

JEFFREY H. WOOD
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Environment & Natural Resources Division
U.S. Department of Justice

LISA LYNNE RUSSELL, Chief
GUILLERMO A. MONTERO, Assistant Chief
SEAN C. DUFFY (NY Bar. No. 4103131)
MARISSA A. PIROPATO (MA Bar. No. 651630)
CLARE BORONOW (admitted to MD bar)
FRANK J. SINGER (CA Bar No. 227459)
ERIKA NORMAN (CA Bar No. 268425)
Trial Attorneys
Natural Resources Section
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 305-0445
Facsimile: (202) 305-0506
sean.c.duffy@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON
EUGENE DIVISION**

KELSEY CASCADIA ROSE JULIANA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 6:15-CV-01517-AA

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE
PLAINTIFFS' CORRECTED
PROPOSED PRETRIAL ORDER**

Defendants hereby move to strike the Corrected Proposed Pretrial Order filed unilaterally by Plaintiffs on October 18, 2018. ECF No. 394. The Corrected Proposed Pretrial Order is improper because it replaces one misrepresentation regarding the position of Defendants during the conferral process with another. Although Plaintiffs have clarified that Defendants have not agreed to any of the 728 “agreed facts” set forth by Plaintiffs, they now accuse Defendants of “refus[ing] to confer with the Plaintiffs on the Proposed Pretrial Order.” ECF No. 394 at 3 n.2. In fact, the opposite is true. Defendants made multiple attempts to confer with Plaintiffs regarding the content of the pretrial order, including two specific suggestions of how the parties could reach a compromise. Plaintiffs rejected both proposals and unilaterally filed their proposed order on Monday, October 15 despite Defendants’ offer to continue conferring on these issues during the week of October 15. The proposed pretrial order is also improper because it was submitted in violation of the Local Rules. Plaintiffs failed to provide their draft order to Defendants thirty days in advance of filing and to allow Defendants fourteen days to review their draft as required by Local Rule 16-5(c).

Defendants respectfully request that the Court strike Plaintiffs’ Corrected Proposed Pretrial Order (ECF No. 394) as improper and prejudicial under the Local Rules. Defendants are prepared to stipulate that no pretrial order is necessary under Local Rule 16-5(a) because the parties’ pleadings, briefing, and trial memoranda have adequately framed the issues for the Court. Should the Court desire a pretrial order, however, Defendants request that the Court order both parties to meaningfully confer on the contents of that order and submit a document that fairly represents the positions of both parties.

BACKGROUND

At the August 27, 2018 conference with the Court, Plaintiffs proposed serving their draft of the proposed pretrial order on Defendants on September 24, having Defendants' response to Plaintiffs due October 5, and filing the final order on October 15. Tr. 8:14-24 (excerpts attached as Ex. A). Counsel for Defendants explained to the Court that Plaintiffs had not conferred with Defendants in advance about those dates and offered to meet and confer with Plaintiffs at a later date to discuss a mutually agreeable schedule. *Id.* at 9:1-6. For its part, the Court never formally set a deadline for the pretrial order and did not set a schedule for the parties' conferral on the order. *See* ECF No. 343 (setting a deadline for "trial memoranda" but not the pretrial order).

On October 5, 2018, nearly two weeks after their proposed date of September 24, Plaintiffs sent Defendants their draft of the pretrial order and requested that Defendants respond in five business days, by October 12, so that the parties could file the document on October 15. Ex. B (Oct. 5 email from Rodgers). Plaintiffs' draft proposed order was 175 pages long and included 716 "agreed facts." *See* Ex. C (Oct. 11 email from Boronow); Ex. E (Oct. 11 email from Boronow). On October 11, counsel for Defendants sent an email to Plaintiffs objecting to the proposed pretrial order as untimely because the Local Rules provided Defendants with fourteen days to review the draft provided by Plaintiffs. Ex. C; L.R. 16-5(c). Defendants explained that, although they were willing to begin the conferral process at that time, they could not meaningfully review the 175-page document and 716 alleged "facts" within five days and thus could not agree to an October 15 filing date. *Id.* Defendants proposed that the parties stipulate under Local Rule 16-5(a) that no pretrial order is necessary in this case given the extensive pleadings and briefing already filed. *Id.*

