			ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 3
		1	
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NOT QUOTE!		MR. DE HUECK: Good morning, everyone. My name
	-	2	is Adam de Hueck. I'm the Hearing Examiner for Docket
	1 THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA	3	EL18-026, In the Matter of Prevailing Wind Park, LLC for
	2 = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	4	an Application for a Wind Energy Facility Permit.
	A PERMIT OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY 4 IN BON HOMME COUNTY, CHARLES MIX	5	We are on day three. The Applicant has
	COUNTY, AND HUTCHINSON COUNTY, 5 SOUTH DAKOTA, FOR THE PREVAILING WIND PARK PROJECT	6	concluded their direct case in chief. Yesterday we heard
	6 = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	7	from our three lay witness Intervenors, and today we're
	7 October 11, 2018 8:30 a.m. 8 Volume III, Pages	8	moving on to Mr. Reece Almond's case in chief. And we
	8 Volume III, Pages	9	will also hear from a Staff witness today.
	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, 10 KRISTIE FIEGEN, CHAIRWOMAN	10	With that, Mr. Almond, you may go ahead and call
	GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN 11 CHRIS NELSON, COMMISSIONER	11	your first witness.
	12 COMMISSION STAFF Adam de Hueck	12	MR. ALMOND: We call Mike Soukup.
	13 Karen Cremer Greg Rislov 14 APPEARANCES	13	Mike Soukup,
	15 Mollie Smith and Lisa Agrimonti,	14	called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above
	appearing on behalf of Prevailing Wind Park; 16 Reece Almond,	15	cause, testified under oath as follows:
	17 appearing on behalf of Intervenors Gregg Hubner, Marsha Hubner, Paul Schoenfelder, and Lisa Schoenfelder;	16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	18 Sherman Fuerniss, 19 appearing pro se;	17	<u>BY MR. ALMOND</u> :
	20 Karen Jenkins,	18	Q. Good morning, Mr. Soukup. Can you introduce
	appearing pro se; 21 Kelli Pazour,	19	yourself to the Commissioners, please.
	22 appearing pro se;	20	A. Hello. My name is Mike Soukup. I live 7 miles
	23 Kristen Edwards and Amanda Reiss, appearing on behalf of Staff. 24	21	north of Tyndall or about 13 miles east of the wind farm,
	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR 25 Precision Reporting, 213 S. Main, Onida, South Dakota	22	proposed wind farm.
		23	Q. And, Mr. Soukup, are you involved in the Bon Homme
		24	County government?
		25	A. Yes, I am. To give you a little history, I've been
	2		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 4
1	The following transcript of proceedings was	1	on the zoning board since 1998 and I've been Chairman of
2	held in the above-entitled matter at the South Dakota	2	the County Commission for '17 and '18 and the years of
3	State Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre,	3	'15 and '16 I was Chairman of the zoning board.
4	South Dakota, on the 11th day of October, 2018,	4	<b>Q.</b> I missed the dates. How long have you been on the
5	commencing at 8:30 a.m.	5	County Commission?
6		6	A. Eight years. Chairman for the last two years.
7		7	<b>Q.</b> Thank you. And I understand there's the County
8		8	Commission board. You referenced the planning
9		9	Commission. Is there another entity known as the Board
10		10	of Adjustment?
11		11	A. Yeah. They switch into that.
12		12	<b>Q.</b> Can you just explain the roles of those three
13		13	separate entities?
14		14	A. You know, legally I can't quite explain how that
15		15	goes. We've always done it and just have a system, and
16		16	it works.
17		17	Q. Who sits on the Board of Adjustment?
18		18	A. Well, it would be the Commissioners.
19		19	Q. The County Commissioners sit on the board?
20		20	A. Yeah.
21		21	Q. Of adjustment?
22		22	A. I hope I answered that right but we've done it for
23		23	eight years.
24		24	Q. So you have the County Commissioners and you have
25		25	the Zoning Board?

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 5		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 7
1	A. The same five people. We have five individuals on	1	<b>Q.</b> Why don't you flip to Article 17 of those zoning
2	the Zoning Board, and usually one on the Zoning Board is	2	ordinances for me.
3	a County Commissioner. And then that guy is also on the	3	A. Where is that at then? Okay. Exhibition [sic] 17.
4	County Commission board of five. One Commissioner for	4	<b>Q.</b> No. Within the zoning ordinances, within Exhibit I
5	each district.	5	14, if you could flip to Article 17 of your zoning
6	<b>Q.</b> Now which of those you have the County Commission	6	ordinances.
7	board and you have the Zoning Board. Which of those acts	7	A. I don't know what page I'm supposed to go to part
8	as the Board of Adjustment?	8	of these?
9	A. The Commissioners.	9	Q. It's page 57, I believe.
10	Q. Commissioners. County Commission.	10	MR. MUSHITZ: What page?
11	Then are you familiar with this wind farm project	11	MR. ALMOND: 57.
12	that's at dispute or being discussed in this proceeding?	12	A. Okay.
13	A. Yes, I am.	13	Q. Have you located Article 17 of the ordinances?
14	Q. How close do you live to that project area?	14	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I'm fairly nervous sitting up here.</li> <li>C. Theta fine. Take your time. I don't work you to</li> </ul>
15	<b>A.</b> Oh, I suppose 12, 13 miles. My great-grandfather's	15	<b>Q.</b> That's fine. Take your time. I don't want you to
16	homestead is in the middle of that wind farm.	16	be nervous. Can you tell the Commissioners what Article
17	<b>Q.</b> And have you or any members of your family received	17	17 is?
18	any sort of financial benefit from this project?	18	A. Well, I don't know how to really explain it. I
19	A. No.	19 20	guess I read through it before when we adopted it. It's
20	Q. And		just improvements on our zoning issues, yes.
21	<b>A.</b> Probably about a third cousin over would be in that	21	<ul><li>Q. And what does Article 17 relate to specifically?</li><li>A The wind former</li></ul>
22 23	hand print footprint of the wind farm.	22 23	<ul> <li>A. The wind farms.</li> <li>And do you recall when Article 17 was adopted?</li> </ul>
23	Q. And have you or any or have you signed any sort of agreements related to this project?	23	<ul><li>Q. And do you recall when Article 17 was adopted?</li><li>A. Well, according to my records, it was on that</li></ul>
		24	
25	A. No. No.	25	Tuesday, October 20 of 2015.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 6		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q.Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8 Q. Sometime in 2015?
1 2	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar	1 2	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the
1 2 3	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should6be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar4with that document?5	1 2 3	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.
1 2 3 4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should6be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar6with that document?6A. Looks good.6	1 2 3 4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just
1 2 3	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There should	1 2 3	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A.A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair?
1 2 3 4 5	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should6be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar6with that document?6A. Looks good.6	1 2 3 4 5	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       8         Q. Sometime in 2015?       A.         A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.       B.         Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair?       And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me
1 2 3 4 5 6	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should6be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar6with that document?6A. Looks good.7Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There should6be a sticker down at the bottom6	1 2 3 4 5 6	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A.A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should6be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar6with that document?A.A. Looks good.7Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       6         Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should       6         be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar       6         with that document?       A.         A. Looks good.       0         Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There should       6         be a sticker down at the bottom       6         A. Oh, there it is. I was reading that       6         Q. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?       6         A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposed deals are.       6         Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning       6	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. Is what now?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. Is what now?Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. Is what now?Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. Is what now?Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. To the best of my knowledge, I would say yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8</li> <li>Q. Sometime in 2015?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.</li> <li>Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? <ul> <li>And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?</li> <li>A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.</li> <li>Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?</li> <li>A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.</li> <li>Q. And how was the idea to adopt Article 17 first</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar with that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There should be a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposed deals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning Ordinances?A. Is what now?Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning Ordinances?A. To the best of my knowledge, I would say yes.Q. If you look at the top of page 1, can you tell us	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commissioner.Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.Q. And how was the idea to adopt Article 17 first brought to the county?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. Is what now?Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. To the best of my knowledge, I would say yes.Q. If you look at the top of page 1, can you tell us	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8</li> <li>Q. Sometime in 2015?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.</li> <li>Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? <ul> <li>And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?</li> <li>A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.</li> <li>Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?</li> <li>A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.</li> <li>Q. And how was the idea to adopt Article 17 first brought to the county?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. Is what now?Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. To the best of my knowledge, I would say yes.Q. If you look at the top of page 1, can you tell uswhen these zoning ordinances were adopted originally?A. Well, it says you mean what the date is on the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8</li> <li>Q. Sometime in 2015?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.</li> <li>Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? <ul> <li>And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?</li> <li>A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.</li> <li>Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?</li> <li>A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.</li> <li>Q. And how was the idea to adopt Article 17 first brought to the county?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Well, that was several years ago. I think after we did that first wind farm some individuals had came</li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 6</li> <li>Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar with that document?</li> <li>A. Looks good.</li> <li>Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There should be a sticker down at the bottom</li> <li>A. Oh, there it is. I was reading that</li> <li>Q. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?</li> <li>A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposed deals are.</li> <li>Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning Ordinances?</li> <li>A. Is what now?</li> <li>Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning Ordinances?</li> <li>A. To the best of my knowledge, I would say yes.</li> <li>Q. If you look at the top of page 1, can you tell us when these zoning ordinances were adopted originally?</li> <li>A. Well, it says you mean what the date is on the top, Bon Homme County adopted on 4-13 of '99.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8</li> <li>Q. Sometime in 2015?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.</li> <li>Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? <ul> <li>And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?</li> <li>A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.</li> <li>Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?</li> <li>A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.</li> <li>Q. And how was the idea to adopt Article 17 first brought to the county?</li> <li>A. Well, that was several years ago. I think after we did that first wind farm some individuals had came forward that we should try to make something an</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 6</li> <li>Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It should be open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiar with that document?</li> <li>A. Looks good.</li> <li>Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There should be a sticker down at the bottom</li> <li>A. Oh, there it is. I was reading that</li> <li>Q. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?</li> <li>A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposed deals are.</li> <li>Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning Ordinances?</li> <li>A. Is what now?</li> <li>Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County Zoning Ordinances?</li> <li>A. To the best of my knowledge, I would say yes.</li> <li>Q. If you look at the top of page 1, can you tell us when these zoning ordinances were adopted originally?</li> <li>A. Well, it says you mean what the date is on the top, Bon Homme County adopted on 4-13 of '99.</li> <li>Q. To your knowledge is that when the Bon Homme County</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!8Q. Sometime in 2015?A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.Q. And how was the idea to adopt Article 17 first brought to the county?A. Well, that was several years ago. I think after we did that first wind farm some individuals had came forward that we should try to make something an improvement on that so that's what became of that Article
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!6Q. Okay. In front of you is Exhibit I 14. It shouldbe open to Exhibit I 14 in the binder. Are you familiarwith that document?A. Looks good.Q. The one in the binder. Exhibit I 14. There shouldbe a sticker down at the bottomA. Oh, there it is. I was reading thatQ. Sorry. Can you tell us what Exhibit I 14 is?A. Well, I guess it's definitions of what the proposeddeals are.Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. Is what now?Q. Is Exhibit I 14 the Bon Homme County ZoningOrdinances?A. To the best of my knowledge, I would say yes.Q. If you look at the top of page 1, can you tell uswhen these zoning ordinances were adopted originally?A. Well, it says you mean what the date is on thetop, Bon Homme County adopted on 4-13 of '99.Q. To your knowledge is that when the Bon Homme CountyZoning Ordinances that are in front of you were adopted?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8</li> <li>Q. Sometime in 2015?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Because we had a Commission meeting in the morning, and then we came back that evening.</li> <li>Q. And I'm not interested in exact dates. We'll just say 2015. Is that fair? <ul> <li>And if I'm looking at the dates you gave me previously you were on both the planning Commission or the Zoning Board and the County Commission at that time?</li> <li>A. At that time, yes. I was not the Chairman of the Commission but I was on the Zoning Board. And a Commissioner.</li> <li>Q. And just generally when ordinances are adopted, what's the general process that gets played out?</li> <li>A. I guess we heard input from both sides, and that's how we adopted it with advice from the public.</li> <li>Q. And how was the idea to adopt Article 17 first brought to the county?</li> <li>A. Well, that was several years ago. I think after we did that first wind farm some individuals had came forward that we should try to make something an improvement on that so that's what became of that Article 17.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 9		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 11
1	<b>Q.</b> And you said some individuals came forward to make	1	I'd like you to compare Section 1701 of the zoning
2	improvements on something. What	2	ordinance to the PURPA section of the PUC ordinance. And
3	<b>A.</b> Oh, I would say a handful. About every time we	3	you don't need to read it out loud, but read it to
4	always had a handful either in favor or against.	4	yourself.
