 | 11:19 13:6 | determined |
| created 6:6 | 10:12,16,17,20 | 14:19 17:20 | 26:3 27:1 34:4 |
| creates 26:16 | 10:21 11:9,17 | 37:1 46:20 | determines |
| critical 16:8 | 12:12,21 13:17 | delaware's 8:8 | 27:10 |
| 39:8 | 13:20 14:20 | 8:14,16 | determining |
| current 31:11 | 15:6,12,24 | deliberate 7:19 | 10:7 41:11 |
| d | 16:2,4,21 | demand 14:1 | develop 42:4 |
| d 5:1 | 22:11,21,24 | denied 21:19 | developed |
| damage 8:8 | 23:10 24:10 | deny 17:16 | 42:15 |
| darn 38:13 | 25:13 26:8 | department 1:7 | development |
| data 20:13 | 27:2 30:1,6,9 | 2:10,13,20 7:9 | 5:18 36:2 |
| date 1:12 31:12 | 30:14 32:24 | 8:2,18 10:23 | devices 5:7 |
| 34:3 35:22 | 37:12,14,17 | 33:10 39:13 | differences |
| day 40:1 | 38:6 39:22 | deputy 6:18 7:3 | 12:16 |
| days 44:20 | 40:4 | 7:9 | different 23:2 |
| dcmp 17:20 | decisions 6:7 | derived 18:17 | 31:8 35:9 |
| 18:12 19:6,10 | 15:4 19:13 | describing | digital 46:8 |
| 21:5 24:16 | 26:21 | 10:18 | 47:3 |
| 27:3 28:2 | decommissio | description 4:2 | directly 34:19 |
| 36:23 37:5,19 | 12:6 23:20 | 18:14 | discharged |
| 41:13 | 32:12,14,19 | designate 15:15 | 43:9 |
| dcmp's 18:18 | define 9:11 | designed 41:14 | discovery |
| 19:21 21:8 | 16:14 | detailed 18:14 | 38:19,23 39:2 |
| | defined 29:5,8 | details 32:22 | 40:1 |
| de 1:21 2:6,15 2:23 | 42:6 | determination | discussed 12:17 |
| | definition | 9:17 13:12 | discussion 44:9 |
| dean 1:14 5:3 | 36:17,22,23 | 16:21 22:14 | distinct 18:2 |
| deborah 1:15 | 37:1,1 | 25:17 34:14 | distinguish |
| 6:15 | del 6:15 | 36:15 40:16 | 27:9 |
| | | 41:4 42:8 | |
| | | 1111 1210 | |

| division 10:24 | dramatically | encourage 37:2 | 18:2 |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| divisions 29:18 | 19:18 | endangered | epa 23:5 |
| 29:19 39:20 | drastically | 35:3 | es 46:4 |
| dnerc 1:18 | 17:11 | endorse 15:12 | esquire 2:3,12 |
| dnrec 2:21 5:17 | duly 46:5 | engages 9:14 | 2:19 |
| 6:8 7:10,15 | duties 6:8 | engineer 18:11 | essentially 9:19 |
| 8:15 11:8,11 | duty 24:8 37:16 | engineers 5:17 | establish 13:17 |
| 12:2 17:4,6,15 | e | 18:8 | established |
| 18:3,20 19:3 | e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1 | enjoyment 8:10 | 6:10 |
| 20:1 21:15,18 | 5:1,1 17:6 | ensure 8:7 | evaluated |
| 26:24 28:1,7,9 | 19:16 39:21 | entails 24:9 | 40:21 |
| 29:12,18 30:3 | 43:8 | enter 17:21 | evaluating 32:5 |
| 31:1 33:21 | eab 16:8 17:12 | 22:1 | evd 4:2 |
| 36:24 39:15 | 17:16,18 20:2 | entire 5:13 8:3 | everybody 43:8 |
| dnrec's 5:21 | 22:16 | 9:2,4,8,12,15 | evidence 10:9 |
| 36:22 | eab's 19:19 | 9:23,24 10:4 | 12:13,15,20 |
| document 12:1 | earlier 12:17 | 10:14 11:5 | 13:18,19,24 |
| 31:12 36:3 | 17:3 | 15:9 16:14 | 14:15,16,23 |
| documented | east 32:17 | 17:8,19 20:1 | 16:22 26:18 |
| 11:13 31:5 | edward 1:4 2:2 | 21:10,15 22:6 | 28:13 37:16,18 |
| documents | 5:12 | 22:13,20 24:11 | 39:21 40:3 |
| 9:16 10:16,19 | effects 8:14 | 24:14,20 27:17 | exactly 20:14 |
| 14:2,6,14 20:8 | 13:5 18:16 | 27:17 36:14,17 | 28:23 42:1 |
| 20:12,15,20 | 33:19 | 37:2 39:5,12 | example 35:1 |
| 24:24 26:23 | efforts 34:1 | 41:3,4,5,8 | excluded 26:8 |
| 27:4 28:17,20 | eight 35:11 | 42:14 | executive 7:19 |
| 31:21 33:6,9 | either 25:18 | entitled 15:10 | 43:18,20 |
| 35:21 36:2 | electronic 5:7 | 24:19 39:16 | exhibit 10:22 |
| 38:22 | employed | environment | exhibits 14:14 |
| doing 23:6 | 46:11,14 47:8 | 10:23 | exist 20:13,18 |
| doubt 15:2 | 47:11 | environmental | 20:21 |
| dover 1:21 2:23 | employee 46:13 | 1:1,8 2:11,18 | existed 15:20 |
| 5:22 | 47:10 | 2:21 5:3,11 6:5 | expand 17:11 |
| | | 8:8 9:11 12:5 | 19:18 |

| | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| expanding | 15:16 17:22 | followed 7:14 | getting 30:5 | | |
| 22:16 | 18:1,4,5,9,22 | following 7:21 | 32:10 | | |
| expansion 16:5 | 19:4,8,13,24 | 12:3 | give 22:8 24:17 | | |
| expect 39:11,15 | 20:19 24:16 | footnotes 20:22 | 39:14 43:6 | | |
| expectations | 26:17 27:8 | foregoing 46:3 | glancing 34:5 | | |
| 42:23 | 32:16 36:18 | 46:4 47:4 | go 23:3 43:18 | | |
| expected 10:6 | 39:13,18 40:9 | foreseeable | 43:20 44:24 | | |
| expertise 29:3 | 43:2 | 8:14 13:5 | going 11:21 | | |
| expired 11:9 | feedback 30:5 | forgot 32:12 | 25:23 26:11 | | |
| 31:24 | feel 16:2 41:21 | forth 25:24 | 28:3 41:19 | | |
| explanation | file 17:6 20:1 | 27:4 | 42:3 43:5 45:1 | | |
| 35:14 | filed 5:15 8:2 | fortunate 14:9 | good 5:2 7:24 | | |
| external 29:14 | 8:17,21 17:18 | found 8:19 | 15:6 17:2 | | |
| extrapolation | 20:4 | 35:5 | governed 6:10 | | |
| 13:1 | final 9:1 14:17 | four 36:9 41:24 | government | | |
| f | 21:9 26:21 | french 2:14 | 10:13 27:16 | | |
| fact 13:7 25:2 | 30:17 | front 32:15 | 32:16 40:9 | | |
| 29:17,17 | financially | fulfills 6:8 | grant 22:17 | | |
| facts 13:1 14:4 | 46:15 47:11 | fun 38:16 | 44:6 | | |
| failed 13:4 | find 9:13 25:17 | further 12:1 | granted 23:6 | | |
| fails 20:21,24 | 37:15,16 | 13:16 19:15 | 34:13 | | |
| fair 13:1 15:5 | finding 8:18 | 20:24 46:13 | grounds 20:7 | | |
| 16:1,3 | findings 14:16 | 47:9 | 21:1 | | |
| fairly 12:18 | 18:16 | g | guess 28:16 | | |
| far 9:12 16:15 | fine 40:12 | g 5:1 | 35:7 | | |
| farkas 2:4 | firefly 35:2 | gap 11:12 28:1 | guidance 9:24 | | |
| farm 5:19 | first 9:10 11:12 | 31:21 | 10:14,18 43:6 | | |
| favor 7:12 | 20:6 36:6 | gaps 13:14 | guide 15:17 | | |
| 43:24 44:14,16 | fish 34:7 | general 6:6,18 | guidelines | | |
| 44:17 | fisheries 23:5 | 7:3,9 16:7 | 10:24 15:17 | | |
| federal 5:16 | flawed 9:14,21 | generation | 24:16 39:13,18 | | |
| 8:13,16 10:1,3 | foia 27:15 | 5:19 | | | |
| 10:13,14 14:10 | follow 38:1 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Varitant Lacal Colutions | | | | | |