Plaintiffs responded by email that they were unwilling to stipulate to forgo the pretrial order and intended to file their version of the pretrial order unilaterally on October 15. Ex. D (Oct. 11 email from Olson). That same day, Defendants sent Plaintiffs a second email in response, explaining that “Plaintiffs’ decision to provide Defendants a 175-page proposed pretrial order one week before the purported deadline is extremely prejudicial and in violation of the Local Rules.” Ex. E. Defendants also noted that the over 700 alleged “agreed facts” in Plaintiffs’ draft pretrial order consisted of Plaintiffs’ characterizations of cherry-picked government documents, and instructed Plaintiffs that they “may not represent that those contentions are ‘agreed facts.’” *Id.* Defendants pointed out that the effect of a pretrial order is to amend the pleadings, L.R. 16-5(d), and noted that Defendants did not intend to amend their pleadings. *Id.* Defendants suggested that if Plaintiffs wished to put these sorts of characterizations before the Court, they could do so in their trial memorandum. *Id.* Nevertheless, in an effort to reach agreement on the pretrial order, Defendants offered to include in the “agreed facts” section of the pretrial order complete and verbatim quotations from the Defendants’ Answer. *Id.*

On October 12, the parties engaged in a telephonic conferral. On October 14, Defendants sent Plaintiffs an email memorializing their position, including another attempt at compromise. Ex. F (Oct. 14 email from Boronow). In that email, Defendants offered to send Plaintiffs their portions of the pretrial order, other than the “agreed facts” section, during the week of October 15, and to work with Plaintiffs to try to reach agreement on the pretrial order on a more reasonable timeline. *Id.* That email also stated that Defendants do not agree to the allegations in the “agreed facts” section of Plaintiffs’ proposed order and instructed that Plaintiffs were “not authorized to submit those contentions as ‘agreed facts.’” *Id.*

Plaintiffs did not respond to that email and, instead, on October 15, unilaterally filed their proposed pretrial order with the Court. The proposed pretrial order was 182 pages long and included 728 “agreed facts” to which Defendants never agreed. ECF No. 383. Moreover, it included new content that Plaintiffs had never before served on Defendants.

On October 17, Defendants sent Plaintiffs a letter asking that they withdraw the proposed pretrial order by 9:00 am Pacific Time on October 18 because it contained false statements and materially misrepresented Defendants’ position. Ex. G. Specifically, Defendants explained that

Prior to your filing of the proposed pretrial order, we expressly told you in two separate emails that Plaintiffs were not authorized to submit the over 700 contentions listed in your draft pretrial order as “agreed facts” because Defendants had not agreed to them. Plaintiffs nevertheless listed 728 allegations as “agreed facts” in the proposed order—including twelve that Defendants had never before seen—and stated, falsely, that “[t]he following facts are admitted by the parties.”

Id.

In response to that letter, Plaintiffs did not withdraw the proposed order but instead, on October 18, filed a Notice of Errata to Plaintiffs’ Proposed Pretrial Order and a Corrected Proposed Pretrial Order. ECF Nos. 393, 394. Although Plaintiffs clarified “that Defendants have not stipulated to any facts,” ECF No. 393 at 2, they inserted a new footnote in the proposed order accusing Defendants of refusing to confer on the pretrial order:

Based on their refusal to confer with the Plaintiffs on the Proposed Pretrial Order, the Defendants have not stipulated to the facts set forth in this section. This section constitutes Plaintiffs’ position as to the agreed facts in this case.

ECF No. 394 at 3 n.2.

ARGUMENT

Plaintiffs’ proposed pretrial order should be struck by this Court because it improperly misrepresents Defendants’ position during the conferral process, was submitted in violation of

the Local Rules, and does not serve the purpose for which a pretrial order is intended under the Local Rules: “to frame the issues for trial.” L.R. 16-5(b).

I. Plaintiffs’ Violation of the Local Rules and Failure to Meaningfully Confer on the Pretrial Order Have Prejudiced Defendants and Stymied Cooperation

A pretrial order “amends the pleadings” and “will control the subsequent course of action or proceedings as provided in Fed. R. Civ. P. 16.” L.R. 16-5(d). Because a pretrial order has such significant effects on the proceedings, it is intended to be a joint document that reflects the collaborative efforts of the parties. *See* L.R. 16-5. Plaintiffs’ failure to confer and their unilateral submission of their own 182-page document containing 728 alleged “factual” contentions is extremely prejudicial to Defendants. It has also undermined what is supposed to be a cooperative process that streamlines both the pretrial conference and trial itself, and has instead generated yet another dispute that this Court must now address.

Local Rule 16-5(c) sets forth the conferral and filing requirements for pretrial orders:

Unless modified by the Court, the time for service and filing of the proposed pretrial order will be as follows:

- (1) The plaintiff will, at least 30 days before the filing date, prepare and serve on all parties a proposed pretrial order.
- (2) Within 14 days after service of that proposed pretrial order, each other party will serve on all parties the objections, additions, and changes such party believes should be made to the plaintiff’s proposed pretrial order.
- (3) All areas of disagreement must be shown in the proposed pretrial order, but the parties will make every effort to resolve such disagreements.
- (4) The proposed pretrial order must be signed by the parties, and the plaintiff must file it with the Court.

L.R. 16-5(c) (emphasis added).