5	<b>Q.</b> And in terms of the improvements that were looking	5	So what I'd like to you do is compare Section 1701
-		6	
6	to be made, can you just give a flavor of what those	_	of Article 17 with the PURPA section of the draft model
7	improvements were.	7	ordinance. Just compare the language of each.
8	<ul> <li>A. Oh.</li> <li>A. Natifies a set that we are a startly used a bat instantiation.</li> </ul>	8	(Witness examines documents.)
9	<b>Q.</b> Not the ones that were actually made but just what	9	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I read them both.</li> <li>A. New sets Casting 1702 of Article 17 and commons</li> </ul>
10	people were looking for?	10	<b>Q.</b> Now go to Section 1703 of Article 17 and compare
11	A. Yeah. That's kind what have we did on Article 17.	11	that to Section 2 of the model ordinance.
12	With our advice everything seemed to be up to par.	12	A. Now what do you want to know?
13	<b>Q.</b> Prior to the adoption of Article 17 did Bon Homme	13	<b>Q.</b> I'd like you now to compare Section 1703 of Article
14	County have an article of their ordinances dedicated	14	17 to Section 2 of the draft model ordinance.
15	exclusively to wind energy systems?	15	(Witness examines documents.)
16	<b>A.</b> It is hard for me to answer that question exactly.	16	A. Yes.
17	You know, we've always talked about it, but I can't	17	<b>Q.</b> Would you agree with me that the language of both
18	say you know, it's always been on the back burner, the	18	Article 17 and the draft model ordinance is substantially
19	wind farm, for many years.	19	the same?
20	Q. And in	20	A. Yes.
21	<b>A.</b> I've got to apologize. I didn't brief up on that	21	<b>Q.</b> So for Article 17 why don't you flip down I'll
22	history from, you know, way back.	22	help you.
23	<b>Q.</b> And in the adoption of Article 17 I assume you	23	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>The Constitute 1722 of Antiple 17</li> </ul>
24	didn't pull out a computer and just start typing Article	24 25	Q. To Section 1723 of Article 17.
25	17 from scratch, did you?	25	A. Ain't there a few pages?
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!10A.No. It probably took a few months, I'm sure.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 12
1	A. No. It probably took a few months, I'm sure.		
2		-	<b>Q.</b> In comparing Section 23 of Article 17 first what
2	<b>Q.</b> Rather than starting from scratch, did the county	2	is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?
3	<b>Q.</b> Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's	2 3	<ul><li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li><li>A. On the setbacks?</li></ul>
3 4	<b>Q.</b> Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?	2 3 4	<ul><li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li><li>A. On the setbacks?</li><li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li></ul>
3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li><li>A. On the setbacks?</li><li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li><li>A. Yeah.</li></ul>
3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks. (Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks. (Witness examines documents.)</li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks. (Witness examines documents.)</li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.</li></ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> <li>Q. That's what I thought when I read them too so I</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> <li>Q. That's what I thought when I read them too so I don't think you made a mistake?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to let Mr. Almond make</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.</li></ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to let Mr. Almond make this comparison.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> <li>Q. That's what I thought when I read them too so I don't think you made a mistake?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I read sentence by sentence but I'm very nervous and I could easily make a mistake up there.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to let Mr. Almond make this comparison.</li> <li>Q. So also in front of you is what's been marked as Exhibit I 23.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> <li>Q. That's what I thought when I read them too so I don't think you made a mistake?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I read sentence by sentence but I'm very nervous and I could easily make a mistake up there.</li> <li>Q. No. And I get that. I think that's the point; it's</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to let Mr. Almond make this comparison.</li> <li>Q. So also in front of you is what's been marked as Exhibit I 23.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> <li>Q. That's what I thought when I read them too so I don't think you made a mistake?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I read sentence by sentence but I'm very nervous and I could easily make a mistake up there.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess 1'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to let Mr. Almond make this comparison.</li> <li>Q. So also in front of you is what's been marked as Exhibit I 23.</li> <li>A. Okay. Two separate sheets?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.</li></ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> <li>Q. So also in front of you is what's been marked as Exhibit I 23.</li> <li>A. Okay. Two separate sheets?</li> <li>Q. Are you on Exhibit I 23?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> <li>Q. That's what I thought when I read them too so I don't think you made a mistake?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I read sentence by sentence but I'm very nervous and I could easily make a mistake up there.</li> <li>Q. No. And I get that. I think that's the point; it's the same language; right?</li> <li>A. Looks the same to me. I just read it.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Rather than starting from scratch, did the county utilize the draft model ordinance that was on the PUC's website?</li> <li>A. We did a lot of our stuff with District III. So I guess I'm just a farmer. I didn't go to college. But we kind of acted on you know, asked them for advice and helped guide us guidance us.</li> <li>Q. Well, why don't we compare the draft model ordinance to Article 17 to see if we can conclude that that's kind of the document that the county used from scratch. Okay?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has testified he doesn't know and if there's a comparison between the ordinances, I believe Mr. Almond can make that argument in his brief.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to let Mr. Almond make this comparison.</li> <li>Q. So also in front of you is what's been marked as Exhibit I 23.</li> <li>A. Okay. Two separate sheets?</li> <li>Q. Are you on Exhibit I 23?</li> <li>A. Yeah. 2018.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>is Section 1723 of Article 17? What's the title of it?</li> <li>A. On the setbacks?</li> <li>Q. Section 1723. Setbacks?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Now go ahead and compare Section 1723 titled setbacks with page 6 of the draft model ordinance.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Where it talks about setbacks.         <ul> <li>(Witness examines documents.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Okay. I read it, that Section 1723.</li> <li>Q. Do you think Section 1723 matches the language from the draft model ordinance regarding setbacks?</li> <li>A. Unless I made a mistake when I read it, I think it's the same.</li> <li>Q. That's what I thought when I read them too so I don't think you made a mistake?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I read sentence by sentence but I'm very nervous and I could easily make a mistake up there.</li> <li>Q. No. And I get that. I think that's the point; it's the same language; right?</li> <li>A. Looks the same to me. I just read it.</li> <li>Q. And we could continue this process, but for the sake</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 13		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 15
1	standard? Was there a state standard?	1	public and took in public input. Who were some of the
2		2	
3	<b>A.</b> You know, back that many years ago I remember that	3	more active participants in the public input process?
4	word, state standard, but I cannot sit here and say that I remember.	4	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. I'd like to have a
5	<b>Q.</b> I mean, did you refer to the state standard during	5	standing objection to this investigation into how a zoning ordinance was adopted.
6	these meetings?	6	I understand the Commission's ruling and I won't
7	A. I'm pretty sure we did.	7	continue to interpose objections but I would like it to
8		8	be maintained.
9	Q. And what was the state standard that you were referring to? Was it the draft model ordinance there?	9	MR. DE HUECK: So noted.
10	A. I would say yes.	10	MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you.
11	Q. Okay.	11	<b>Q.</b> Who were involved who were the more active public
12	<ul><li>A. That was three years ago. And then in that summer</li></ul>	12	participants in that public input process?
13	of 2015 my dad died so we were in and out of the hospital	13	A. Mainly Mr. Hubner, who I've known forever. And his
14	quite a bit.	14	wife.
15	<b>Q.</b> And it makes sense?	15	Q. Anyone else?
16	A. Yeah.	16	A. Mr. Van Gerpen from Avon.
17	<b>Q.</b> If the PUC has a draft model ordinance, it would	17	<b>Q.</b> Anyone else from the public that was involved in the
18	make sense that a county would start with that when	18	public input process?
19	drafting the zoning ordinance; right?	19	<b>A.</b> Those would be the main two to three.
20	A. Right.	20	<ul><li>Q. Was anyone on behalf of the wind industry involved</li></ul>
21	Q. I think you need to	21	in the public input process?
22	<b>A.</b> As far as my opinion we did everything up to par. I	22	<b>A.</b> Yes. Mr. Roland Jorgenson [sic] was there, and a
23	can't say that we we can't make a mistake because	23	couple of landowners that will eventually have windmills
24	everybody watches us.	24	were at the meeting.
25	<b>Q.</b> Okay. So we can set aside	25	<b>Q.</b> Do you know the names of those landowners?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 14		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 16
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 14 MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move	1	
1		1	A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder
_	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24.		
2	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move	2	<b>A.</b> Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I
2 3	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going	2 3	<b>A.</b> Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.
2 3 4	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance?	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me. MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit 124. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me. MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead. MR. ALMOND: I believe his testimony was that he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note that we have various entities that have owned or two</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me. MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead. MR. ALMOND: I believe his testimony was that he just relied on the state standard which was this PUC	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note that we have various entities that have owned or two entities that have owned the project that was before the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit 124. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me. MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead. MR. ALMOND: I believe his testimony was that he just relied on the state standard which was this PUC model ordinance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note that we have various entities that have owned or two entities that have owned the project that was before the Commission, and I'd just like the record to be clear what</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit 124. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me. MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead. MR. ALMOND: I believe his testimony was that he just relied on the state standard which was this PUC model ordinance. MR. DE HUECK: With that, I'm going to go ahead	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note that we have various entities that have owned or two entities that have owned the project that was before the Commission, and I'd just like the record to be clear what developer was being discussed in 2015 versus the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit 124. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me. MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead. MR. ALMOND: I believe his testimony was that he just relied on the state standard which was this PUC model ordinance. MR. DE HUECK: With that, I'm going to go ahead and admit it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note that we have various entities that have owned or two entities that have owned the project that was before the Commission, and I'd just like the record to be clear what developer was being discussed in 2015 versus the Applicant in this proceeding.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit 124.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I believe his testimony was that he just relied on the state standard which was this PUC model ordinance.</li> <li>Q. You can set aside the model ordinance now and we're</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note that we have various entities that have owned or two entities that have owned the project that was before the Commission, and I'd just like the record to be clear what developer was being discussed in 2015 versus the Applicant in this proceeding.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ALMOND: Well at this time I'd like to move for the admission of Exhibit I24. MR. DE HUECK: Absent any objection, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. MS. EDWARDS: Is that the draft model ordinance? MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. MS. REISS: Staff would object just based on the fact that no appropriate foundation was laid. The County Commissioner never said that he reviewed it. He just reviewed the language and answered questions as to whether it matched or not. MR. DE HUECK: Anything from the Applicant? MS. AGRIMONTI: I'd join in the objection. MR. ALMOND: Would you like a response from me. MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead. MR. ALMOND: I believe his testimony was that he just relied on the state standard which was this PUC model ordinance. MR. DE HUECK: With that, I'm going to go ahead and admit it. <b>Q.</b> You can set aside the model ordinance now and we're going to change topics. Okay?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Well, I would say through the summer Mr. Bowder (check) and I don't know who else to say on the I guess just supporters of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. And you mentioned Mr. Roland Jurgens. Who is he?</li> <li>A. I guess he's the project manager of the wind farm.</li> <li>Q. You say the wind farm, which wind farm are you referring to?</li> <li>A. Actually he was involved with both of them. I'm pretty sure he was on the with the first wind farm, the Beethoven Wind Farm.</li> <li>Q. When you say both of them, are you referring to Beethoven and?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. This wind farm?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague. I would note that we have various entities that have owned or two entities that have owned the project that was before the Commission, and I'd just like the record to be clear what developer was being discussed in 2015 versus the Applicant in this proceeding.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Does Mr. Almond need to rephrase that then?</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 17		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 19
1	MS. AGRIMONTI: I can do it that way. It seems	1	on our records, we started acting on the first meeting of
2	to me we'd have a clearer record if we know what	2	November, which would be November 3 of 2015.