[h - jane] Page 8

| h | horne 1:17 6:16 | included 11:13 | input 24:4 |
|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| h 4:1 | 24:23 25:8,20 | 12:8,20 14:17 | 33:23 |
| halloran 2:4 | 25:23 26:6,22 | 20:9 21:3 | instance 11:18 |
| happening 32:3 | 27:6,13,20 | 26:24 33:6,11 | intended 8:7 |
| heading 34:24 | 28:5 34:9 | 40:22 | interest 27:11 |
| hear 6:7 16:13 | 36:16,21 37:4 | includes 9:4 | 29:3 |
| 29:4 | 37:9 40:14,15 | 10:18 16:16 | interested |
| hearing 1:11 | 40:18,24 41:2 | including 6:9 | 46:15 47:12 |
| 5:10,20 6:3,14 | 41:10,21 42:1 | 12:5 | interlocutory |
| 7:22 8:1,24 | 43:16,20 44:8 | incorporated | 14:16 26:21 |
| 18:3,4 | 44:15,16 | 30:16 | internal 26:18 |
| hearings 6:9 | i | incorrectly | 29:24 |
| 16:8 43:12 | identification | 20:17 | interpretations |
| heck 23:3 | 20:10 | indicating | 12:23 |
| held 11:3 20:19 | identified | 18:17 | interpreting |
| help 39:9,15 | 41:16 | influenced | 24:23 |
| 43:13 | identifies 14:11 | 32:24 | introduce 6:12 |
| helpful 43:3 | 37:20 40:19 | information | 6:17,22 7:6 |
| hereto 46:15 | identify 14:2,5 | 10:11 11:7,13 | 12:20 |
| 47:11 | 38:19 39:11 | 11:15 12:3,8 | introducing |
| hfk.com 2:7 | identifying | 12:10,23 13:13 | 19:15 |
| highway 1:19 | 20:12 | 13:14 15:11,15 | involved 38:9 |
| 2:22 5:21 | immediate 43:5 | 15:21,23 19:3 | issuance 19:8 |
| historically | impact 13:15 | 22:8,23 23:9 | issue 7:20,21 |
| 42:19 | important | 23:15,16,21,22 | 22:1 27:7 39:9 |
| hold 14:22 | 12:10 17:24 | 24:1 25:11,16 | issued 5:17 |
| holden 1:14 5:3 | 25:3 28:11 | 25:18 28:2 | 19:13 32:1 |
| holds 8:24 | inappropriate | 30:4 31:17 | 44:19 |
| holston 3:4 | 19:16 | 32:6,7,23 | items 9:20 |
| 6:20 | include 9:2 | 37:21 38:3 | 17:23 19:20 |
| honorable 6:21 | 11:23 26:18 | 40:6 41:23 | j |
| hope 29:11 | 39:18 | 42:18 43:7 | jane 2:3 6:21 |
| | | inherently 18:6 | 7:1 |
| | | | |

[janella - means] Page 9

| janella 3:3 6:19 | 39:6 41:16 | list 29:11,18 | 44:5 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 45:12 | 42:21 | 31:14 33:24 | makes 14:1,19 |
| january 1:12 | knowing 42:5 | 34:6 | 15:6 22:11 |
| jenna 47:2,15 | knowledge | listing 31:7 | 25:12 |
| job 1:23 12:17 | 46:10 47:6 | lists 37:20 | making 9:17 |
| 22:18 37:15 | known 13:15 | litigants 42:10 | 10:16 11:17 |
| 38:12 40:7,15 | knows 39:15 | little 17:14 | 13:20 16:20 |
| joining 5:7 | 1 | 25:21 31:21 | 25:16 26:8,20 |
| journal 6:3 | labor 43:7 | 32:9 39:14 | 27:2 30:7,9,15 |
| judicial 6:6 | lacking 8:21 | location 1:18 | 39:22 |
| justice 2:13 | language 22:12 | 12:5 23:18,19 | management |
| 7:10 10:23 | law 6:11 9:7 | 32:8,10,11 | 8:6 11:19 13:6 |
| 39:13 | 10:1 14:19 | logically 41:19 | 13:8 17:20 |
| k | 17:10 21:18 | look 28:18 34:6 | 28:22 |
| keeps 22:2 | 22:12 24:18 | 43:1,1 | mandatory |
| kennett 2:5 | 25:14 27:9 | looks 25:14 | 16:18 24:15 |
| kind 16:8 27:16 | 36:13,18,18 | 27:9 | marked 4:3 |
| 32:15 39:8 | 37:1 41:8 | lot 25:24 29:24 | materials 10:19 |
| 42:18 | 42:14 43:14,14 | 32:13 39:7 | 14:11 20:11 |
| kings 1:19 2:22 | laws 27:8 | 43:11 | 21:4,7 35:6 |
| 5:21 | lawsuits 38:9 | m | matter 11:10 |
| kittla 2:4 | lawyers 38:13 | ma'am 29:6 | 15:1 16:10 |
| know 11:5,6,11 | learn 12:22 | made 8:19 | 17:19 18:7 |
| 11:14 12:14 | led 36:3 | 10:12 11:9 | 19:14,17 21:6 |
| 13:19,23 14:6 | letter 38:2 | 15:12,23 19:12 | 21:11,16 |
| 15:10 16:5,19 | letters 29:11 | 34:13 35:23 | matters 16:13 |
| 22:9 23:8,14 | letting 22:17 | 38:6 | mean 9:23 10:1 |
| 23:15,18,19,20 | level 10:3 | mail 39:21 | 33:16 35:18 |
| 23:21,22 26:16 | life 38:8 | mails 17:6 | 37:13 |
| 26:17 28:8,10 | lighting 35:4,9 | 19:17 43:8 | meaning 9:6 |
| 28:12 29:5 | likely 20:13 | make 15:3,3 | 17:11 |
| 32:2,21 36:7 | limited 18:6 | 16:2,17 22:13 | means 9:8 |
| 37:18 38:3,4,5 | 42:10 | 36:14 40:16 | 42:16 |