Although Plaintiffs proposed an alternative schedule for service and filing of the pretrial order at the August 27 conference, the Court never modified the schedule. Nor did Plaintiffs at

any time after the August 27 conference approach Defendants about seeking a court order modifying the schedule. Thus, the rules governing submission of the pretrial order that are in effect for this case have been, and continue to be, the default local rules that require Plaintiffs to serve their proposed pretrial order on Defendants “at least 30 days before the filing date.” L.R. 16-5(c)(1).

By serving their proposed order on Defendants on October 5, ten days—five business days—before their filing date of October 15, Plaintiffs violated the Local Rules. As Defendants told Plaintiffs in their attempts to confer on this issue, that violation was extremely prejudicial given the extraordinary prolixity of Plaintiffs’ proposed pretrial order and the number of alleged “agreed facts.” Exs. C, E.

In addition, prior to filing their initial proposed order on October 15, Plaintiffs made no attempt to meaningfully confer with Defendants regarding the contents of the pretrial order in violation of Local Rule 16-5. Defendants made two specific offers to try to resolve the disagreement over the “agreed facts” section of the order. First, they offered to stipulate that the order was not necessary, and, second, they offered to include complete verbatim quotations from their Answer in the “agreed facts” section. Exs. C, E. Plaintiffs rejected both of these offers but made no proposals of their own. Defendants also requested additional time to complete their review of Plaintiffs’ 175-page draft, which included 716 alleged “agreed facts” and hundreds of footnoted citations. Ex. F. Defendants offered to send Plaintiffs Defendants’ portions of the pretrial order, and to continue to confer with Plaintiffs, during the week of October 15. *Id.* Plaintiffs refused to allow Defendants a reasonable amount of time to review their 175-page draft document and instead filed their 182-page proposed pretrial order—which contained twelve

alleged “agreed facts” that Defendants had never before seen—on October 15, without ever attempting to negotiate the contents of that order.

What is more, despite two emails expressly instructing Plaintiffs that they were not authorized to submit their over 700 alleged “agreed facts” as “agreed facts” because Defendants did not agree to them, Exs. E, F, Plaintiffs nevertheless did just that in their October 15 filing. ECF No. 383 at 3. Only after Defendants sent a letter noting that the proposed pretrial order falsely stated that the 728 contentions were “admitted by the parties” and requesting that Plaintiffs withdraw the document did Plaintiffs amend their filing to correct that false statement. Ex. G; ECF No. 394 at 3.

But in correcting the one misrepresentation, Plaintiffs doubled down on another. In the introduction to the proposed order, they state that, during the conferral process, “Defendants refused to provide any input and refused to provide any sections.” ECF No. 394 at 2. They also added a footnote accusing Defendants of “refus[ing] to confer with the Plaintiffs on the Proposed Pretrial Order.” *Id.* at 3 n.2. Not only are these statements patently false in light of Defendants’ multiple compromise proposals and requests of additional time to review Plaintiffs’ lengthy draft and engage in conferral, Exs. C, E, F, they also ignore Plaintiffs’ own violations of the Local Rules and failure to meaningfully confer. Indeed, at no point have Plaintiffs offered any compromise on their proposed order or their 728 alleged “agreed facts.” Plaintiffs’ actions speak for themselves: Plaintiffs have no interest in meaningfully conferring with Defendants to reach agreement on what is supposed to be a joint document, but instead are focused solely on using the pretrial order as a vehicle to improperly put their own allegations before the Court.

II. Plaintiffs' Proposed Pretrial Order Is Not a Pretrial Order

The purpose of a pretrial order is “to frame the issues for trial.” L.R. 16-5(b). The order is intended to be a joint submission that contains “concise” statements and “agreed facts.” L.R. 16-5(b). The 728 contentions submitted by Plaintiffs as “agreed facts”—which make up 176 pages, or 96.7% of the proposed order—are not “agreed” and are not “facts.” They are Plaintiffs’ characterizations of statements cherry-picked from a range of documents chosen by Plaintiffs with no input from Defendants. Plaintiffs have pulled statements from hundreds of different documents, without providing any context, and arranged them into a narrative of their choosing. And they have relied on numerous documents to which Defendants may ultimately have evidentiary objections.¹

Plaintiffs’ contentions do not frame the issues for trial and they certainly do not provide the Court with a list of facts that the parties agree upon. Rather, they represent Plaintiffs’ attempt to put their own contentions and allegations based on their own evidence before the Court prior to trial and with no regard for evidentiary requirements. Plaintiffs’ unilateral coopting of the pretrial order process to serve their own ends is improper and should not be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Because Plaintiffs’ Corrected Proposed Pretrial Order (ECF No. 394) is misleading, materially misrepresents Defendants’ actions and position during the conferral process, was submitted in violation of the Local Rules, and fails to serve the purpose of a pretrial order,

¹ Many of the allegations contained in the “agreed facts” section of Plaintiffs’ proposed pretrial order are allegedly derived from documents filed as exhibits to Plaintiffs’ motions in limine seeking judicial notice (ECF Nos. 254, 340). Defendants reviewed those documents to determine authenticity only and have not conceded the admissibility of the documents or the truthfulness or accuracy of their contents. ECF No. 327 at 3-4; ECF No. 357 at 2-4.

