1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
3	EUGENE DIVISION
4	MET CENT CACCARDIA DOCE THE TANKS
5	KELSEY CASCADIA ROSE JULIANA;) XIUHTEZCATL TONATIUH M.,)
6	through his Guardian Tamara) Roske-Martinez, et al.)
7	Plaintiff,) Case No. 6:15-cv-01517-AA
8	V.) May 12 2021
9) May 13, 2021 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) et al.
10	Defendant.)
11)
12	
13	
14	
15	TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE
16	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
17	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANN L. AIKEN
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S):
3	JULIA A. OLSON Our Children's Trust 1216 Lincoln Street Eugene, OR 97401
5	FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S):
6	ANDREA K. RODGERS Our Children's Trust
7	3026 NW Esplanade Seattle, WA 98117
8	FOR THE PLAINTIFF(S):
9	PHILIP L. GREGORY Gregory Law Group
10	1250 Godetia Drive Redwood City, CA 94062
11	
12	FOR THE DEFENDANT(S): SEAN C. DUFFY
13	U.S. Department of Justice Environment & Natural
14	Resources Division 150 M Street NE Weakington DC 20002
15	Washington, DC 20002
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT(S): FRANK J. SINGER
17	U.S. Department of Justice Environment & Natural
18	Resources Division PO Box 7611
19	Washington, DC 20044
20	
21	COURT REPORTER: Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC
22	United States District Courthouse 1000 SW Third Avenue, Room 301
23	Portland, OR 97204 (503)326-8191
24	
25 25	* * *

1 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 2 (May 13, 2021) 3 (Telephonic hearing:) DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: Now, is the time for Civil 4 Case No. 15-01517. Juliana, et al. v. United States of 5 America, et al., for a status conference. 6 7 If you could please introduce yourselves for the record, beginning with plaintiffs. 8 9 MS. OLSON: Good morning, Your Honor. This is 10 Julia Olson on behalf of the plaintiff. 11 MR. GREGORY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is 12 Phillip Gregory on behalf of the plaintiffs. 13 MS. RODGERS: And good morning, Your Honor. This is Andrea Rodgers. Also on behalf of the plaintiffs. 14 15 DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: For defendants? That's all for the plaintiffs today. 16 MS. RODGERS: 17 THE COURT: Thank you. MR. DUFFY: Good morning, Your Honor. 18 This is Sean Duffy on behalf of the federal defendants. And also on 19 20 the call is Frank Singer, and it will just be the two of us. 21 THE COURT: So I have two purposes for this call. 22 The first is to arrange and set a date for oral argument. That's the first order of business. And I'm looking at 23 24 sometime in June. 25 Have you had discussions at all about what dates might

work?

MS. OLSON: Good morning, Your Honor. This is

Julia Olson. Counsel has not conferred on potential dates, but
we are very open in June, with the exception of -- June 17, 18,
and 21 are dates that do not work; but, otherwise, we are very
flexible. And the earlier, the better for plaintiffs' side.

THE COURT: Well, the 18th doesn't work. We have re-entry court, and I have re-entry court on the 15th, and so -- I have a full calendar on the 16th, so -- and you have -- the 17th is out.

For the government?

MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Your Honor. Federal defendants have conferred, and we have no conflicts in the month of June.

THE COURT: Oh, gosh. I have conflicts all over the place.

How about -- how about the 24th or 25th -- 23rd or 25th of June?

MS. OLSON: That works on plaintiffs' side, Your Honor. Thank you.

MR. DUFFY: And either of those dates work for federal defendants as well. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Let's do it on the 25th.

10:00. I'm assuming it will be 10:00 to 12:00 -- is that a fair assumption -- at max?

MS. OLSON: That works for plaintiffs, Your Honor.

MR. DUFFY: And that works for federal defendants as

well.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Now I have a second part of this set -- this discussion.