[meant - order] Page 10

| meant 9:23 | 8:21 17:17 | negated 37:12 | objective 28:7 |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| meet 13:18 | 21:17 36:11 | 37:14 | 28:8 |
| meeting 5:24 | 43:18,20 44:3 | neither 12:17 | obligation 22:2 |
| member 1:15 | 44:5,6,10,18 | 13:2 46:11 | 23:24 25:17 |
| 1:16,17 | move 17:14 | 47:7 | 26:14 40:2 |
| members 6:12 | moves 17:5 | network 11:20 | occurred 35:23 |
| 6:13 7:17 15:5 | mulrooney | 12:24 18:21 | offer 15:16 |
| 17:2 | 1:16 6:16 | 19:11 21:8 | officer 46:2 |
| memos 24:6 | 28:15 29:13,16 | 24:4,6,7 28:16 | officer's 18:4 |
| mentioned | 29:21 30:3,18 | 28:19,23 29:6 | offices 5:21 |
| 27:24 31:20 | 30:22 31:4 | 30:5,16 31:2,8 | offshore 5:19 |
| merely 20:12 | 38:7,11,14,21 | 31:14 32:4 | 12:6 |
| mic 17:14 | 39:3 40:10 | 33:23 | oh 22:15 |
| 30:12 32:12 | 43:23 44:13,14 | never 37:22 | okay 26:22 |
| mic's 25:8 | multiple 44:1 | 39:7 | 29:21 30:18 |
| microphones | mute 5:8 | new 10:7 11:15 | 31:4 37:9 39:3 |
| 5:8 | n | 35:1 | 40:10 41:12,23 |
| mind 41:2 | n 2:1 3:1 5:1 | news 6:3,4 | 43:16 45:10 |
| minimal 24:14 | name 5:2 6:24 | non 20:15 | omitted 17:7 |
| minimum | 7:8 17:3 | 21:14 | 20:11,18 |
| 37:11,13 | national 23:5 | nonspeculative | onerous 39:24 |
| minutes 7:12 | natural 1:7 | 20:7 21:1 | online 5:8 |
| 7:14,16 | 2:10,20 8:3,19 | north 2:14 | opinion 12:16 |
| mitigation | 10:24 33:19 | notary 46:19 | 23:18 |
| 33:19 34:1 | 43:2 | notes 9:10 | opinions 23:3 |
| mjb 2:7 | naylor 2:19 | 26:18 39:18,19 | 32:4 33:10 |
| monitoring | 6:18 45:10,12 | notice 5:20 6:2 | opportunity |
| 33:19 34:1 | need 9:15,19 | 18:22 19:4 | 7:6 15:7 |
| month 11:12 | 41:7,23 42:3,3 | notices 14:12 | opposed 10:3 |
| 27:24 31:20 | 42:5,5 | number 33:4 | 28:6 |
| morning 5:2 | needs 12:11 | 0 | oral 7:20 26:16 |
| 7:24 17:2 | 15:8 | o 5:1 | order 7:21 |
| motion 5:12 | | | 13:10 32:1 |
| 7:12,15 8:1,4 | | | 33:3,14 35:24 |