Defendants respectfully ask this Court to strike it. As it is not this Court's job to adjudicate between two competing proposed pretrial orders, Defendants do not submit their own proposed order. Rather, Defendants are prepared to stipulate that no pretrial order is necessary under Local Rule 16-5(a) because the parties' pleadings and trial memoranda adequately frame the issues for the Court. Should the Court desire a pretrial order, however, Defendants request that the Court order both parties to meaningfully confer on the contents of that order and submit a joint document that fairly represents the positions of both parties and limits its submission of "agreed facts" to facts actually agreed to by both parties.

Dated: October 18, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY H. WOOD
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Environment & Natural Resources Division

/s/ Clare Boronow

LISA LYNNE RUSSELL
GUILLERMO A. MONTERO
SEAN C. DUFFY (NY Bar No. 4103131)
MARISSA PIROPATO (MA Bar No. 651630)
CLARE BORONOW (admitted to MD bar)
FRANK J. SINGER (CA Bar No. 227459)
ERIKA NORMAN (CA Bar No. 268425)
U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
Natural Resources Section
601 D Street NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: (202) 305-0445
Facsimile: (202) 305-0506
sean.c.duffy@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

Exhibit A

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF OREGON

THE HON. ANN L. AIKEN, JUDGE PRESIDING

KELSEY CASCADIA ROSE JULIANA, et)
al.,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,)

Defendants.)

No. 6:15-cv-01517-TC

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EUGENE, OREGON

MONDAY, AUGUST 27, 2018

PAGES 1 - 17

Kristi L. Anderson
Official Federal Reporter
United States Courthouse
405 East Eighth Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 431-4112
Kristi_Anderson@ord.uscourts.gov

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2 FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

3 Julia A. Olson
4 Wild Earth Advocates
5 1216 Lincoln St.
6 Eugene, OR 97401
7 415-786-4825
8 Email: juliaaolson@gmail.com

9 Philip L. Gregory
10 Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP
11 840 Malcolm Road
12 Burlingame, CA 94010
13 650-697-6000
14 Fax: 650-697-0577
15 Email: pgregory@gregorylawgroup.com

16 Andrea K. Rodgers
17 Law Offices of Andrea K. Rodgers
18 3026 NW Esplanade
19 Seattle, WA 98117
20 206-696-2851
21 Fax: (541) 485-2457
22 Email: andrearodgers42@gmail.com

23 FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

24 Sean C. Duffy
25 U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
P.O. Box 7611
Washington, DC 20044
202-305-0445
Fax: 202-305-0506
Email: sean.c.duffy@usdoj.gov

Frank J. Singer
U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
P.O. Box 7611
Washington, DC 20044
202-616-9409
Fax: 202-305-0506
Email: Frank.singer@usdoj.gov

25

1 Marissa Piropatto
U.S. Department of Justice
2 601 D. St. NW
Washington, DC 20004
3 202-305-0470
Fax: 202-305-0506
4 Email: marissa.piropatto@usdoj.gov

5 Clare Boronow
U.S. Department of Justice
6 Environment & Natural Resources Division
999 18th St.
7 South Terrace, Suite 370
Denver, CO 80202
8 303-844-1362
Fax: 303-844-1350
9 Email: clare.boronow@usdoj.gov

10 Erika Norman
United States Department of Justice
11 Environment & Natural Resources Division
Natural Resources Section
12 601 D. Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
13 202-305-0475
Fax: 202-305-0506
14 Email: erika.norman@usdoj.gov

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13:35:49 1 if the October 29th date -- if you are anticipating that
2 that's -- we are going to go on the 29th, I have not heard
3 you all say you are prepared to go to trial on the 29th of
4 October.

5 So maybe is that agreed to? And I would have
6 suggested also that before we had this conference call there
7 had been a meet and confer on many of these issues so that I
8 am not operating in a vacuum making decisions. I would
9 think that you would all want to sit down and walk through
10 how you want to walk through this trial and what is for the
11 good of both sides a streamlined way to do that.

12 So first of all, number one.

13 MS. OLSON: Yes.

14 THE COURT: Number one, our ruling will be done,
15 and, frankly, we had anticipated that there will be yet
16 another mandamus filed. And I don't know how much that will
17 interfere with how we go forward.

18 So maybe we can start with the fact we'll have a
19 ruling out shortly.

20 MS. OLSON: Your Honor, this is Julia Olson.

21 And we will be ready to begin trial on
22 October 29th, and we are preparing for trial with that in
23 mind and working on a tight schedule for completing expert
24 depositions and other depositions such as those of
25 plaintiffs.

