In The Matter Of:

Place ID: 135845

Air Quality Permit No. 55223

Rosemont Copper Project

ADEQ

1

3

5 6

7

10

11

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24 25

26

27 28 29

30

No. 13A-A006-DEQ No. 13A-A007-DEQ

No. 13A-A010-DEQ

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER No. 14

Granting Rosemont's Motion for Leave to File

Denying ADEQ's Motion in Limine Regarding Misael Cabrera

Denying Rosemont's Motion in Limine

Denying ADEQ's Motion in Limine Regarding Dr. Fisher's Supplemental Witnesses

Granting SSSR's Motion for Leave to File

Mr. Zeagler's Request for Clarification

Establishing Supplemental Filing Deadlines

Rosemont's Motion for Leave to File

On July 1, 2013, Rosemont filed a Motion requesting that it be allowed to file supplemental documents and witness lists after reviewing the other parties' Prehearing Briefs. SSSR filed a Response stating that it had no objection. No other party filed a Response.

Rosemont stated that if necessary, it would file the supplemental material on July 8, 2013, which was before the deadline for other parties to respond to the Rosemont's Motion. Rosemont did not file any supplemental material, but the ALJ does not have sufficient information to determine whether Rosemont did not find it appropriate to file or whether it was waiting for the ALJ to issue a ruling.

Office of Administrative Hearings 1400 West Washington, Suite 101 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 (602) 542-9826

In other pending Motions, Rosemont and ADEQ have argued that certain Appellants have not adequately disclosed their witness's anticipated testimony. Considering the pending Motions collectively, it is appropriate to allow the parties an opportunity to supplement their existing filings.

Rosemont may make a supplemental filing addressing issues it believes

Appellants did not adequately describe prior to submission of their Prehearing Briefs.

All other parties will then be given an opportunity to file any objections to Rosemont's filing.

IT IS ORDERED that on or before July 18, 2013, Rosemont may make a supplemental filing addressing issues, if any, that Appellants did not address in detail prior to the submission of Prehearing Briefs;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED on or before July 22, 2013, the other parties may file any objections to Rosemont's supplemental filing.

ADEQ's Motion in Limine Regarding Misael Cabrera

ADEQ argues that Mr. Cabrera's testimony should be excluded because he had no involvement in ADEQ's administrative review and issuance of the Permit, and because Mr. Zeagler did not provide a summary of Mr. Cabrera's proposed testimony.

Mr. Zeagler filed a Response arguing that he did disclose Mr. Cabrera's proposed testimony, which relates to AERMOD modeling procedures, and that this information is related to an issue he has raised on appeal.

The relevance of evidence is best considered during the hearing, consequently ADEQ's Motion in Limine is denied.

Mr. Zeagler's witness list, however, does not comply with Case Management Order No. 10, because he did not provide a fair statement of <u>each</u> witness's testimony. Instead, Mr. Zeagler provided only a listing of witnesses and a listing of issues, with the import being that all witnesses will testify on all issues.¹

Considering the other pending Motions, it is appropriate to allow Mr. Zeagler the opportunity to provide the required information.

¹ The parties are reminded that needless cumulative evidence may be excluded. A.R.S. § 41-1092.07(D).

IT IS ORDERED that on or before July 18, 2013, Mr. Zeagler must provide a fair summary of each witness's expected testimony;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Mr. Zeagler does not provide the required information, his witnesses will not be allowed to testify;²

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED on or before July 22, 2013, the other parties may file any objections to Mr. Zeagler's supplemental filing.

Rosemont's Motion in Limine

Mr. Zeagler

Rosemont argues that Mr. Zeagler should be excluded from the hearing because he did not file a Prehearing Brief. Rosemont argues that such a filing was mandatory based on discussion at the prehearing conference, but does not cite any portion of the audio record to support its argument. Alternatively, Rosemont argues that Mr. Zeagler's evidence should be limited to issues raised in his public comments and notice of appeal.

In his Response, Mr. Zeagler argues Rosemont's Motion should be disregarded because it was filed after the deadline. Mr. Zeagler also filed a Request for Clarification that is considered as a Supplemental Response.

Although Rosemont's Motion was filed after the deadline, it could not have been filed before that date because that was also the deadline for filing Prehearing Briefs. The ALJ's intention was to allow the parties to file Prehearing Briefs, but not to require them. Consequently, without a specific citation to the audio record to show that filing was mandatory, Rosemont's Motion is denied. The issues for hearing are however limited to those issues raised in the Appellants' comments. See A.R.S. § 41-1092.03(B).