| 41:15 44:19 | participated | permitting | precedence |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 45:3,7,11 | 31:8,15 | 18:2 34:17 | 36:22 |
| orders 14:15,17 | participating | person 5:6 | prejudice |
| 45:1 | 6:13 | perspective | 27:14 |
| organizations | particular 14:4 | 28:4 | prepared 19:9 |
| 29:2,14 | 32:20 38:22 | petitioner's | 47:3 |
| outcome 46:16 | 39:8 41:12 | 20:20 | preparing 16:9 |
| 47:12 | 43:13 | phone 5:8 31:2 | prescribe 17:21 |
| outer 18:9,24 | parties 10:7 | 35:23 | present 3:2 |
| outside 35:20 | 14:13 46:12,14 | piece 40:6 | presented |
| overall 30:19 | 47:8,11 | pike 2:5 | 10:10 13:2 |
| overcome | partner 24:7 | placed 15:21 | 14:8,24 26:2 |
| 20:21 | partners 11:20 | plain 9:6 | preserve 8:9 |
| overly 21:18 | 11:24 12:16,24 | plan 8:6 11:19 | 11:2 26:15 |
| overrode 32:18 | 18:21 19:11 | 13:6,8 18:10 | 38:21 42:4,18 |
| overton 11:2 | 21:9 24:4,6 | 19:1,2 28:22 | 43:8 |
| p | 28:16,19,23 | please 5:6,8 | preserved |
| p 2:1,1 3:1,1 | 29:6 30:5,16 | 6:22 | 39:23 |
| 5:1 | 31:3,8,15 32:5 | pleasure 44:23 | presume 15:14 |
| page 33:20 | 33:24 34:8 | point 40:24 | presumes 20:3 |
| 34:22,22 | party 14:20 | points 41:5 | presumption |
| paid 16:8 39:7 | 20:5 | policies 17:21 | 20:6,16,21 |
| paper 10:15 | pending 34:14 | 18:12,19 19:6 | 21:14 23:12,13 |
| park 11:2 | people 43:9 | 19:21 21:5 | pretty 28:1 |
| part 12:9,20 | period 11:8 | portion 7:13 | prior 38:8 46:5 |
| 14:3 18:5 | 12:4 31:24 | 11:4,13 | probable 18:15 |
| 19:17 23:10 | permanent | position 28:14 | procedurally |
| 26:19 28:11 | 35:4 | possible 14:24 | 9:21 |
| 30:6,8,14,19 | permit 18:8,11 | possibly 13:18 | procedure 10:2 |
| 36:6 38:11,15 | 23:6 | posted 5:22 | 15:16 19:24 |
| 38:17 42:18 | permits 34:14 | power 5:19 | procedures |
| participate | 34:15 | practice 24:3,5 | 14:10 |
| 31:3 | permitted 7:16 12:19 | practices 42:4 42:15,17 43:14 | proceed 7:23 |

| proceeding | prove 40:2 | | receives 25:11 |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 45:16 47:4 | provide 8:3 | q | recognized |
| proceedings | 9:19 15:22 | qualified 46:7 | 40:9 |
| 7:4 46:3,5,6,9 | 19:1,3 22:5 | quasi 6:6 | recommendat |
| 47:6 | 24:1,4 26:4 | question 22:11 | 26:21 |
| process 10:16 | 37:24 39:12 | 35:15 36:10,11 | recommended |
| 10:20 18:1,6 | | 36:12,21 41:10 | 14:15 23:5 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | provided 11:8 | questions 7:17 | record 5:13 |
| 27:2 30:7,9,15 | 11:14 12:1,9 12:23 17:23 | 24:22 31:18 | |
| 38:19,23 | | 40:13 43:17 | 6:23 7:7 8:3,19 |
| processes 34:17 | 19:21 21:6,11 | quorum 6:14 | 9:1,2,4,5,12,15 |
| produce 35:19 | 21:15 23:11,15 | r | 9:23,24 10:3,4 |
| production | 23:22,23 24:13 | r 2:1 3:1 5:1 | 10:4,7,10,15 |
| 5:13 | 30:19 31:12 | randall 1:17 | 11:1,4,4,5,6,14 |
| program 18:21 | 32:23 33:8 | 6:16 | 11:24 12:9,21 |
| 19:11 21:8 | 38:3 42:22 | rather 10:9 | 14:3,7,12,18,24 |
| 30:16 31:3,15 | provides 10:13 | 16:12 | 15:9,9,19,20,20 |
| programs | 34:3 | read 14:22 | 16:14 17:8,10 |
| 17:20 | providing 35:6 | reading 33:2 | 17:11,18,19,21 |
| project 5:18 | public 5:23 6:2 | reads 33:21 | 19:16,17,22 |
| 12:6 25:1 29:4 | 8:24 11:8,21 | really 21:24 | 20:1,4,6,9,19 |
| 32:10 | 11:22 12:4 | 36:9 | 20:22 21:3,6 |
| projects 32:17 | 15:5 18:3,21 | reason 15:5 | 21:10,15 22:2 |
| proof 22:5 | 19:4 21:7 | reasonable | 22:4,6,13,20,22 |
| proper 15:4 | 27:16 31:24 | 20:6 21:1 | 23:9,11 24:8,9 |
| proposal 23:3 | 32:13,21 46:19 | | 24:12,14,20 |
| proposed 8:12 | published 6:3 | reasonably 8:13 13:4 | 25:2,15 26:10 |
| 18:14,18 | purports 37:23 | | 26:15 27:11,17 |
| prosecute | purpose 5:10 | rebut 20:6 | 27:17 29:2 |
| 12:18 | purposes 42:8 | 21:14 23:12 | 33:8 34:2 |
| protect 13:8 | pursuant 6:14 | rebuttal 7:14 | 35:16,21 36:14 |
| 33:19 41:14 | 21:5 | 7:16 | 36:17,20 37:2 |
| protection 8:7 | put 22:11 35:3 | receive 22:4 | 37:8,20,22,24 |
| protective 35:2 | | received 12:3 | 39:5,12 40:22 |
| | | 25:1 30:10,15 | 41:3,5,8,17 |