13:37:08 1 And we did meet and confer regarding the date for
2 the trial briefs, and we were hoping that the court might be
3 able to accommodate an extension to the present deadline,
4 which is September -- I am sorry. I believe it's
5 September 12th, and we were hoping to extend that out, both
6 the trial briefs and elements of the pretrial order that we
7 think would be beneficial for the court for the parties to
8 file by a month to October 15th.

9 THE COURT: Is that agreed to by all parties?

10 MR. DUFFY: This is Sean Duffy.

11 That's correct, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: We'll make that adjustment.

13 What else is next?

14 MS. OLSON: Related to the filing of the pretrial
15 order, Your Honor, the local rules provide that plaintiffs
16 serve on defendants their pretrial order 30 days before the
17 date of filing, and we were hoping to shorten the timeline
18 for the parties back and forth on the pretrial order as
19 well.

20 So our proposal -- and I have not conferred with
21 counsel on this, but our proposal would be to serve our
22 pretrial order on them September 24th and ask that they
23 respond by October 5th so that we could file it on
24 October 15th.

25 THE COURT: For the defendants.

13:39:00 1 MR. DUFFY: As plaintiffs said, we haven't
2 conferred specifically as to dates, so I will want to
3 discuss that further with my colleagues.

4 In principle, though, I don't foresee any major
5 objections. So I think that's something the parties can
6 come to an agreement to and then let the court know.

7 THE COURT: Well, everything -- it will be -- I am
8 sure it's going to get worked out, and I am pretty confident
9 it will get filed on the 15th. You can have your conferral
10 time.

11 So what else is next?

12 MS. OLSON: Next, Your Honor, is setting deadlines
13 for exchanging witness and exhibit lists, and plaintiffs
14 propose October 1st for that.

15 THE COURT: For the defendants.

16 MR. DUFFY: We can agree to that.

17 THE COURT: All right. What's next?

18 MS. OLSON: All right. Your Honor, the other
19 issue is a cutoff date for filing motions in limine, and I
20 don't think the court has set a date for that. And we would
21 propose the end of September for that.

22 THE COURT: For the defendants.

23 MR. DUFFY: I am sorry. Can you repeat those
24 dates?

25 THE COURT: The cutoff date, the end of September

Exhibit B

From: [Andrea Rodgers](#)
To: [Singer, Frank \(ENRD\)](#); [Piropato, Marissa \(ENRD\)](#); [Duffy, Sean C. \(ENRD\)](#); [Norman, Erika \(ENRD\)](#); [Boronow, Clare \(ENRD\)](#)
Cc: [Julia Olson](#); [Philip Gregory](#)
Subject: Juliana v. United States, Plaintiffs" Proposed Pretrial Order
Date: Friday, October 5, 2018 9:26:23 PM
Attachments: [2018.10.05.Plaintiffs Proposed Pretrial Order.docx](#)

Counsel-

Attached is Plaintiffs' Proposed Pretrial Order for you to add your sections so that this can be filed with the Court on October 15. We have included those facts which we believe are not in dispute, as they are admissions from the answer or factual statements from federal government documents. To facilitate your review of the agreed facts, we have provided footnotes with citations to the relevant document, including the motion in limine exhibit number, if applicable. Pursuant to Local Rule 16-5(b)(3), please put an asterisk by those facts where relevance is disputed, and we will do the same with any agreed facts that you include.

Given our deadline of October 15, please provide us with your sections to include in the proposed pretrial order by close of business on October 12, 2018. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Andrea K. Rodgers
Attorney
Law Offices of Andrea K. Rodgers
andrearodgers42@gmail.com
T: (206) 696-2851

Exhibit C

From: [Boronow, Clare \(ENRD\)](#)
To: [Andrea Rodgers](#); [Julia Olson](#); [Philip Gregory](#)
Cc: [Duffy, Sean C. \(ENRD\)](#); [Piropato, Marissa \(ENRD\)](#); [Singer, Frank \(ENRD\)](#); [Norman, Erika \(ENRD\)](#)
Subject: Juliana v. United States, Proposed Pretrial order
Date: Thursday, October 11, 2018 12:24:00 PM

Andrea, Julia, and Phil,

We are in receipt of your draft pretrial order which you sent to us on Friday, October 5. You have asked us to respond by this Friday, October 12 so that the parties can file the order by October 15.

As an initial matter, we object to your draft order because it is untimely and unreasonable under the circumstances. The Court's scheduling order does not set a deadline for the pretrial order. The local rules therefore govern by default. Local Rule 16-5(c) requires Plaintiffs to serve their proposed order on Defendants at least 30 days prior to filing, and affords Defendants a full 14 days to respond. Your proposed order and timeline do not comport with that rule.