3	developer we're talking about when questions are being	3	<b>Q.</b> I want to take take your time and familiarize
4	asked.	4	yourself with that e-mail, please.
5	MR. DE HUECK: Yes.	5	MS. AGRIMONTI: I object. This document to the
6	So, Mr. Almond, please refer to the correct	6	extent the witness is just being asked to review a
7	developer while asking questions.	7	document. No foundation has been laid for it. I would
8	But before I go any further, Mr. Soukup, could	8	request that foundation be laid before we investigate and
9	you please scoot your microphone a little closer to your	9	ask questions about this document.
10	mouth. Because you end up turning sideways and get a	10	MR. ALMOND: Ms. Agrimonti, I believe you
11	ways away. And you can move that around if you want to	11	stipulated to the foundation of this document.
12	continue sit sideways. It's absolutely fine.	12	MS. AGRIMONTI: I stipulated to the document
13	Thank you.	13	being an e-mail from Mr. Jurgens to Mr. Elsberry. The
14	<b>Q.</b> Again, so who is Mr. Roland Jurgens?	14	witness has not stated he's never seen this document
15	<b>A.</b> One of the the wind developer for this last wind	15	before. It's also a document from a prior Applicant with
16	farm.	16	this PUC than Prevailing Winds so it's not relevant, but
17	Q. When you say this wind farm, which one are you	17	I don't believe you've laid the foundation that this
18	referring to?	18	witness can speak to the document.
19	A. The one we're talking about today.	19	MR. DE HUECK: Continue reviewing the document.
20	<b>Q.</b> And did he hold himself out to the county as	20	I'm going to allow Mr. Almond to ask his
21	overseeing all development activities for the project?	21	questions just based on this mail. I'm assuming, yes,
22	A. Well, when he would come to our meetings he would	22	this gentleman cannot speak to the conversation that took
23	tell us the future plans of what they wanted to do.	23	place in this e-mail, but maybe there's some information
24	Q. Okay.	24	within that he Mr. Almond's got some sort of line of
25	A. Briefed us on what was coming in the future.	25	questioning that will make sense.
	5	20	
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 20
1		1	
1 2	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 20
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q.And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 20 (Witness examines documents.)
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.	1 2	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been	1 2 3	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       20         (Witness examines documents.)       20         A. Okay. I've read it.       20         Q. As part of the public input process Mr. Roland       20
2 3 4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's beenthere the last three years. Our other guy retired so we	1 2 3 4 5 6	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A. Okay. I've read it.Q.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?
2 3 4 5	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       18         Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.       18         A. Yes.       18         Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?       18         A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A.Okay. I've read it.Q.As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI:Objection.Methods to state what is in the document.The document
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       18         Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.       18         A. Yes.       18         Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?       18         A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.         Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A. Okay. I've read it.Q.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A.Okay. I've read it.Q.As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A.Okay. I've read it.Q.As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A.Okay. I've read it.Q.As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's beenthere the last three years. Our other guy retired so wehired him and put him in there. And he does a very goodjob.Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of thepublic submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions heusually calls District III for some advice becausethere's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's beenthere the last three years. Our other guy retired so wehired him and put him in there. And he does a very goodjob.Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of thepublic submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions heusually calls District III for some advice becausethere's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!18Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public inputprocess, as we've discussed.A. Yes.Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's beenthere the last three years. Our other guy retired so wehired him and put him in there. And he does a very goodjob.Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of thepublic submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions heusually calls District III for some advice becausethere's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me,please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?A. What do you really want to know now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?A. What do you really want to know now.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?A. What do you really want to know now.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit I24 an e-mail from Roland Jurgens to</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?A. What do you really want to know now.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.(Reporter reads back the question.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit I24 an e-mail from Roland Jurgens to the zoning administrator Eric Elsberry?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?A. What do you really want to know now.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.(Reporter reads back the question.)MS. AGRIMONTI: Further objection of hearsay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit I24 an e-mail from Roland Jurgens to the zoning administrator Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is. I'm reading it right now. Hi, Eric."</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A.Okay. I've read it.Q.As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q.Would you like the question repeated?A.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.(Reporter reads back the question.)MS. AGRIMONTI: Further objection of hearsay.MR. DE HUECK: Well, and I'm just going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit 124 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit 124 an e-mail from Roland Jurgens to the zoning administrator Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is. I'm reading it right now. Hi, Eric."</li> <li>Q. And this e-mail was sent in October of 2015, around</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A.Okay. I've read it.Q.As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q.Would you like the question repeated?A.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.(Reporter reads back the question.)MS. AGRIMONTI: Further objection of hearsay.MR. DE HUECK: Well, and I'm just going toadvise Mr. Almond you're basically testifying, and you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit I24 an e-mail from Roland Jurgens to the zoning administrator Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is. I'm reading it right now. Hi, Eric."</li> <li>Q. And this e-mail was sent in October of 2015, around the same time the county was looking to adopt Article 17;</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A.A.Okay. I've read it.Q.As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q.Would you like the question repeated?A.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.(Reporter reads back the question.)MS. AGRIMONTI: Further objection of hearsay.MR. DE HUECK: Well, and I'm just going toadvise Mr. Almond you're basically testifying, and you'releading your direct examination. So let's try to avoid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit I24 an e-mail from Roland Jurgens to the zoning administrator Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is. I'm reading it right now. Hi, Eric."</li> <li>Q. And this e-mail was sent in October of 2015, around the same time the county was looking to adopt Article 17; right?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?A. What do you really want to know now.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.(Reporter reads back the question.)MS. AGRIMONTI: Further objection of hearsay.MR. DE HUECK: Well, and I'm just going toadvise Mr. Almond you're basically testifying, and you'releading questions and leave them more open-ended.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 18</li> <li>Q. And Mr. Jurgens was involved in the public input process, as we've discussed.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Who's Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. He's our zoning administrator. I suppose he's been there the last three years. Our other guy retired so we hired him and put him in there. And he does a very good job.</li> <li>Q. And as the zoning administrator, do members of the public submit input and comments to Mr. Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, they do. And if there's any questions he usually calls District III for some advice because there's a wide variety of knowledge you need to know.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to turn to Exhibit I24 for me, please. It's in the binder under the tab I 24.</li> <li>A. With them yellow tags? There's 23 and there's 25. Right there? I 24. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And is Exhibit I24 an e-mail from Roland Jurgens to the zoning administrator Eric Elsberry?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is. I'm reading it right now. Hi, Eric."</li> <li>Q. And this e-mail was sent in October of 2015, around the same time the county was looking to adopt Article 17;</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!20(Witness examines documents.)A. Okay. I've read it.Q. As part of the public input process Mr. RolandJurgens suggested to the county that a 35 dBnonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best wayto protect nonparticipants?MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's just asking thewitness to state what is in the document. The documentspeaks for itself.MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. But I'm going to let thefactual basis for these questions just merely go to theweight of what this witness responds and gives to theCommission. And we'll go from there.Q. Would you like the question repeated?A. What do you really want to know now.MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you ask the questionagain.(Reporter reads back the question.)MS. AGRIMONTI: Further objection of hearsay.MR. DE HUECK: Well, and I'm just going toadvise Mr. Almond you're basically testifying, and you'releading questions and leave them more open-ended.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 21		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 23
1		1	
2	process? A. I can't answer that. I can't remember. That was	2	MR. DE HUECK: Can the parties help me out. Did we have this one?
3	three years ago.	3	MR. ALMOND: No. It's not admitted.
4	<b>Q.</b> Looking at exhibit what's been marked as Exhibit	4	MR. DE HUECK: Not admitted.
5	I24, go to the fifth paragraph for me. Follow along as I	5	MS. AGRIMONTI: It's not admitted. And the
6	read it out loud.	6	Applicant does agree that it is a document from
7	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness has not	7	Mr. Roland Jurgens to Eric Elsberry so that that
8	seen this document except for today. He has not laid any	8	foundation I'm not suggesting that the document isn't
9	foundation that the document in front of him influenced	9	what it is. But it is hearsay, and there's no foundation
10	his decision or that he was even aware of it. To have	10	for this witness to opine on it.
11	Mr. Almond read into the record what isn't otherwise	11	MR. DE HUECK: In agreement. It's not admitted
12	admissible is improper, it's not relevant, and the	12	at this point in time.
13	foundation has not been laid.	13	MR. ALMOND: And, just to be clear, I cannot use
14	MR. ALMOND: May I respond?	14	this document for impeachment purposes with this witness?
15	MR. DE HUECK: You may.	15	MR. DE HUECK: I have not seen you try to do
16	MR. ALMOND: We've heard this witness who is the	16	that yet.
17	County Commissioner also sitting on the Zoning Board.	17	<b>Q.</b> Did the county receive public input from Mr. Roland
18	We've heard that the Zoning Board and the County	18	Jurgens suggesting a 35 dBA limit for nonparticipants?
19	Commission receives public input in whether or not to	19	A. To my knowledge I cannot remember that. It was
20	adopt zoning ordinances. We've heard as part of that	20	three years ago.
21	public input process people submit e-mails to Mr. Eric	21	Q. Looking at Exhibit I what's been marked as
22	Elsberry, the zoning administrator for the county.	22	Exhibit I24 in front of you read along as I read for you.
23	This is an e-mail from Mr. Jurgens to Eric	23	"The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise
24	Elsberry, the zoning administrator clearly providing	24	restraint is absolutely the best way to protect
25	public input into the process of the adoption of Article	25	nonparticipants."
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 22		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 24
1	17. As a County Commissioner and the board of a	1	Did I read that correctly?
-			Did I read that correctly?
2	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to	2	<ul><li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li></ul>
	-		
2	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to	2	A. You're on the page of this I 24?