IT IS ORDERED denying Rosemont's Motion in Limine regarding Mr. Zeagler.

SSSR

Rosemont argues that evidence related to alternatives cited in the Forest Service Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") should be excluded because these are outside the scope of the hearing and are not relevant to this matter. SSSR filed a Response asserting that the EIS information is relevant to its Issue 6. Rosemont's

² Or, in cases where other parties have also named these witnesses, Mr. Zeagler's examination will be limited to the issues raised by the other parties.

³ It appears that neither Mr. Zeagler's nor Dr. Fisher's comments have been listed as proposed exhibits.

argument that the EIS is not relevant is best considered at the hearing. Consequently, Rosemont's Motion in Limine is denied.

Rosemont also argues that SSSR should be required to provide more information related to Dr. Hart's calculations. Rosemont asserts that it is "entitled to notice and review of Dr. Hart's alternate calculations prior to the hearing," but it provides no legal authority to support this assertion.

SSSR's Response shows that Dr. Hart has not yet done any calculations.

Rosemont has not demonstrated that SSSR must provide any additional information relating to Dr. Hart's proposed testimony.

IT IS ORDERED denying Rosemont's Motion in Limine regarding SSSR.

Dr. Fisher

Rosemont argues that in his Prehearing Brief Dr. Fisher has raised for the first time a claim that ADEQ's decision was based on political pressure (i.e., that this claim was not raised in Dr. Fisher's comments).

In Response, Dr. Fisher argues that this evidence is relevant to the issues for hearing and that Rosemont presented no authority to show that "newly discovered evidence" that "could not have been stated in Appellant's comments or notice of appeal" should be excluded.

The relevance of evidence is best considered at the hearing. Consequently, Rosemont's Motion is denied. The parties are advised however, that the issues for hearing are limited to those raised in Appellants' comments. See A.R.S. § 41-1092.03(B).

IT IS ORDERED denying Rosemont's Motion in Limine regarding Dr. Fisher.

ADEQ's Motion in Limine Regarding Dr. Fisher's Supplemental Witnesses

ADEQ argues that Dr. Fisher's supplemental witnesses should be excluded because he has not demonstrated that these witnesses have relevant evidence. ADEQ also argues that Dr. Fisher did not comply with Case Management Order No. 10 because he did not provide a summary of each witness's proposed testimony.

Dr. Fisher filed a Response asserting that it "self-evident" that these witnesses' testimony "was tied directly" to his supplemental exhibits. Dr. Fisher also argues that the proposed testimony is relevant to his argument that political involvement and

political interference were a factor in ADEQ's deliberations related to the Rosemont Mine.

Dr. Fisher has not complied with the requirement that he provide a fair summary of each witness's proposed testimony.

IT IS ORDERED that on or before July 18, 2013, Dr. Fisher must provide a fair summary of each witness's proposed testimony;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Dr. Fisher does not provide the required information, his witnesses will not be allowed to testify;⁴

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED on or before July 22, 2013, the other parties may file any objections to Dr. Fisher's supplemental filing.

ADEQ's Motions in Limine Regarding Trevor Baggiore and Robert Arpino

ADEQ filed Motions in Limine regarding Trevor Baggiore and Robert Arpino. SSSR filed a Response stating that it had no objection to those Motions. No other Responses were filed.

IT IS ORDERED granting ADEQ's Motions in Limine regarding Trevor Baggiore and Robert Arpino.

SSSR's Leave to File

SSSR requests leave to file supplemental exhibits related to ADEQ's meeting notes.

IT IS ORDERED that on or before July 18, 2013, SSSR may file its proposed exhibits;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED on or before July 22, 2013, the other parties may file any objections to SSSR's supplemental filing.

Mr. Zeagler's Request for Clarification

Mr. Zeagler filed a Request for Clarification that was considered as a Supplemental Response to Rosemont's Motion in Limine. Because the ALJ has denied that Motion in Limine and the deadline for filing Prehearing Briefs has passed, Mr. Zeagler's Request is moot.⁵

Done this day: July 16, 2013.

⁴ Or, in cases where other parties have also named these witnesses, Dr. Fisher's examination will be limited to the issues raised by the other parties.

⁵ The ALJ does not find it necessary to determine whether Mr. Zeagler's Request should be considered a request for legal advice.

/s/ Thomas Shedden Thomas Shedden Administrative Law Judge

Copy e-mailed this 16th day of July, 2013 to all persons on the approved mailing list:

By: autogenerated and posted to

https://portal.azoah.com/oedf/documents/13A-A006-DEQ/index.html