While we recognize that a potential October 15 deadline for the pretrial order was discussed at the August 27, 2018 hearing before Judge Aiken, that was never solidified. Instead, the Court left it to the parties to confer as to the timing of the pretrial order, and the parties have yet to do that. We are happy to start the conferral process now, but we cannot agree to a deadline of October 15, particularly given the prolixity of the 175 page document you provided and the many additional pretrial obligations that the parties have. That original target date was predicated on Plaintiffs' representation that they could serve their draft order on Defendants by September 24, not October 5. Also, your proposed pretrial order includes a massive volume of proposed "agreed facts," which consist largely of Plaintiffs' characterization of statements drawn from agency documents. We simply do not have enough time to review and negotiate those contentions, nor do we think such an extensive filing is contemplated by Local Rule 16-5.

Given that the parties' positions are well-established through numerous pleadings, and will be further fleshed out in the trial briefs, we believe that this is a case where the parties should stipulate that no pretrial order need be filed. We therefore propose that the parties stipulate that no pretrial order is necessary pursuant to Local Rule 16-5(a). Please let us know if Plaintiffs will agree to this approach, in which case we could file the stipulation for court approval on October 15.

Thank you,
Clare

Clare Boronow
Trial Attorney, Natural Resources Section
Environment & Natural Resources Division
U.S. Department of Justice
(303) 844-1362
clare.boronow@usdoj.gov

Exhibit D

From: [Julia Olson](#)
To: [Boronow, Clare \(ENRD\)](#)
Cc: [Andrea Rodgers](#); [Phil Gregory](#); [Duffy, Sean C. \(ENRD\)](#); [Piropato, Marissa \(ENRD\)](#); [Singer, Frank \(ENRD\)](#); [Norman, Erika \(ENRD\)](#)
Subject: Re: Juliana v. United States, Proposed Pretrial order
Date: Thursday, October 11, 2018 4:18:31 PM

Counsel,

The Local Rules require a pre-trial order. On August 27, Judge Aiken ordered the parties to file a pre-trial order on October 15. Counsel for Defendants agreed to that date. Also on August 27, counsel for Defendants informed the Court that counsel for Defendants would confer amongst themselves about exchanging a draft pre-trial order and then confer with Plaintiffs. Defendants did not do that. On October 5, Plaintiffs served a draft pre-trial order for review by Defendants.

As ordered by the Court, Plaintiffs are prepared to and will file their version of a pre-trial order on October 15. Plaintiffs are open to meeting and conferring on the pre-trial order up to the pre-trial conference. We will not stipulate that a pre-trial order is unnecessary because it is particularly appropriate in a case such as this. However, we are prepared to confer about the issues covered by the pre-trial order to see if we can reach agreement on any (or all) of the issues.

Regards,

Julia

On Oct 11, 2018, at 11:25 AM, Boronow, Clare (ENRD)
<Clare.Boronow@usdoj.gov> wrote:

Andrea, Julia, and Phil,

We are in receipt of your draft pretrial order which you sent to us on Friday, October 5. You have asked us to respond by this Friday, October 12 so that the parties can file the order by October 15.

As an initial matter, we object to your draft order because it is untimely and unreasonable under the circumstances. The Court's scheduling order does not set a deadline for the pretrial order. The local rules therefore govern by default. Local Rule 16-5(c) requires Plaintiffs to serve their proposed order on Defendants at least 30 days prior to filing, and affords Defendants a full 14 days to respond. Your proposed order and timeline do not comport with that rule.

While we recognize that a potential October 15 deadline for the pretrial order was discussed at the August 27, 2018 hearing before Judge Aiken, that was never solidified. Instead, the Court left it to the parties to confer as to the timing of the pretrial order, and the parties have yet to do that. We are happy to start the conferral process now, but we cannot agree to a deadline of October 15, particularly given the prolixity of the

175 page document you provided and the many additional pretrial obligations that the parties have. That original target date was predicated on Plaintiffs' representation that they could serve their draft order on Defendants by September 24, not October 5. Also, your proposed pretrial order includes a massive volume of proposed "agreed facts," which consist largely of Plaintiffs' characterization of statements drawn from agency documents. We simply do not have enough time to review and negotiate those contentions, nor do we think such an extensive filing is contemplated by Local Rule 16-5.

Given that the parties' positions are well-established through numerous pleadings, and will be further fleshed out in the trial briefs, we believe that this is a case where the parties should stipulate that no pretrial order need be filed. We therefore propose that the parties stipulate that no pretrial order is necessary pursuant to Local Rule 16-5(a). Please let us know if Plaintiffs will agree to this approach, in which case we could file the stipulation for court approval on October 15.