2 3	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.	2 3	<ul><li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li><li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li></ul>
2 3 4	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's never seen this. He's completely unfamiliar with this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's never seen this. He's completely unfamiliar with this document. So I am not going to let you read it into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's never seen this. He's completely unfamiliar with this document. So I am not going to let you read it into the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's never seen this. He's completely unfamiliar with this document. So I am not going to let you read it into the record. I think you could formulate your questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's never seen this. He's completely unfamiliar with this document. So I am not going to let you read it into the record. I think you could formulate your questions without even having this e-mail in front of us right now. MR. ALMOND: Well, I asked the question of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's never seen this. He's completely unfamiliar with this document. So I am not going to let you read it into the record. I think you could formulate your questions without even having this e-mail in front of us right now. MR. ALMOND: Well, I asked the question of whether or not Mr. Jurgens submitted public input, and I'm now attempting to the county, and I'm now	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process. MS. AGRIMONTI: The witness has not seen the document MR. DE HUECK: I got this. So Mr. Elsberry should be on the stand because it's clear from his statement and from observing him he's never seen this. He's completely unfamiliar with this document. So I am not going to let you read it into the record. I think you could formulate your questions without even having this e-mail in front of us right now. MR. ALMOND: Well, I asked the question of whether or not Mr. Jurgens submitted public input, and I'm now attempting to the county, and I'm now attempting to impeach the witness.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." <ul> <li>Did I read that correctly?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> <li>A. Well, I haven't been on the board for a couple of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> <li>A. Well, I haven't been on the board for a couple of years and that we had read through, and this is all</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> <li>A. Well, I haven't been on the board for a couple of years and that we had read through, and this is all you know, we deal with many things, gravel to machinery</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> <li>A. Well, I haven't been on the board for a couple of years and that we had read through, and this is all you know, we deal with many things, gravel to machinery to personnel and whatever. We go through that book, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> <li>A. Well, I haven't been on the board for a couple of years and that we had read through, and this is all you know, we deal with many things, gravel to machinery to personnel and whatever. We go through that book, and I guess I'll apologize. I did not read through this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> <li>A. Well, I haven't been on the board for a couple of years and that we had read through, and this is all you know, we deal with many things, gravel to machinery to personnel and whatever. We go through that book, and I guess I'll apologize. I did not read through this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>member of the planning board he's capable to speak to those public input that is submitted into the process.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. You're on the page of this I 24?</li> <li>Q. Yes. It's the fifth paragraph.</li> <li>A. Read that again for me.</li> <li>Q. "The 45 dB participant, 35 dB nonparticipant noise restraint is absolutely the best way to protect nonparticipants." Did I read that correctly?</li> <li>A. That's what's wrote in the book.</li> <li>Q. What was that?</li> <li>A. That's what is written here.</li> <li>Q. Okay. What noise limitation did the county ultimately adopt for nonparticipants?</li> <li>A. I'd have to go through the book and you'd have to show me what page. When we did that three years ago we did it.</li> <li>Q. Do you frequently look to your zoning ordinances?</li> <li>A. Well, I haven't been on the board for a couple of years and that we had read through, and this is all you know, we deal with many things, gravel to machinery to personnel and whatever. We go through that book, and I guess I'll apologize. I did not read through this</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 25		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 27
1	ask me questions about hog barns and setbacks, and I can	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 27 that. That's why it was put in there.
2	answer them.	2	<b>Q.</b> And what are the issues you said there had been
3	<b>Q.</b> Well, let's look to Article 17 and find the noise	3	issues?
4	setback for nonparticipants. Can you turn to Article 17	4	A. That shadow flicker. You know, I personally
5	of your zoning ordinances for me?	5	don't I do understand it, but I don't. I mean, I know
6	<ul><li><b>A.</b> What page is that on?</li></ul>	6	what it is and that's why it was put in there, to the
7	Q. It starts on page 57.	7	best of my knowledge.
8	<ul> <li>A. Okay. I'm on page 57, Article 17. What do you want</li> </ul>	8	<b>Q.</b> You said there had been other issues. Do you know
9	to know?	9	what those other issues are?
10	<b>Q.</b> I want to know what the county's noise restriction	10	A. No.
11	is for nonparticipating residences of a wind energy	11	Q. Okay.
12	system, a large wind energy system?	12	<ul><li>A. But when we from some county or whatever, they</li></ul>
13	<ul> <li>A. Well, I know it's in here but I'm not going to be</li> </ul>	13	said that you know, we kind of relied on everybody
14	able to tell you right offhand where that paragraph is.	14	else's advice is how we acted on that, other
15	Because we did study that three years ago.	15	<b>Q.</b> In adopting the ordinances, did the county ever
16	<b>Q.</b> And I'll help you out. It's Section 1741.	16	consider the concepts of infrasound or low frequency
17	A. Okay. "Noise level produced by"	17	noise?
18	(Witness examines document.)	18	A. Oh, I'm sure that was brought up. About everything
19	<b>A.</b> Okay. Now what do you want to know here?	19	you've talked about has been brought up in them three
20	<b>Q.</b> Yeah. What is the noise limitation placed on large	20	years prior a little bit.
21	wind energy systems for nonparticipating residences?	21	<b>Q.</b> And in anywhere in those Article 17 of your
22	A. I guess I will admit the truth. This is a little	22	ordinances does the county place any sort of limitations
23	above my head. You know, we went through this three	23	or restrictions on infrasound or low frequency noise?
24	years ago and according to the zoning administrator and	24	A. I did not read up on that. I cannot answer that.
25	everything, other counties, it worked.	25	Q. Well, you have Article 17 in front of you so feel
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 26		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 28
1	<b>Q.</b> Looking specifically at the first line of Section	4	free to if you can find
		1	
2	1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind	2	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.
2 3			
	1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind	2	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.
	1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted	2 3	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative. MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the
3 4	1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences."	2 3 4	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative. MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances. MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the
3 4 5	1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound	2 3 4 5	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative. MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances. MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative. MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances. MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative. MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances. MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not. MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer he's unaware.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative. MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances. MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not. MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer he's unaware. <b>A.</b> I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In that same Section 1741 deals with shadow flicker.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> <li>the PUC model ordinance should not be used as a resource?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In that same Section 1741 deals with shadow flicker. Do you see that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> <li>the PUC model ordinance should not be used as a resource?</li> <li>A. I honestly can't recall that.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In that same Section 1741 deals with shadow flicker. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. To the bottom. I read that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> <li>the PUC model ordinance should not be used as a resource?</li> <li>A. I honestly can't recall that.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In that same Section 1741 deals with shadow flicker.</li> <li>Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. To the bottom. I read that.</li> <li>Q. Why did the county think it needed to regulate</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> <li>the PUC model ordinance should not be used as a resource?</li> <li>A. I honestly can't recall that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have anymore questions for</li> <li>you, Mr. Soukup. Thank you for coming in.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In that same Section 1741 deals with shadow flicker. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. To the bottom. I read that.</li> <li>Q. Why did the county think it needed to regulate shadow flicker?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> <li>the PUC model ordinance should not be used as a resource?</li> <li>A. I honestly can't recall that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have anymore questions for</li> <li>you, Mr. Soukup. Thank you for coming in.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. But I do recall the night</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. In that same Section 1741 deals with shadow flicker. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. To the bottom. I read that.</li> <li>Q. Why did the county think it needed to regulate shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. I guess with advice from other counties and other</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> <li>the PUC model ordinance should not be used as a resource?</li> <li>A. I honestly can't recall that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have anymore questions for</li> <li>you, Mr. Soukup. Thank you for coming in.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. But I do recall the night</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>1741 it says, "Noise level produced by the large wind energy system shall not exceed 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure at the perimeter of occupied residences." What does that 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure mean?</li> <li>A. Well, they monitor that and not supposed to go over it; right, is my understanding.</li> <li>Q. And the 45 dBA average A-weighted sound pressure, I understand you're saying that they monitor it and they can't go over it, but what is it?</li> <li>A. Well, it's the sound from the windmills.</li> <li>Q. And it says average A-weighted. How is it averaged?</li> <li>A. I cannot answer that. That is over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. Is there a certain time period over which it's averaged that you're aware of?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. In that same Section 1741 deals with shadow flicker. Do you see that?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. To the bottom. I read that.</li> <li>Q. Why did the county think it needed to regulate shadow flicker?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Argumentative.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm attempting to refresh the</li> <li>witness's recollection of his zoning ordinances.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I think it's an unfair test to</li> <li>ask him to read the entire ordinance and answer the</li> <li>question. It's either in the ordinance or it's not.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I agree. And he gave the answer</li> <li>he's unaware.</li> <li>A. I guess we adopted this three years ago, and at that</li> <li>time we started up we thought everything was up to par at</li> <li>that time three years ago.</li> <li>I've flipped through it here and there. You know,</li> <li>we've heard about this many times and flipped through,</li> <li>whatever, should be good. And you're asking me these in</li> <li>depth questions, and they are over my intelligence.</li> <li>Q. At some point was it communicated to the county that</li> <li>the PUC model ordinance should not be used as a resource?</li> <li>A. I honestly can't recall that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have anymore questions for</li> <li>you, Mr. Soukup. Thank you for coming in.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. But I do recall the night</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 29		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 31
1	yet. What I have to do now is to tender you for	1	A. You know, I remember taking notes that night you
2	cross-examination. Which means that now we let the	2	guys all talked in Tyndall. I said who was in favor, say
3	Applicant ask you questions, and then I'll turn it over	3	your name. Karen, yes and or no. And I kept track of
4	to these other Intervenors in room and then we'll go to	4	that because I sat right next to the Chairman that night.
5	Staff and then the Commission will have an opportunity to	5	And, you know, that meeting was two and a half hours
6	ask you some questions as well. So, with that,	6	long. I guess there was a lot of things that was asked
7	Prevailing Winds would you like to cross-examine this	7	for. I don't really remember anything specifically.
8	witness?	8	MR. FUERNISS: Okay. Thank you.
9	MS. AGRIMONTI: I have no questions. I thank	9	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.
10	you for coming in today.	10	MS. JENKINS: No questions.
11	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, do you have any	11	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.
12	cross-examination?	12	MS. PAZOUR: No questions.
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION	13	MR. DE HUECK: Staff.
14	BY MR. FUERNISS:	14	MS. REISS: Thank you. Just briefly.
15	Q. Mr. Soukup, I don't think you're giving yourself	15	CROSS-EXAMINATION
16	enough credit when you say this is over your	16	BY MS. REISS:
17	intelligence.	17	Q. Thank you for being here, Commissioner. I just have
18	Don't you think perhaps you just haven't looked into	18	a couple of quick questions for you. Prior to today, did
19	this lately, that it's not fresh you're mind?	19	anyone help you prepare your testimony for today?
20	A. I will apologize. You know, I should have brought	20	A. No. I met with the State's attorney two days ago
21	that in fact, I borrowed my zoning book to one of the	21	and she said when to be here and I said what room and
22	other Commissioners to read through it two weeks ago.	22	that was it. And if I would have been prepared I would
23	And I should have brought that book along. This morning	23	have brought that book and read it instead of sitting
24	I was waiting in the hall. I could have read it about	24	here looking like an idiot.
25	twice and refreshed my memory. You know, this was all	25	<b>Q.</b> Great. And in response to some of Mr. Almond's
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 30		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 32
	stuff from three years ago. I remember that October 20	1	
1		1	questions you responded that the Commission looked
2	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke	2	towards counties and other entities for zoning
2 3	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm	2 3	towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?