I am going to refer you to Judge Tom Coffin for settlement discussions, and I'm going to note for the record that Judge Coffin is a re-called magistrate, which means he essentially retired in 2016 and has been on recall status for the sole purpose of presiding over settlement conferences, which he conducts pursuant to the court rules which provide that all communications related to mediation are privileged and confidential and, as well, voluntary, with the consent of the parties.

As a mediator, he does not rule on any issue in the litigation but strictly limits his involvement to assisting the parties to come to a consensual resolution of the case that's a mutually agreeable result with all the parties.

He has been doing this service as a member of the court since I -- long before I came to the bench, and he's been instrumental in -- or an Oregon reputation for resolutions of complex litigation. I know all of you know him, and I know all of you know he understands and knows this case, and I'm confident that his work with both the DOJ and -- for the DOJ, as a settlement judge, and with and for many different

environmental groups in this state that let people know and respect his work.

I'm sending you there purposefully, and I -- I expect you to go there before the argument in this case and maybe afterwards. And it's my hope that that -- that this will lead to a different -- it will augment the arguments in this case, and I think it's an appropriate moment for everybody to take a look at decisions they need to make.

I have this matter to review as well.

So I think it's a tremendous opportunity, and so I am going to leave it, at this juncture, to ask you to schedule that with Judge Coffin.

You can go to -- you know, what I have indicated is I expect you to go meet with him, and if -- if one or the other of you say, "We will not negotiate," you can tell him that.

But you will tell him that first before you tell that to me.

Because I do believe that it has -- this case is in a position, given many things that have intervened in the year that this case was on appeal and changes that have taken please legally and in the world, that it's a moment in time that I think people should take advantage of.

How we resolve complex litigation when the courtroom is not necessarily the best place to do it -- it's one place to do it, but there are ways in which you're able to utilize having the Court serve as the galvanizer or the convener, so to speak,

that allows people to go to a table with a mediator to resolve disputes that are both resolvable through our various branches of government.

So, with that said, I would ask you to make contact -work with Cathy Kramer, my courtroom deputy, and Judge Coffin
directly to schedule a time for that settlement discussion.

Any comments?

MS. OLSON: Your Honor, this is Julia Olson for the plaintiffs, and we are happy to utilize the services of Magistrate Judge Coffin to discuss settlement with the defendants and look forward to doing that.

One related issue: As the Court knows, we have an approaching deadline to file a petition for cert with the Supreme Court, pursuant to the COVID order, which allows for 150 days from the time of judgment. And it is plaintiffs' position that if this case ever goes to the Supreme Court, it would be better to do so upon a final judgment or final order, if -- if we get to that place outside of a settlement.

So what we intend to do is file an application for a 60-day extension of time to that July 12 deadline that we currently face and are hopeful that will be granted. If that's not granted, we are faced with a decision point at that point. And so we will keep the Court alerted as to the status of what happens with that application for an extension of time.

And, obviously, the Court's decision on the motion for

leave to amend and any progress the parties begin to make on settlement -- on the settlement front will also weigh heavily on that ultimate decision that the plaintiffs make.

THE COURT: I think those are -- does the government have anything to say?

MR. DUFFY: I have nothing to say with respect to what the plaintiffs just raised.

If I could raise a separate issue? We're currently -- the current -- we're currently operating under the Justice

Department's Workforce Safety Plan; and, under that, remote meetings and hearings are strongly encouraged over in-person appearances. Your Honor didn't address whether the hearing would be remote or in person, but we would request a remote hearing.

THE COURT: Who's speaking? Who's speaking?

MR. DUFFY: I'm sorry. This is Sean Duffy for federal defendants.

THE COURT: Mr. Duffy, do you practice in Oregon?

MR. DUFFY: Yes.

THE COURT: We're under an order of remoteness.

We're remote. Judge Coffin has been doing his -- all of his hearings remotely.