Thank you,
Clare

Clare Boronow
Trial Attorney, Natural Resources Section
Environment & Natural Resources Division
U.S. Department of Justice
(303) 844-1362
clare.boronow@usdoj.gov

Julia Olson
Wild Earth Advocates
1216 Lincoln St.
Eugene, OR 97401
415-786-4825
juliaAolson@gmail.com

This message may contain privileged and/or confidential information. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, disclosure or distribution by persons or entities other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

Exhibit E

From: [Boronow, Clare \(ENRD\)](#)
To: [Julia Olson](#)
Cc: [Andrea Rodgers](#); [Phil Gregory](#); [Duffy, Sean C. \(ENRD\)](#); [Piropato, Marissa \(ENRD\)](#); [Singer, Frank \(ENRD\)](#); [Norman, Erika \(ENRD\)](#)
Subject: RE: Juliana v. United States, Proposed Pretrial order
Date: Thursday, October 11, 2018 7:16:00 PM

Counsel,

We disagree with your interpretation of the August 27 conference. Plaintiffs' decision to provide Defendants a 175-page proposed pretrial order one week before the purported deadline is extremely prejudicial and in violation of the Local Rules. At no point did Defendants agree to, or the Court order, anything less than the 14 day period of review provided by the Local Rules. And at no point did Plaintiffs confer with Defendants regarding a schedule other than the one they proposed at the August 27 conference, under which Plaintiffs would have served their proposed pretrial order on Defendants on September 24.

As noted in our prior email, Defendants object to the over 700 "agreed facts" that you have included in your proposed order. These statements are not facts but rather cherry-picked characterizations of agency documents. Not only do we lack the time to review every alleged "fact", we also do not believe a 175-page document is useful for the Court in framing the issues for trial or what the Local Rules contemplate. We also note that the effect of a pretrial order is to amend the pleadings. LR 16-5(d). We intend to stand by our pleadings and see no reason to amend them with additional "facts." To the extent Plaintiffs wish to put these sorts of characterizations before the Court, they can do so in their trial memorandum.

To resolve this issue, we are prepared, for purposes of this case only, to include in the "agreed facts" section of the pretrial order statements that are quoted completely and verbatim from Defendants' Answer. We will not agree to statements derived from any other documents, nor would we agree to any attempt by Plaintiffs to characterize the statements in Defendants' Answer.

If Plaintiffs agree to this approach, you can send us a revised draft that limits the "agreed facts" section to complete, verbatim quotations from our Answer. If Plaintiffs insist on including over 700 statements from Plaintiffs' own assortment of sources, we want to be clear, you may not represent that those contentions are "agreed facts." Further, we will oppose the pretrial order and request that the Court order that no pretrial order need be filed pursuant to Local Rule 16-5(a).

Thank you,
Clare

From: Julia Olson <juliaaolson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2018 4:17 PM
To: Boronow, Clare (ENRD) <CBoronow@ENRD.USDOJ.GOV>
Cc: Andrea Rodgers <andrearodgers42@gmail.com>; Phil Gregory <pgregory@gregorylawgroup.com>; Duffy, Sean C. (ENRD) <SDuffy@ENRD.USDOJ.GOV>; Piropato, Marissa (ENRD) <MPiropato@ENRD.USDOJ.GOV>; Singer, Frank (ENRD)

<FSinger@ENRD.USDOJ.GOV>; Norman, Erika (ENRD) <ENorman@ENRD.USDOJ.GOV>

Subject: Re: Juliana v. United States, Proposed Pretrial order

Counsel,

The Local Rules require a pre-trial order. On August 27, Judge Aiken ordered the parties to file a pre-trial order on October 15. Counsel for Defendants agreed to that date. Also on August 27, counsel for Defendants informed the Court that counsel for Defendants would confer amongst themselves about exchanging a draft pre-trial order and then confer with Plaintiffs. Defendants did not do that. On October 5, Plaintiffs served a draft pre-trial order for review by Defendants.

As ordered by the Court, Plaintiffs are prepared to and will file their version of a pre-trial order on October 15. Plaintiffs are open to meeting and conferring on the pre-trial order up to the pre-trial conference. We will not stipulate that a pre-trial order is unnecessary because it is particularly appropriate in a case such as this. However, we are prepared to confer about the issues covered by the pre-trial order to see if we can reach agreement on any (or all) of the issues.

Regards,

Julia

On Oct 11, 2018, at 11:25 AM, Boronow, Clare (ENRD)
<Clare.Boronow@usdoj.gov> wrote:

Andrea, Julia, and Phil,

We are in receipt of your draft pretrial order which you sent to us on Friday, October 5. You have asked us to respond by this Friday, October 12 so that the parties can file the order by October 15.

As an initial matter, we object to your draft order because it is untimely and unreasonable under the circumstances. The Court's scheduling order does not set a deadline for the pretrial order. The local rules therefore govern by default. Local Rule 16-5(c) requires Plaintiffs to serve their proposed order on Defendants at least 30 days prior to filing, and affords Defendants a full 14 days to respond. Your proposed order and timeline do not comport with that rule.