2 3 4	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the	2 3 4	<ul><li>towards counties and other entities for zoning</li><li>ordinances. Do you remember that?</li><li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>towards counties and other entities for zoning</li><li>ordinances. Do you remember that?</li><li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning</li> <li>ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning</li> <li>ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning</li> <li>ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning</li> <li>ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm? Do you remember any specific requests that were made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm? Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning</li> <li>ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm? Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that? <b>A.</b> You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm? Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that? <b>A.</b> You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in TyndalI at least three	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure. In your experience as a County Commissioner I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm? Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that? <b>A.</b> You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in TyndalI at least three different times; right? And you was in TyndalI once or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure. <ul> <li>In your experience as a County Commissioner I believe you said 17 years? How many years was it?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm? Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that? <b>A.</b> You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in TyndalI at least three different times; right? And you was in TyndalI once or twice.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure. <ul> <li>In your experience as a County Commissioner I believe you said 17 years? How many years was it?</li> <li>A. Zoning is 21. Commissioner 8.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and <b>Q.</b> And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm? Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that? <b>A.</b> You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in TyndalI at least three different times; right? And you was in TyndalI once or twice. <b>Q.</b> But do you remember what was specifically being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure.</li> <li>In your experience as a County Commissioner I believe you said 17 years? How many years was it?</li> <li>A. Zoning is 21. Commissioner 8.</li> <li>Q. 21 years?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. So in your experience on the Zoning Board is it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and</li> <li>Q. And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm?</li> <li>Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that?</li> <li>A. You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in TyndalI at least three different times; right? And you was in TyndalI once or twice.</li> <li>Q. But do you remember what was specifically being asked for?</li> <li>A. Three years ago? The main specific thing was you guys just wanted to stop it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure. In your experience as a County Commissioner I believe you said 17 years? How many years was it?</li> <li>A. Zoning is 21. Commissioner 8.</li> <li>Q. 21 years?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. So in your experience on the Zoning Board is it abnormal for the county to look towards other resources,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and</li> <li>Q. And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm?</li> <li>Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that?</li> <li>A. You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in TyndalI at least three different times; right? And you was in TyndalI once or twice.</li> <li>Q. But do you remember what was specifically being asked for?</li> <li>A. Three years ago? The main specific thing was you guys just wanted to stop it.</li> <li>Q. But you don't recalI</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure. <ul> <li>In your experience as a County Commissioner I</li> </ul> </li> <li>believe you said 17 years? How many years was it?</li> <li>A. Zoning is 21. Commissioner 8.</li> <li>Q. 21 years?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. So in your experience on the Zoning Board is it abnormal for the county to look towards other resources, counties?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and</li> <li>Q. And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm?</li> <li>Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that?</li> <li>A. You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in Tyndall at least three different times; right? And you was in Tyndall once or twice.</li> <li>Q. But do you remember what was specific thing was you guys just wanted to stop it.</li> <li>Q. But you don't recall</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure. <ul> <li>In your experience as a County Commissioner I</li> <li>believe you said 17 years? How many years was it?</li> <li>A. Zoning is 21. Commissioner 8.</li> <li>Q. 21 years?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. So in your experience on the Zoning Board is it abnormal for the county to look towards other resources, counties?</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. We're issuing with these hog barns right</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>night meeting. And there was quite a few people spoke that night. I'm sure Gregg was there that night. I'm sitting here. You know, I know everybody here with the wind farm and I drive right by Karen's farm on my way here and you know, cut through your neighborhood, I should say, and</li> <li>Q. And maybe this came out, Reece got this out, I don't know, but do you remember any specifics that the public was asking for, as far as putting into the ordinance for the wind farm?</li> <li>Do you remember any specific requests that were made that it should have this or it should have that?</li> <li>A. You know, I guess I'm very nervous, but as I sit here I remember Karen speaking in TyndalI at least three different times; right? And you was in TyndalI once or twice.</li> <li>Q. But do you remember what was specifically being asked for?</li> <li>A. Three years ago? The main specific thing was you guys just wanted to stop it.</li> <li>Q. But you don't recalI</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>towards counties and other entities for zoning ordinances. Do you remember that?</li> <li>A. In that area we had paid attention to what some of the other counties up north had done.</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. And like I said that was three and a half years ago.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. Almost four. So we did give it a lot of thought, and at that time everything we did in that book we thought we was up to par and District III thought it was up to par. Everything we did not want to make any mistakes.</li> <li>Q. Sure. <ul> <li>In your experience as a County Commissioner I</li> </ul> </li> <li>believe you said 17 years? How many years was it?</li> <li>A. Zoning is 21. Commissioner 8.</li> <li>Q. S1 years?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. So in your experience on the Zoning Board is it abnormal for the county to look towards other resources, counties?</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 33		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 35
1	setbacks and smell and whatever.	1	<b>Q.</b> And does Charles Mix County have any zoning
2	<b>Q.</b> So just to clarify it's a normal practice for the	2	ordinances?
3	county to look to other entities or it's not normal?	3	A. It does not.
4	A. Yeah. I would call other Commissioners. Other	4	<b>Q.</b> Are you aware of the project that's being considered
5	Commissioners call me all the time about something.	5	as part of this proceeding?
6	<b>Q</b> . Sure. And I guess my last question is after looking	6	A. For Prevailing Winds, yes.
7	at other resources did the county independently review	7	<b>Q</b> . And when did you first learn about this project?
8	the information in the ordinance before passage?	8	A. Six months ago, roughly.
9	A. I think I'm sure our Chairman had called some other	9	<b>Q.</b> And how did you come to learn of the project?
10	counties and we just thought everything we did was up to	10	A. They petitioned the county, let us know that they
11	par.	11	had an Application out. But beings how we're not zoned
12	MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.	12	they're really not required to do a lot. They did let us
13	MR. DE HUECK: That will bring us to Commission	13	know what some of the tax base would be from the project.
14	questions. And I'll go down to Chairman Fiegen and see	14	Wanted to meet with the highway superintendents for road
15	if she has any questions for you.	15	agreements.
16	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I don't have any questions.	16	<b>Q.</b> You said they petitioned the county? Is that what
17	And thank you for coming to your State Capitol and	17	you said?
18	leaving your farm for a little bit. We are praying for	18	<b>A.</b> No.
19	better weather every single day.	19	Q. Okay. Maybe I misheard you.
20	THE WITNESS: Next week.	20	<b>A.</b> No.
21	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.	21	<b>Q.</b> They just reached out to the county let them know
22	THE WITNESS: Next week.	22	about the project?
23	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.	23	A. Right. There would be haul road agreements to be
24	COMMISSIONER HANSON: No thank you.	24	considered and things like that.
25	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Nelson.	25	<b>Q</b> . And in response of learning of this project, what
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 34		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 36
1	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thanks for being part of	1	did the county do?
2	the process. No questions.	2	A. We're not zoned. We really didn't do nothing,
3	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond do you have any	3	other after there was some protests, we looked into
4	redirect?	4	zoning but that's not going to work in Charles Mix
5	MR. ALMOND: No.	5	County.
6	MR. DE HUECK: With that, you may step down. Thank you for testifying.	7	<ul><li>Q. And you say after some protest. Tell me about that.</li><li>A. Your clients were not in favor of wind power or the</li></ul>
8	THE WITNESS: Thank you. And you earned your	8	placement of it. Whatever.
9	money that night at Avon. That was a tough one. Between	9	<b>Q.</b> When you say your clients who are you referring to?
10	the heat and the speaker problem.	10	<ul> <li>A. This row of gentlemen and Mr. Fuerniss.</li> </ul>
11	(The witness is excused.)	11	<b>Q.</b> Cuss their names and can you get a little more
12	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond, you may call your	12	closer to the microphone?
13	next witness.	13	A. Mr. Sherman Fuerniss, I know he spoke before the
14	MR. ALMOND: Call Keith Mushitz.	14	Commission before and Mr. Hubner. And I'm not real good
15	Keith Mushitz,	15	with names so I don't know the rest of them by name.
16	called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above	16	<b>Q</b> . And when did the members of the public protest about
17	cause, testified under oath as follows:	17	this project?
18	CROSS-EXAMINATION	18	A. When it was prevented when it was presented by
19	BY MR. ALMOND.	19	Prevailing Winds, I guess.
20	Q. Will you introduce yourself to the Commission,	20	<b>Q.</b> And you said there was some consideration of zoning.
21	please.	21	Tell us about that.
22	A. I'm Keith Mushitz. Geddes, South Dakota. Chairman	22	A. Some people thought we should do some emergency
23	of Charles Mix County.	23	zoning, but after more so meeting on other matters, not
1 ~ -			
24	<b>Q.</b> You're Chairman of Charles Mix County Commission?	24	necessarily wind matters, zoning is not just not going

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 37		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 39
1	good fit for Charles Mix County. There's 40,000 acres	1	<b>Q.</b> Looking at page 3 of Exhibit 1-22, the Affidavit of
2	that we have no control over.	2	Peter Pawlowski, do you see that?
3	<b>Q.</b> Did the County Commission start the process of	3	A. Yes, sir.
4	implementing the ordinance zoning?	4	<b>Q.</b> And is that that agreement you were just referring
5	<ul> <li>A. We looked into it. We never ever read any</li> </ul>	5	to?
6	ordinances. We did District III draw an ordinance up but	6	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Mischaracterizes the
7	we never acted on anything.	7	document.
8	<b>Q.</b> And when you said you looked into it, is that what	8	MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead, Reiss.
9	you meant by looking it is you had District III?	9	Q. What is that document?
10	<ul> <li>A. We actually had a draft written up, yes, sir.</li> </ul>	10	A. That is the document that we approved.
11	<b>Q.</b> And did you do anything else to look into it?	11	<b>Q</b> . So this is the document that Charles Mix County
12	A. Don't understand.	12	approved for this project?
13	<b>Q.</b> Well, did you hold any public hearings or any public	13	A. Yes, sir.
14	meetings about?	14	<b>Q.</b> When was the first time you seen this document?
15	A. Yes.	15	<b>A.</b> At one of the meetings in the one of the public
16	<b>Q.</b> Adopting emergency zoning ordinances?	16	meetings that we had in the evening. I don't know the
17	A. Yes, we did.	17	date.
18	Q. Tell us about those meetings.	18	Q. Yeah. And did you at some point the County
19	<b>A.</b> Well, we had people that were wanting to have the	19	Commission approved this document.
20	wind project and we had people that were not in favor of	20	A. Correct. At the end of the meeting.
21	the wind power and we just let them air it out.	21	<b>Q.</b> At the end of the meeting. Have you ever seen this
22	<b>Q.</b> And approximately how many meetings took place	22	document prior to that meeting?
23	considering the adoption of emergency zoning ordinances?	23	<b>A.</b> I think I've heard that the document was around.
24	A. One special meeting that was just for public comment	24	Had I read it? No, sir.
25	and then one of our Commission meetings had pretty much a	25	<b>Q.</b> Okay. And from the county's perspective, what does
-			
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 38		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 40
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 38 full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 40 it mean to approve this document?
1 2		1 2	
_	full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power	_	it mean to approve this document?