[record - rules] Page 13

| 42:4,12,12,13 | relating 18:15 | require 8:2 | responsibilities |
|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 42:14,19 43:11 | 29:24 | 18:12 19:6 | 6:9 |
| 44:2 46:9 47:5 | relative 25:1 | 44:19 | restrictions |
| recorded 21:9 | 46:13 47:10 | required 9:16 | 33:18 35:8 |
| 46:6 | relevant 10:20 | 13:5 16:17 | retain 42:7 |
| recording 46:8 | 13:14 22:10 | 18:20 19:20 | revealed 30:2 |
| 47:4 | 26:4 27:1,4,10 | 22:4 24:15 | review 9:16 |
| records 30:19 | 27:15 38:5 | 35:13 36:5,7,8 | 16:12 17:22 |
| 30:21 31:1 | relied 21:2 24:1 | 37:7,21,24 | 18:1,5,22 19:4 |
| recreation 8:9 | 36:17 | 39:4 | 19:19,20 22:16 |
| reduced 46:7 | relies 10:9 | requirement | 22:19 27:5,16 |
| reflected 38:1 | rephrase 31:14 | 32:19 35:3,10 | 28:7,8,11 41:3 |
| reflecting 28:8 | report 18:4 | requirements | reviewed 8:15 |
| reg 43:15 | 29:23 | 21:5 33:5,15 | 19:7 31:6 |
| regard 13:12 | reported 1:22 | 34:7 | reviewing |
| 23:10 | reporter 17:13 | requires 8:11 | 14:20,20 18:8 |
| regarding 12:4 | 30:11 44:24 | 10:4 11:19 | 28:1 36:12 |
| 23:19,20 29:3 | 45:6,10,14 | 20:5 28:22 | richardson |
| regs 26:17 | reports 11:23 | 36:14 37:5 | 1:20 |
| 36:13 43:1 | 17:6 19:7,9 | 41:9 | right 13:21 |
| 44:18 | 20:18 21:2 | reserve 7:13 | 15:3 26:5 27:7 |
| regular 19:10 | 29:19 30:20 | resource 10:24 | 27:7 33:20 |
| 31:2 | 36:4,5,7 | resources 1:7 | 34:1 35:16,18 |
| regulations | represented | 2:10,20 8:3,19 | 35:24 38:20,20 |
| 6:11 8:16 9:11 | 6:21 7:3 11:21 | 33:20 43:2 | 40:7,23 41:1 |
| 10:1 22:12 | representing | respect 42:20 | 44:10 |
| 24:19 | 7:1,10 17:4 | respectfully | robbins 1:20 |
| rejected 25:7 | request 12:7 | 17:16 21:19 | robert 1:16 |
| 25:10 | 20:14,15 22:17 | respects 9:10 | 6:16 |
| rejects 22:7 | 26:11 | response 9:9 | robinson 1:22 |
| related 28:17 | requests 17:9 | 18:22 19:5 | 46:2,18 |
| 38:22 41:23 | 17:16 21:19 | 32:22 | roll 44:10 |
| 46:11 47:7 | 23:14 | responses 12:7 | rules 8:16 16:9 |
| | | 12:9 | |