While we recognize that a potential October 15 deadline for the pretrial order was discussed at the August 27, 2018 hearing before Judge Aiken, that was never solidified. Instead, the Court left it to the parties to confer as to the timing of the pretrial order, and the parties have yet to do that. We are happy to start the conferral process now, but we cannot agree to a deadline of October 15, particularly given the prolixity of the 175 page document you provided and the many additional pretrial obligations that the parties have. That original target date was predicated on Plaintiffs' representation that they could serve their draft order on Defendants by September 24, not October 5. Also, your proposed pretrial order includes a massive volume of proposed "agreed

facts,” which consist largely of Plaintiffs’ characterization of statements drawn from agency documents. We simply do not have enough time to review and negotiate those contentions, nor do we think such an extensive filing is contemplated by Local Rule 16-5.

Given that the parties’ positions are well-established through numerous pleadings, and will be further fleshed out in the trial briefs, we believe that this is a case where the parties should stipulate that no pretrial order need be filed. We therefore propose that the parties stipulate that no pretrial order is necessary pursuant to Local Rule 16-5(a).

Please let us know if Plaintiffs will agree to this approach, in which case we could file the stipulation for court approval on October 15.

Thank you,
Clare

Clare Boronow
Trial Attorney, Natural Resources Section
Environment & Natural Resources Division
U.S. Department of Justice
(303) 844-1362
clare.boronow@usdoj.gov

Julia Olson
Wild Earth Advocates
1216 Lincoln St.
Eugene, OR 97401
415-786-4825
juliaAolson@gmail.com

This message may contain privileged and/or confidential information. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, disclosure or distribution by persons or entities other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

Exhibit F

From: [Boronow, Clare \(ENRD\)](#)
To: "[Julia Olson](#)"; "[Andrea Rodgers](#)"; "[Philip Gregory](#)"
Cc: [Duffy, Sean C. \(ENRD\)](#); [Norman, Erika \(ENRD\)](#); [Piropato, Marissa \(ENRD\)](#); [Singer, Frank \(ENRD\)](#)
Subject: Juliana v. United States, Pretrial order
Date: Sunday, October 14, 2018 1:53:00 PM

Counsel,

As a follow-up to Friday's telephonic conferral on the pretrial order, we wanted to memorialize Defendants' position in writing. We do not agree that a pretrial order is due October 15. Any discussions along those lines were predicated on you providing your draft to us by September 24, not October 5. Nonetheless, we will continue to work with you to see if the parties can reach agreement as to the contents of the pretrial order on a more reasonable timeline. We will send you Defendants' portions for all sections of the order other than "agreed facts" during the week of October 15. As to the "agreed facts" section, we have not had any reasonable opportunity to review what you submitted, and the volume of your submission (over 170 pages) is unreasonable on its face. So, to be clear, we do not agree with those contentions and you are not authorized to submit those contentions as "agreed facts." That said, we will be happy to discuss next week a more reasonable approach to that section of the pretrial order that includes complete verbatim statements from Defendants' Answer.

Thank you,
Clare

Clare Boronow
Trial Attorney, Natural Resources Section
Environment & Natural Resources Division
U.S. Department of Justice
(303) 844-1362
clare.boronow@usdoj.gov

Exhibit G



U.S. Department of Justice

Environment and Natural Resources Division

90-1-4-14528

*Natural Resources Section
P.O. Box 7611
Washington, DC 20044*

*Telephone (202) 305-0445
Facsimile (202) 305-0506*

VIA EMAIL

October 17, 2018

Julia Olson
Andrea Rodgers
Philip Gregory
Wild Earth Advocates
1216 Lincoln St.
Eugene, OR 97401

Re: *Juliana v. United States*, No. 15-cv-1517-AA

Dear Julia, Andrea, and Phil:

We write to request that Plaintiffs immediately withdraw their Proposed Pretrial Order (ECF No. 383) because it contains false and misleading statements. If Plaintiffs do not withdraw the proposed pretrial order by 9:00 am Pacific Time on October 18, 2018, Defendants will move to strike it.

Prior to your filing of the proposed pretrial order, we expressly told you in two separate emails that Plaintiffs were not authorized to submit the over 700 contentions listed in your draft pretrial order as “agreed facts” because Defendants had not agreed to them. Plaintiffs nevertheless listed 728 allegations as “agreed facts” in the proposed order—including twelve that Defendants had never before seen—and stated, falsely, that “[t]he following facts are admitted by the parties.” ECF No. 383 at 3. Because your proposed pretrial order contains false statements and material misrepresentations of Defendants’ position, it is improper and prejudicial and should be immediately withdrawn.

Sincerely,

/s/ Clare Boronow
Clare Boronow
Trial Attorney

cc: Sean Duffy
Erika Norman
Marissa Piropato
Frank Singer