2	full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.	2	it mean to approve this document? A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go
2 3	full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure. A little later on we had just strictly a zoning	2 3	<ul><li>it mean to approve this document?</li><li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their</li></ul>
2 3 4	full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure. A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.	2 3 4	<ul><li>it mean to approve this document?</li><li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li><li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li><li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> <li>A. The county signed a document with Prevailing Winds</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> <li>A. Farther distance was 2 to 3 miles and the least</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> <li>A. The county signed a document with Prevailing Winds as to where they would have how much they would use</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> <li>A. Farther distance was 2 to 3 miles and the least distance I believe was 1,000 feet.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> <li>A. The county signed a document with Prevailing Winds as to where they would have how much they would use for setbacks. I'm sure you've looked at the document.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> <li>A. Farther distance was 2 to 3 miles and the least distance I believe was 1,000 feet.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Aside from just looking at other county</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> <li>A. The county signed a document with Prevailing Winds as to where they would have how much they would use for setbacks. I'm sure you've looked at the document. We accepted that document, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> <li>A. Farther distance was 2 to 3 miles and the least distance I believe was 1,000 feet.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Aside from just looking at other county zoning else</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> <li>A. The county signed a document with Prevailing Winds as to where they would have how much they would use for setbacks. I'm sure you've looked at the document. We accepted that document, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you turn to Exhibit 1-22 for me in that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> <li>A. Farther distance was 2 to 3 miles and the least distance I believe was 1,000 feet.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Aside from just looking at other county zoning ordinances, did the county rely on anything else in deciding to approve of this document?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> <li>A. The county signed a document with Prevailing Winds as to where they would have how much they would use for setbacks. I'm sure you've looked at the document. We accepted that document, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you turn to Exhibit 1-22 for me in that binder in front of you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> <li>A. Farther distance was 2 to 3 miles and the least distance 1 believe was 1,000 feet.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Aside from just looking at other county zoning ordinances, did the county rely on anything else in deciding to approve of this document?</li> <li>A. No. Not really, sir.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>full house but it wasn't designated as just a wind power meeting. Those two for sure.</li> <li>A little later on we had just strictly a zoning meeting which did end up getting wind power comments.</li> <li>Q. And you said ultimately the emergency zoning never went forward. Did any type of zoning get adopted in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. It has not.</li> <li>Q. Is Charles Mix County currently considering adopting zoning regulations?</li> <li>A. We I don't believe the matter will be brought up again.</li> <li>Q. So for the time being, there's not going to be any zoning in Charles Mix County in the near future?</li> <li>A. I highly doubt it, sir.</li> <li>Q. Did the County Commission make any sort of agreements or affirmations about this project?</li> <li>A. The county signed a document with Prevailing Winds as to where they would have how much they would use for setbacks. I'm sure you've looked at the document. We accepted that document, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you turn to Exhibit 1-22 for me in that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>it mean to approve this document?</li> <li>A. Well, it was Prevailing Wind said that they would go with these setbacks and distances when they put their project up within Charles Mix County. That looked acceptable to us.</li> <li>Q. And what information did the county rely on to</li> <li>A. We looked</li> <li>Q. To form the conclusion that it looked acceptable?</li> <li>A. We looked at other county zoning wind power zoning ordinances. This has greater distance than some for setbacks, less than others. It's between, you know, the most severe and the most lenient. The county did not have the resources to do their own independent studies.</li> <li>Q. And which counties did you look to?</li> <li>A. I think we had pretty much a list of every county in the state that has zoning on wind power.</li> <li>Q. And give some examples of the</li> <li>A. Farther distance was 2 to 3 miles and the least distance I believe was 1,000 feet.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Aside from just looking at other county zoning ordinances, did the county rely on anything else in deciding to approve of this document?</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 41		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 43
1	see the section that says, "Noise"?	1	<b>Q.</b> Didn't obligate the county in any way?
2	A. Page 4? Attachment 2	2	A. Correct.
3	<b>Q.</b> We're on the same exhibit?	3	MS. AGRIMONTI: I have no further questions.
4	A. Yes, sir.	4	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.
5	<b>Q.</b> And then the last page of that exhibit.	5	CROSS-EXAMINATION
6	In looking at the last page of Exhibit 1-22 can you	6	BY MR. FUERNISS:
7	locate the noise?	7	<b>Q.</b> Good morning, Keith.
8	A. Yes, sir.	8	A. Good morning.
9	<b>Q.</b> And it says the noise from the wind turbines will	9	<b>Q.</b> A little bit of housekeeping here. You stated that
10	not exceed 43 dBA at any existing nonparticipating	10	you think I'm a client of Mr. Almond's; is that correct?
11	residence. Can you give us anymore information on what	11	A. I guess I don't know that for sure. I know you're
12	that means?	12	not do not want wind towers around your property.
13	A. That is the sound emitted by the turbines, 43	13	<b>Q.</b> Well, would it surprise you to know that he is not
14	decibels, 45 decibels.	14	my attorney and neither Karen's nor Kelly's?
15	<b>Q.</b> And is this the strike that.	15	<b>A.</b> I apologize for making that assumption.
16	From the county's perspective, is there any	16	<b>Q.</b> Just to be clear there's not an attorney in this
17	additional information that the Commission should be	17	room that's within my pay grade.
18	aware of as it relates to noise?	18	Were you on the County Commissioners when the
19	A. No, sir. This was in a lot of the other zoning	19	Beethoven project was built?
20	ordinances as a standard.	20	A. Yes, I was.
21	<b>Q.</b> So as you read that noise limitation what happens	21	<b>Q.</b> Was there any kind of similar Affidavit or any kind
22	if if the noise from the wind turbines goes over 43	22	of agreements at that time to do that project?
23	dBA?	23	<b>A.</b> When that project came in there was no very
24	A. As to what happens?	24	little objection to it. I mean, we never had no public
25	<b>Q.</b> Would they be in essentially violation of this	25	meetings or nobody wanted one.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 42		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 44
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 42 approved limitation?	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       44         Q. Do you know how       44
1		1 2	
-	approved limitation?		Q. Do you know how
2	<ul><li>approved limitation?</li><li>A. I would assume so, yes.</li></ul>	2	<ul><li>Q. Do you know how</li><li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li></ul>
23	approved limitation? A. I would assume so, yes. MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.	2 3	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> </ul>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	approved limitation? A. I would assume so, yes. MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti. MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very limiteded.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	approved limitation? A. I would assume so, yes. MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti. MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very limiteded. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	approved limitation? A. I would assume so, yes. MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti. MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very limiteded. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MS. AGRIMONTI</u> :	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So would you have any idea of how that project got</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	approved limitation? A. I would assume so, yes. MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti. MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very limiteded. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. AGRIMONTI: Q. Thank you for attending today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So would you have any idea of how that project got</li> <li>placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>limiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today. You referenced public meetings where various</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	approved limitation? A. I would assume so, yes. MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti. MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very limiteded. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. AGRIMONTI: Q. Thank you for attending today. You referenced public meetings where various individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>Imiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today. You referenced public meetings where various individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was put where it is?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> <li>limiteded.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today.</li> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was put where it is?</li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>Imiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI: <ul> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today.</li> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was put where it is?</li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>Imiteded. <ul> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today. <ul> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was put where it is?</li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> <li>limiteded.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today.</li> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak</li> <li>about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> <li>A. As much time as we had, yeah. One meeting went on all night long I think if we didn't close it down.</li> <li>Q. And you considered all those comments in determining</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got</li> <li>placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have</li> <li>you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? <ul> <li>Do you have any idea how it came about that it was</li> <li>put where it is?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those turbines that are in Charles Mix County?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>limiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI: <ul> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today.</li> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. <ul> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak</li> <li>about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> <li>A. As much time as we had, yeah. One meeting went on all night long I think if we didn't close it down.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got</li> <li>placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have</li> <li>you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? <ul> <li>Do you have any idea how it came about that it was</li> <li>put where it is?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they</li> <li>could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those</li> <li>turbines that are in Charles Mix County?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>limiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI: <ul> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today.</li> <li>You referenced public meetings where various individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. <ul> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> <li>A. As much time as we had, yeah. One meeting went on all night long I think if we didn't close it down.</li> <li>Q. And you considered all those comments in determining whether to move forward with emergency zoning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got</li> <li>placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have</li> <li>you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? <ul> <li>Do you have any idea how it came about that it was</li> <li>put where it is?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they</li> <li>could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those</li> <li>turbines that are in Charles Mix County?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Up close or from my place that's 40 miles away.</li> <li>Q. Up close. I mean, driven by, driven through?</li> <li>A. Just off of highway going to trip 18.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that would put you some 3 miles at least</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>limiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today. <ul> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. <ul> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> <li>A. As much time as we had, yeah. One meeting went on all night long I think if we didn't close it down.</li> <li>Q. And you considered all those comments in determining whether to move forward with emergency zoning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was put where it is?</li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those turbines that are in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Up close or from my place that's 40 miles away.</li> <li>Q. Up close. I mean, driven by, driven through?</li> <li>A. Just off of highway going to trip 18.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that would put you some 3 miles at least probably from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>limiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today. <ul> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. <ul> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> <li>A. As much time as we had, yeah. One meeting went on all night long I think if we didn't close it down.</li> <li>Q. And you considered all those comments in determining whether to move forward with emergency zoning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I 22 we've been talking about the exhibit of that Mr. Almond was asking you questions about. You agree</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was put where it is?</li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those turbines that are in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Up close or from my place that's 40 miles away.</li> <li>Q. Up close. I mean, driven by, driven through?</li> <li>A. Just off of highway going to trip 18.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that would put you some 3 miles at least probably from</li> <li>A. Or 46. I've never drove to any of the towers.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>Imiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI: <ul> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today.</li> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. <ul> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> <li>A. As much time as we had, yeah. One meeting went on all night long I think if we didn't close it down.</li> <li>Q. And you considered all those comments in determining whether to move forward with emergency zoning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I 22 we've been talking about the exhibit of that Mr. Almond was asking you questions about. You agree that that is a document that binds only Prevailing Wind</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got</li> <li>placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have</li> <li>you I've got to ask one question at a time; right?</li> <li>Do you have any idea how it came about that it was</li> <li>put where it is?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those turbines that are in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Up close or from my place that's 40 miles away.</li> <li>Q. Up close. I mean, driven by, driven through?</li> <li>A. Just off of highway going to trip 18.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that would put you some 3 miles at least probably from</li> <li>A. Or 46. I've never drove to any of the towers.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you recall at both the I think when</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>approved limitation?</li> <li>A. I would assume so, yes. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Cross-examination, Ms. Agrimonti.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Yes. Thank you. Very</li> </ul> </li> <li>limiteded. <ul> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. AGRIMONTI:</li> <li>Q. Thank you for attending today. <ul> <li>You referenced public meetings where various</li> <li>individuals came and spoke about the possibility of a</li> <li>zoning change or adoption of zoning. Do you recall that?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Yes. <ul> <li>Q. And did you listen to everyone who wanted to speak about their concerns with respect to wind turbines?</li> <li>A. As much time as we had, yeah. One meeting went on all night long I think if we didn't close it down.</li> <li>Q. And you considered all those comments in determining whether to move forward with emergency zoning?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I 22 we've been talking about the exhibit of that Mr. Almond was asking you questions about. You agree</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Do you know how</li> <li>A. We did not sign nothing on that project.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The county didn't have?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any kind of agreement or statements?</li> <li>A. You're correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>So would you have any idea of how that project got placed within the bounds of Charles Mix County? Have you I've got to ask one question at a time; right? Do you have any idea how it came about that it was put where it is?</li> <li>A. No. I really don't. I suppose it's where they could generate the most wind from, I'm assuming.</li> <li>Q. And have you been up there and looked at those turbines that are in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Up close or from my place that's 40 miles away.</li> <li>Q. Up close. I mean, driven by, driven through?</li> <li>A. Just off of highway going to trip 18.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So that would put you some 3 miles at least probably from</li> <li>A. Or 46. I've never drove to any of the towers.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 45		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 47
1	guys did have a couple of special meetings during the	1	Commissioner Hanson.
2	summer but for the most part these were regularly	2	Staff.
3	scheduled Commissioner meetings?	3	MS. REISS: Thank you.
4	A. Correct.	4	CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Do you remember particulars or what specifics	5	BY MS. REISS:
6	in regards to regulations that the people were asking for	6	Q. Good morning, Mr. Mushitz?
7	in a potential zoning ordinance? Some of the numbers	7	A. Correct.