So I don't know. We -- we don't -- all of our mediations are either -- he does them by phone. And when we're out from under the Court's general order and are -- everyone is fully

vaccinated, we will return to the courtroom. But I'm aware that Judge Coffin has been doing this work remotely for well over a year. We all have. None of us -- I go to the courthouse only for video. I have done no in-court work. We're under a court order; so that is not a problem.

Number two, you know, people with authority -- I know he'll encourage and want that to take place.

I am confident that the issues, Ms. Olson, that you've raised are all good subjects for mediation discussion and -- and decision-making; so I'm sure that will get taken up.

And I'm going to ask that you be -- at least you have a session before the argument in this case. Because I'm happy to bump the argument, if I need to, to accommodate ongoing negotiation. In other words, everyone should take a look at what this case is about and what -- the best way to move it forward and how to take advantage of a variety of a couple of branches of government -- maybe all three -- working together to resolve disputes in the set-in timelines and the set-in goals, aspirations, and expectations.

You know, I read all the -- I read all the opinion, and I read the dissent. And I know that this case, and I have read -- people who have no idea, we have 3,000 issues that were asked of the Court to take judicial notice of on each side. We understand the information in this case very well.

I would hope that you are grateful and are appreciative of

having this opportunity to look globally at how this case may be resolved that moves forward what we understand and -- and what I refer to in there as a crisis.

So do not -- do not see that as just a ministerial step in what you need to do to make the next legal decision. Take a step back from it and take a look at what you need to do to move forward on what you all know are issues in this case that can be resolved, and there can be issues that can make progress that will best address the rights that have been acknowledged in the Ninth Circuit's opinion.

So, with that said, please make contact with Judge Coffin's chambers shortly. He'll -- I'll be more than willing to accommodate time schedules. And he, I know, has been. When I asked him if he would do this, he said, "I will clear the deck to take a -- take my best efforts to work on trying to mediate this case."

So please take advantage of him. It is not just a ministerial check-the-box pro forma referral. All right?

Let me know what I can do next. And we'll set that hearing date for Friday the 25th at 10:00.

And, again, that date can be moved, and the decision points can be moved, and some of those decision points can be revisited.

So, with that said, is there anything else I can do to be helpful?

Your Honor, this is Julia Olson. 1 MS. OLSON: Just 2 one last question. On the oral argument, is it -- my 3 understanding is that will be telephonic and not video. Is 4 that correct? At this time, that's correct. 5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much for your 6 MS. OLSON: 7 assistance today and for having this conference. The plaintiffs are on the public call line, and we really 8 appreciate the opportunity for them to be able to listen in. 9 10 THE COURT: I understand that. The case took a very 11 long time to get back. You know, we are -- have been slammed 12 with cases dealing with any number of other topics, and our criminal justice system is stretched about as thin as it can 13 be, and we will -- we will get at this, but it's -- and I know 14 15 there's some deadlines that people want to meet, but this is our best effort to get to it as quickly as we can, but it's 16 17 certainly more than waiting a year to issue a decision. So with that said -- again, is there anything else? 18 19 MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 That's all for plaintiff. MS. OLSON: MR. DUFFY: No more from the defendants. 21 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your time. 23 We're in recess.

(Hearing concluded.)

24

25

CERTIFICATE

Juliana, et al. v. The United States of America, et al.

6:15-1517-AA

Telephonic Status Conference

May 13, 2021

I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the telephonic proceedings heard via conference call, taken by stenographic means. Due to the telephonic connection, parties appearing via speakerphone or cell phone or wearing masks due to coronavirus, speakers overlapping when speaking, speakers not identifying themselves before they speak, fast speakers, the speaker's failure to enunciate, and/or other technical difficulties that occur during telephonic proceedings, this certification is limited by the above-mentioned reasons and any technological difficulties of such proceedings occurring over the speakerphone at the United States District Court of Oregon in the above-entitled cause.

A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature, or digitally signed signature is not certified.

/s/Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC

Official Court Reporter Signature Date: 5/13/2021

Oregon CSR No. 98-0346 CSR Expiration Date: 9/30/2023