| ruling 10:5 | 37:12,13,18 | significant 11:7 | staff 6:13 24:5 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| S | 39:21 | 12:4 | standard 34:6 |
| s 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 | secretary's | significantly | standpoint |
| sapp 3:3 6:20 | 9:21 12:12,21 | 8:21 | 26:23 |
| sapp 3.3 0.20 sawyer 2:12 | 13:9 17:22 | silence 5:6 | start 45:1 |
| 7:3,8 17:3 | 22:21 24:10 | similarly 9:3 | starting 34:22 |
| · · | 27:5 32:24 | 18:24 | state 1:2 5:23 |
| sawyer.traver 2:16 | 33:3,14 35:24 | simply 16:17 | 6:4 9:9,14,18 |
| saying 32:17 | 40:4 41:4,15 | 29:22 37:10 | 11:14,15,18 |
| 37:4 42:21 | section 6:15 | site 20:22 | 13:21,24 14:1 |
| says 11:12 22:6 | 14:11 | skills 46:10 | 15:20,22 18:7 |
| 24:7 41:13 | see 16:13 31:16 | 47:6 | 21:24 23:6 |
| 42:14 43:15 | 33:17 35:11 | sorry 30:12,13 | 24:13 26:15 |
| scenic 8:9 | 41:18 43:2,12 | 32:11 38:10 | 28:23 29:13 |
| scope 19:18 | 43:12 | sought 12:2 | 34:13 43:6 |
| 22:16,19 42:6 | seeking 11:15 | speak 37:19 | 46:20 |
| searching | 15:19 32:4 | speaker 38:16 | state's 5:23 |
| 14:22 | seem 34:2 | speakers 44:1 | 18:5 32:18 |
| sec 27:19 | seems 16:11 | speaking 31:1 | stated 17:2 |
| second 20:10 | 33:4 35:19 | speaks 33:17 | statement |
| 43:22,23 44:7 | 36:1 39:10 | 33:18 | 18:13 |
| 44:8 | sense 26:10 | species 35:3 | statements |
| secretary 5:13 | 30:21 | specific 12:8 | 11:22 |
| 5:23 6:7 8:5 | session 7:19 | 15:15 20:15 | states 8:23 9:3 |
| 9:1,3,5,16 11:9 | 43:19,21 | 21:14 22:3 | 11:3 |
| 11:16 12:13 | set 18:16 | specifically 8:7 | stern 47:2,15 |
| 13:4,20,24 | sets 27:3 | 13:9 26:7 | stewardship |
| 14:7 15:6,11 | several 13:7 | 41:14 | 34:6 |
| 15:23 16:4,17 | shelf 18:10 | specificity | street 2:14 |
| 17:12 22:3,7 | 19:1 | 20:11 | stuff 23:8 25:24 |
| 23:9,17 24:1,6 | show 24:8 | specifies 40:19 | subaqueous |
| 25:12,15 26:20 | sided 40:6 | speculative | 34:15 |
| 27:10 32:1 | signature 46:17 | 20:15 21:14 | subject 8:12 |
| | 47:14 | | 25:19 |

| | • 24.10 | 4.1. 20.11 | 2604124 |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| submission | superior 34:18 | takes 28:11 | 36:8 41:24 |
| 33:12 | 34:20 | talk 24:5 | time 1:13 7:13 |
| submissions | supplement | talked 28:15 | 7:18 11:15,22 |
| 33:22 | 15:19 17:10 | 29:22 | 26:11 32:3 |
| submit 21:24 | 34:21 | tell 14:1 28:23 | 35:8 40:1 |
| 37:21 | support 10:21 | 31:21 42:13 | 42:15,24 |
| submitted 8:20 | 19:24 22:22 | term 36:19 | times 23:1 |
| 10:5 14:14 | 24:9 25:19 | terms 31:5 | today 5:5 7:10 |
| 21:4,7 25:24 | 35:15 37:17 | 39:12 | 17:3,5,17 |
| 28:2 33:6 34:3 | 40:3 42:8 | testifying 46:5 | 42:21 |
| 35:22 36:5 | supported 10:8 | testimony | today's 5:10,20 |
| 37:5,5,7 | 10:8 12:12 | 14:14 18:4 | 7:4 |
| submitting | 13:17 16:2,22 | thank 6:24 7:2 | together 21:7 |
| 37:23 | 22:21 | 7:24 16:23,24 | tonight 43:5 |
| substantial | supporting | 17:1,14 21:19 | took 28:14 |
| 10:9 13:18 | 19:2 | 21:23 24:20,21 | touch 45:8 |
| 28:13 37:16 | supports 22:23 | 25:9 33:1 | touches 13:11 |
| 40:3 42:8 | 24:8,9 | 40:10 44:21,22 | tough 35:22 |
| substantially | supposed 10:10 | 45:14 | trail 10:15 |
| 12:12 16:22 | supreme 11:3 | theorizes 20:17 | transcriber |
| 22:20,21 25:19 | sure 16:17 | thing 15:18 | 47:1 |
| substantive | 27:13,20 28:5 | 32:15 36:8 | transcript 45:1 |
| 8:17 | 28:19 29:7 | things 22:3,5 | 45:4,7,11 47:3 |
| substation 23:4 | 31:15 33:13 | 26:2 32:2 | 47:5 |
| suggest 16:15 | suspect 29:23 | 35:20 38:4 | transcriptionist |
| 39:6 | sworn 46:5 | 39:17 40:19 | 46:8 |
| suggesting 26:6 | t | 41:24 | traver 2:12 7:3 |
| 26:16 | t 4:1 | think 9:23 25:6 | 7:8,9 17:1,3,13 |
| sum 21:17 | take 7:5 13:4 | 26:9 27:3 29:9 | 17:15 27:3 |
| summaries | 36:22 39:19 | 34:23 36:6 | 29:7,10 30:8 |
| 14:15 26:18 | 45:12 | 41:7 42:15,20 | 30:11,13,20,24 |
| summary 23:17 | taken 33:22 | 42:24 43:4,5 | 31:6,9,13 33:2 |
| summer 35:8 | 46:3,12 47:9 | three 11:12 | 33:13 34:5 |
| | 40.3,14 47.3 | 27:24 31:20 | 35:18 36:4 |