8	that were mentioned?	8	<b>Q.</b> I have just have a couple of questions for you. If
9	<b>A.</b> They varied quite a bit, yes, sir.	9	you could turn your attention to Exhibit 1-22, and that
10	<b>Q.</b> But do you remember what some of them were?	10	would be the Affidavit of the Peter Pawlowski.
11	A. Yes. I think I heard a three-quarter-of-a-mile	11	You mentioned in response to Mr. Almond's questions
12	setback. I've heard mile setback. I've heard half-mile	12	that the first time you saw this Affidavit was at the
13	setback. Depends whether you was for or against the	13	Commission meeting; is that correct?
14	project.	14	A. Yes, ma'am.
15	<b>Q.</b> Do you remember a particular county zoning ordinance	15	<b>Q.</b> Did you speak to Mr. Pawlowski at any time before
16	that we referenced?	16	this Affidavit was presented at the Commission meeting?
17	A. No. I do know that one ordinance I don't know	17	Let me clarify. Did you speak to him about the
18	the exact county. One of them had very far setbacks. I	18	terms of this Affidavit?
19	do remember that part.	19	<b>A.</b> No.
20	<b>Q.</b> You're referring	20	Q. Okay. You mentioned I believe in response to
21	<b>A.</b> I don't know which county it was for sure.	21	Mr. Fuerniss's question that the Beethoven project did
22	<b>Q.</b> You're probably referring to the Walworth County	22	not have a similar Affidavit; is that correct?
23	ordinance which has a 2 mile setback?	23	A. Correct.
24	A. Could be. I don't know, Sherman. I don't know.	24	<b>Q.</b> Are these affidavits normal practice for Charles Mix
25	Q. Well, that was one that was	25	County?
			•
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 46		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 48
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 46 A. Uh-huh.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!48A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in
1 2		1 2	
-	A. Uh-huh.	1 2 3	A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in
2	<ul><li>A. Uh-huh.</li><li>Q. Thank you, Keith.</li></ul>	1 2 3 4	<b>A.</b> This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?
2 3	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions?</li> </ul>	2 3	<ul><li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li><li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul><li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li><li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. THE WITNESS: Either way. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. JENKINS: Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. THE WITNESS: Either way. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay. MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. THE WITNESS: Either way. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. PAZOUR</u>:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> <li>going through the process you said that there were 40,000</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay. MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. PAZOUR:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Keith.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> <li>going through the process you said that there were 40,000</li> <li>acres that you had no control over in the county.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay. MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>EY MS. PAZOUR</u>:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Keith.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> </ul> </li> <li>going through the process you said that there were 40,000 acres that you had no control over in the county. <ul> <li>And I'm assuming that's reservation property; is</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li><u>EY MS. PAZOUR</u>:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Keith.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember me being at the meetings?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> <li>going through the process you said that there were 40,000</li> <li>acres that you had no control over in the county.</li> <li>And I'm assuming that's reservation property; is</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>SINKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>PY MS. PAZOUR</u>:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Keith.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember me being at the meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. And your daughter.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> </ul> </li> <li>going through the process you said that there were 40,000 acres that you had no control over in the county. <ul> <li>And I'm assuming that's reservation property; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Trust lands.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>EY MS. PAZOUR</u>:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Keith.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember me being at the meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. And your daughter.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember me giving you literature?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> <li>going through the process you said that there were 40,000</li> <li>acres that you had no control over in the county.</li> <li>And I'm assuming that's reservation property; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Trust lands.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Trust lands. Okay. And</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Keith. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, any questions? <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Sir, do you remember me attending one of your regular meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you remember what my concerns were?</li> <li>A. It was health concerns, I believe, with the wind power.</li> <li>Q. Okay. MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MS. JENKINS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. PAZOUR</u>:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Keith.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember me being at the meetings?</li> <li>A. Yes, I do. And your daughter.</li> <li>Q. Do you remember me giving you literature?</li> <li>A. Yes. As far as the health concerns again on wind</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. This is only the two wind projects that ever come in so what is normal?</li> <li>Q. All right. But there's not another type of project that would utilize an Affidavit like this?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Okay. <ul> <li>MS. REISS: Okay. No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good morning,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. Mushitz or Commissioner, I should say. <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Either way.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, were you</li> </ul> </li> <li>subpoenaed to come here today? <ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: You spoke as you were</li> </ul> </li> <li>going through the process you said that there were 40,000 acres that you had no control over in the county. <ul> <li>And I'm assuming that's reservation property; is</li> <li>that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Trust lands.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HANSON: Trust lands. Okay. And of course you don't have authority over municipalities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 49		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	51
1	I have. I appreciate your testimony. Thank you.	1	the projected tax payments to Charles Mix County might	
2	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Nelson.	2	come out to, say, per acre or something like that for	
3	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thanks for being part of	3	Charles Mix County, taking into consideration all those	
4	the process. No questions.	4	trust lands that aren't taxed?	
5	MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen.	5	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection.	
6	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.	6	THE WITNESS: This is not even relevant to this.	
7	MR. DE HUECK: Any redirect.	7	We're on a whole new ground.	
8	MR. ALMOND: Briefly.	8	MR. FUERNISS: Okay. I'll withdraw the question	
9	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	9	it if that's the proper thing to do. Thank you.	
10	BY MR. ALMOND:	10	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins?	
11	<b>Q.</b> You were asked about the public input process, the	11	MS. JENKINS: No questions.	
12	meetings. Was there a meeting, a County Commission	12	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.	
13	meeting in which you and Mr. Peter Pawlowski left the	13	MS. PAZOUR: I have a question but I would like	
14	meeting to go out in the hallway and have a private	14	to ask Ms. Edwards because I'm not sure on how to ask it.	
15	conversation?	15	MS. EDWARDS: Can we take 30 seconds. I can't	
16	A. Yes, sir.	16	give legal advice but I can see what you want to know	
17	<b>Q</b> . Tell us about that private conversation.	17	from me.	
18	A. Within the meeting maps had been showed of a setback	18	MR. DE HUECK: Yep. Go ahead.	
19	map. And, of course, I was over here, Mr. Pawlowski was	19	(A short recess is taken.)	
20	over there. There was so much comment going on ${\sf I}$ wanted	20	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour, go ahead.	
21	a question clarified. We stepped out. I asked him how	21	CROSS-EXAMINATION	
22	many towers would be affected with a 2,000 foot setback.	22	BY MS. PAZOUR:	
23	And the lines were real close on paper. He thought two	23	<b>Q.</b> Did you have any public meetings outside of the	
24	and possibly three would be affected the way they were	24	Commission Commissioners meetings with Prevailing	
25	presented on the paper at that time.	25	Winds?	
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 50		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	52
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 50 We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter	52
2	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.	2	<b>A.</b> No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public	52
	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?	2 3	<b>A.</b> No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.	52
2 3 4	<ul><li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li><li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li><li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li></ul>	2 3 4	<b>A.</b> No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public	52
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not. MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay. MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay. MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz. THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting?</li> <li>A. No, sir. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay. MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz. THE WITNESS: Mushitz. MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your testimony, and you may step down. (The witness is excused.)</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? A. No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? A. No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay. MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz. THE WITNESS: Mushitz. MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your testimony, and you may step down. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting?</li> <li>A. No, sir. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay. MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz. THE WITNESS: Mushitz. MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> :	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> <li>David Hessler,</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door.</li> <li>Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway?</li> <li>A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified.</li> <li>Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting?</li> <li>A. No, sir.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss?</li> <li><u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. FUERNISS:</li> <li>Q. Commissioner Hanson brought up the trust lands in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler. David Hessler,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. Q. Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? A. No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. Q. Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? A. No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> : Q. Commissioner Hanson brought up the trust lands in Charles Mix County.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> <li>David Hessler,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <b>BY MR. FUERNISS:</b> <b>Q.</b> Commissioner Hanson brought up the trust lands in Charles Mix County. How does that affect property taxes in Charles Mix	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> <li>David Hessler,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <b>BY MR. FUERNISS:</b> <b>Q.</b> Commissioner Hanson brought up the trust lands in Charles Mix County. How does that affect property taxes in Charles Mix County?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> <li>David Hessler,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <b>SYMR. FUERNISS:</b> <b>Q.</b> Commissioner Hanson brought up the trust lands in Charles Mix County. How does that affect property taxes in Charles Mix <b>County?</b> <b>A.</b> There is no taxes on trust land.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> <li>David Hessler,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>Q. Mr. Hessler, welcome back to South Dakota. Will you</li> </ul>	52
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> : <b>Q.</b> Commissioner Hanson brought up the trust lands in Charles Mix County. How does that affect property taxes in Charles Mix County? <b>A.</b> There is no taxes on trust land. <b>Q.</b> So there's 40,000 acres, give or take, that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not. <ul> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> </ul> </li> <li>testimony, and you may step down. <ul> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> </ul> </li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand. <ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> <li>David Hessler,</li> </ul> </li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <ul> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MS. EDWARDS:</li> <li>Q. Mr. Hessler, welcome back to South Dakota. Will you please introduce yourself for the record.</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We came back in the meeting, and I told the meeting that that's what we had discussed outside the door. <b>Q.</b> Was there any other discussion out in the hallway? <b>A.</b> No, sir. I wanted that question clarified. <b>Q.</b> Aside from that particular meeting, have you had any other conversations with Mr. Pawlowski or anyone else outside of a public meeting? <b>A.</b> No, sir. MR. ALMOND: Okay. Nothing further. THE WITNESS: I was invited to a site and didn't even go so MR. ALMOND: No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: No questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss? <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <b>SYMR. FUERNISS:</b> <b>Q.</b> Commissioner Hanson brought up the trust lands in Charles Mix County. How does that affect property taxes in Charles Mix <b>County?</b> <b>A.</b> There is no taxes on trust land.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No I stepped out of that meeting with Mr. Peter Pawlowski, but no other meetings, other than public meetings.</li> <li>Q. Like in the beginning of August?</li> <li>A. I did not.</li> <li>MS. PAZOUR: Okay.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Mushitz.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mushitz.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mushitz. Thank you for your</li> <li>testimony, and you may step down.</li> <li>(The witness is excused.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will move on to Staff's</li> <li>witness. He was scheduled today so that's why we're</li> <li>breaking the Order for Mr. Almond at this time allowing</li> <li>Staff's witness to take the stand.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Staff calls David Hessler.</li> <li>David Hessler,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>Q. Mr. Hessler, welcome back to South Dakota. Will you</li> </ul>	al

1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 53	4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 55
1	by the public utilities Staff to provide impartial	1	wind farm in Australia and then replicated that sound in
2	technical advice on noise for this project.	2	a laboratory setting and people with known sensitivities,
3	<ul><li>Q. Did you submit prefiled testimony in this Docket?</li><li>A. Yes, I did.</li></ul>	4	people that lived on the site that were bothered by it could tell when this completely inaudible sound was
5	<ul><li>Q. Have you testified before this Commission before?</li></ul>	5	played with 100 percent accuracy; whereas, a group of
6		6	
7	<ul><li>A. Two previous times.</li><li>Q. Have you reviewed the other testimony submitted by</li></ul>	7	other people didn't hear anything. Q. So then is it your testimony that certain people
8	other witnesses in this Docket?	8	would be more sensitive than others?
9	A. Yes, I have.	9	<ul> <li>A. I believe some people do have a sensitivity to the</li> </ul>
10	Q. Both direct and rebuttal?	10	pulsations produced by all wind turbines really, every
11	A. Yes.	11	model, every size. It's just the nature of the thing
12	<ul><li>Q. Have you also reviewed all responses to data</li></ul>	12	that it produces a pulse around just under 1 hertz, which
13	requests?	13	is extremely low and well below the capability of any
14	<b>A.</b> I believe I've read most of them if not all of them.	14	conventional sound instrument to measure.