[traver - zoom] Page 16

| 45:6,8 true 9:12 46:9 47:5 try 41:18,19,22 tuesday 1:12 turn 30:12 two 5:16 types 10:19 typewriting 46:7 typically 16:6 u ultimate 22:23 36:3 ultimately 30:1 40:17 unanimously 44:18 under 23:3 underlying 11:10 12:18 13:3 40:23 undermined 32:16 understand 28:19 33:13 understanding 24:24 30:24 unidentified 38:16 united 11:3 unsupported | usdoj 43:2 use 8:9 36:19 40:21 used 26:7 uses 10:3 37:22 utilized 11:16 33:10,11 v v 1:6 vague 17:9 virtual 5:22 virtually 13:12 volpe 11:3 vote 44:10,17 vs 11:3 w want 16:13,14 29:4 40:20 42:5 wants 15:3 16:3 39:20 wards 20:16 watershed 34:6 way 6:8 16:1,3 35:24 website 6:1 weigh 27:18 weight 22:8 wetlands 34:15 vicks 1:15 6:15 40:11,12 44:5 44:11,12 | wildlife 34:7 wilmington 2:6 2:15 wind 5:18,19 21:4 28:2,3 32:6 33:7 35:6 37:21,23 winds 18:9 witness 46:4 word 9:7 10:3 37:22 40:20 words 9:6 work 39:14 43:9 worked 38:8 39:7 would've 34:8 write 24:6 writing 14:22 18:23 24:2,4 31:5 written 7:21 19:13 21:9 44:19 x x 4:1 y yeah 25:22 27:23 33:16 40:12,18 45:12 year 35:8 | zach 6:18 39:14 zachary 2:19 zone 13:5,15 18:16 zoom 26:11,12 |
|--|---|--|---|
| 17:10 21:18 | 44:11,12 | | |

DELAWARE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

Part V. Depositions and Discovery

Title V, Rule 30

4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

(e) Submission to witness; changes; signing. When the testimony is fully transcribed, the deposition shall be submitted to the witness for examination and shall be read to the witness, unless such examination and reading are waived by the witness and by the parties. Any changes in form or substance which the witness desires to make shall

substance which the witness desires to make shall be entered upon the deposition by the officer with a statement of the reasons given by the witness for making them. The deposition shall then be signed by the witness, unless the parties by stipulation waive the signing or the witness is ill or cannot be found or refuses to sign. If the deposition is not signed by the witness within 30 days after the date when the reporter notifies the witness and counsel by mail of the availability for examination by the witness, the officer shall sign it and state on the record the fact of the waiver or of the illness or absence of the witness or the fact of the refusal to sign together with the reason, if

any, given therefor; and the deposition may then be

used as fully as though signed, unless on a motion to suppress under Rule 32(d) the Court holds that the reasons given for the refusal to sign require rejection of the deposition in whole or in part.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES

ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1,

2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE STATE RULES

OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted

fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions'
confidentiality and security policies and practices
should be directed to Veritext's Client Services
Associates indicated on the cover of this document or
at www.veritext.com.