15	<ul><li>Q. Did you rely upon that information when formulating</li></ul>	15	<b>Q.</b> If you had based upon your training and
16	your opinion?	16	experience, if you had to guess without anybody talking
17	A. Yes.	17	what's the noise level in this room today?
18	<b>Q.</b> Are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Howell,	18	<b>A.</b> I would say with the fan going it's maybe 40 dBA.
19	Chris Howell?	19	In fact I have a sound level meter on my phone if you
20	<b>A.</b> Yes. Mr. Chris Howell, the he's the acoustical	20	can 1?
21	engineer for the project.	21	<b>Q.</b> I'll take your word for it.
22	Q. Would you agree that it is based upon his	22	A. Okay. All right.
23	testimony yesterday would you agree that it is either	23	<b>Q.</b> Are you familiar with Mr. Howell's Rebuttal
24	inappropriate or impossible to assess the potential noise	24	Testimony as it relates to the testimony of Mr. Richard
25	impact on the strike that.	25	James?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 54		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 56
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 54 What is your over all assessment of the positions	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!56A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with
1		1	
-	What is your over all assessment of the positions	-	A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with
2	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?	2	<b>A.</b> Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances
23	<ul><li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li><li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li><li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a</li></ul>	2 3	A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.
2 3 4	<ul><li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li><li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li><li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances</li> <li>counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level. That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard. Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony? A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard. Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant's noise study, which was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that level.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?</li> <li>A. Yeah. The Applicant's noise study, which was prepared by Mr. Howell.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with a Mr. Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li> <li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?</li> <li>A. Yeah. The Applicant's noise study, which was prepared by Mr. Howell.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with a Mr. Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who is Steven Cooper?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that level.</li> <li>So it's not practical to use that to actually measure a complete project.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li> <li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?</li> <li>A. Yeah. The Applicant's noise study, which was prepared by Mr. Howell.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with a Mr. Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. He's an acoustical engineer out of Australia who</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that level.</li> <li>So it's not practical to use that to actually measure a complete project.</li> <li>Q. Have you read the direct and Rebuttal Testimony of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li> <li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?</li> <li>A. Yeah. The Applicant's noise study, which was prepared by Mr. Howell.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with a Mr. Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. He's an acoustical engineer out of Australia who with relevance here has recently done some experiments</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that level.</li> <li>So it's not practical to use that to actually measure a complete project.</li> <li>Q. Have you read the direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Intervenor witness professor Alves-Pereira?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li> <li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?</li> <li>A. Yeah. The Applicant's noise study, which was prepared by Mr. Howell.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with a Mr. Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. He's an acoustical engineer out of Australia who with relevance here has recently done some experiments that I find very convincing that demonstrate that people</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that level.</li> <li>So it's not practical to use that to actually measure a complete project.</li> <li>Q. Have you read the direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Intervenor witness professor Alves-Pereira?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li> <li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?</li> <li>A. Yeah. The Applicant's noise study, which was prepared by Mr. Howell.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with a Mr. Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And who is Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. He's an acoustical engineer out of Australia who with relevance here has recently done some experiments that I find very convincing that demonstrate that people with certain sensitivities are affected by extremely low</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with</li> <li>Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that level.</li> <li>So it's not practical to use that to actually measure a complete project.</li> <li>Q. Have you read the direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Intervenor witness professor Alves-Pereira?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what is your opinion of that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>What is your over all assessment of the positions</li> <li>and arguments advanced by Mr. Howell in his testimony?</li> <li>A. Well, I think what you were getting at there for a minute was the first point, which is he contends that it's impossible to predictor assess the public reaction to a project, and so their study focused entirely on simply demonstrating whether the project was going to meet the 45 dBA Bon Homme County noise limit. But they did no work or evaluating what the predicted sound levels meant or looked into any kind of low frequency issues, none of that. So I was critical of the of Mr. Howell's work in that regard.</li> <li>Q. Now just now when you stated their study are you referring to that of the Applicant?</li> <li>A. Yeah. The Applicant's noise study, which was prepared by Mr. Howell.</li> <li>Q. Are you familiar with a Mr. Steven Cooper?</li> <li>A. He's an acoustical engineer out of Australia who with relevance here has recently done some experiments that I find very convincing that demonstrate that people</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yes, I am. And I have to say I agree with Mr. Howell on his comments there, that in most instances counter to what Mr. James was putting forward.</li> <li>Q. How about Mr. Howell's testimony as it rebutted that of Mr. Jerry Punch?</li> <li>A. I actually did agree with Mr. Howell there because what he was talking about was Dr. Punch was recommending that the noise limit for the project should be expressed in terms of an LAmax statistical noise level.</li> <li>That sounds good. That makes sense on paper. But that's coming from someone that's never measured a wind project.</li> <li>If we were to put a sound monitor at the site today when there's no project, the Lmax would go over 40, 45, or even 50 a thousand times a day. Every dog bark, plane flying, everything would cause an exceedance of that level.</li> <li>So it's not practical to use that to actually measure a complete project.</li> <li>Q. Have you read the direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Intervenor witness professor Alves-Pereira?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 57		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 59
1	witness, Mark Hopkins, I believe, who reviewed her	1	to do is we ask the project who has called or complained
2	testimony. And he's a physiologist and answered her	2	or who's upset about this project in any way, and we're
3	point by point, and I had to agree. I found his	3	going to monitor at their houses.
4	testimony very compelling.	4	Now that in every case I can think of that's a
5	<b>Q.</b> Would you be referring to Dr. Mark Roberts?	5	number between zero and three. Usually there's about
6	A. Mark Roberts. Thank you. I drew a blank there for	6	maybe two people. And most of these projects cover 25
7	a moment.	7	square miles. They involve hundreds of houses, but
8	<b>Q.</b> What statistical descriptor would you associate with	8	that's what we find.
9	the 40 dBA noise limit?	9	So we measure at those locations, and then I pick
10	A. If there were to be a 40 dBA limit on this project	10	five to seven other locations that are on the sound map
11	or any other project, the only practical descriptor would	11	the locations of the houses that are receiving the
12	be a long-term average measured over a period of days or	12	maximum sound level and so we set up instruments at all
13	weeks.	13	of those locations.
14	And the reason for that is that the sound of the	14	In doing that, we can talk to all of those people.
15	project varies with wind and atmospheric conditions so a	15	So I've heard the grievances of people that don't like
16	short measurement of 10 minutes wouldn't tell you	16	it, and then I've also talked to the people at all these
17	anything. The project might not even be operating.	17	other houses that are receiving sound levels of '46 and
18	So what we found from many years of experience	18	47 dBA and most people just say it's it's nothing.
19	testing completed projects is that you have to monitor	19	You hear it. Nothing.
20	for usually two weeks and then try to determine what the	20	So my impression after 15 wind projects of seeing
21	project alone level is exclusive of the background level.	21	that same thing repeated is that there's going to be some
22	The background levels vary significant in these projects.	22	people very upset. It's going to be a small number.
23	As as high as the project many times.	23	There's a few projects that everybody to my knowledge is
24	For example, in our assessments we'll usually	24	fine with. But most people aren't that bothered. And
25	monitor for about two weeks prior to any construction,	25	that's kind of the facts on the ground.
4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 58	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 60
1	and what we find is that the sound level is directly	1	Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard
2	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's	2	<b>Q.</b> What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?
2 3	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's	2 3	<ul><li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li><li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45</li></ul>
2 3 4	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the project recording the simultaneous background level.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built. So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the project recording the simultaneous background level. It's not an easy thing to do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li>Q. Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9.</li> <li>Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9.</li> <li>Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li>Q. Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> <li>A. Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was</li> <li>exactly that question so I had to go back and look.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the community against complaints and annoyance.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was</li> <li>exactly that question so I had to go back and look.</li> <li>We've measured 15 newly operational projects all over the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9.</li> <li>Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the community against complaints and annoyance.</li> <li>Now here, because almost all the houses are already below 40, it seems to me that it's wouldn't be inconceivable to modify the project slightly so that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful not just to accept the level that's measured as being completely from the project. A lot of times that's only one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you evaluated?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was exactly that question so I had to go back and look.</li> <li>We've measured 15 newly operational projects all over the country, one in Jamaica, and what we have done in all of those cases is performed these two or three-week surveys with background monitors, and it's not easy but you can</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9.</li> <li>Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the community against complaints and annoyance.</li> <li>Now here, because almost all the houses are already below 40, it seems to me that it's wouldn't be inconceivable to modify the project slightly so that so as to achieve the 40 here. I think there's 11 houses</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was</li> <li>exactly that question so I had to go back and look.</li> <li>We've measured 15 newly operational projects all over the</li> <li>country, one in Jamaica, and what we have done in all of</li> <li>those cases is performed these two or three-week surveys</li> <li>with background monitors, and it's not easy but you can</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the community against complaints and annoyance.</li> <li>Now here, because almost all the houses are already below 40, it seems to me that it's wouldn't be inconceivable to modify the project slightly so that so as to achieve the 40 here. I think there's 11 houses that are over right now, and many of those are just over</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li>Q. Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> <li>A. Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was</li> <li>exactly that question so I had to go back and look.</li> <li>We've measured 15 newly operational projects all over the</li> <li>country, one in Jamaica, and what we have done in all of</li> <li>those cases is performed these two or three-week surveys</li> <li>with background monitors, and it's not easy but you can</li> <li>tease out what the project level is doing on a long-term</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the community against complaints and annoyance.</li> <li>Now here, because almost all the houses are already below 40, it seems to me that it's wouldn't be inconceivable to modify the project slightly so that so as to achieve the 40 here. I think there's 11 houses that are over right now, and many of those are just over by a tenth or two tenths of a dB, which isn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li>Q. Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> <li>A. Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was</li> <li>exactly that question so I had to go back and look.</li> <li>We've measured 15 newly operational projects all over the</li> <li>country, one in Jamaica, and what we have done in all of</li> <li>those cases is performed these two or three-week surveys</li> <li>with background monitors, and it's not easy but you can</li> <li>tease out what the project level is doing on a long-term</li> <li>average basis.</li> <li>Now one point I'd like to make about that is when we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the community against complaints and annoyance.</li> <li>Now here, because almost all the houses are already below 40, it seems to me that it's wouldn't be inconceivable to modify the project slightly so that so as to achieve the 40 here. I think there's 11 houses that are over right now, and many of those are just over by a tenth or two tenths of a dB, which isn't significant. So I would like to see the project shoot</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>and what we find is that the sound level is directly</li> <li>directly correlates to the wind speed. And so when it's</li> <li>windy the sound levels 45, 50 dBA before anything's</li> <li>built.</li> <li>So when the project comes in you have to be careful</li> <li>not just to accept the level that's measured as being</li> <li>completely from the project. A lot of times that's only</li> <li>one component of it. So the difficulty is separating the</li> <li>two, and that's why a long-term measurement campaign is</li> <li>needed, supplemented by monitors that are miles from the</li> <li>project recording the simultaneous background level.</li> <li>It's not an easy thing to do.</li> <li>Q. Ballpark number, how many wind farms have you</li> <li>evaluated?</li> <li>A. Well, one of the Intervenor data requests was</li> <li>exactly that question so I had to go back and look.</li> <li>We've measured 15 newly operational projects all over the</li> <li>country, one in Jamaica, and what we have done in all of</li> <li>those cases is performed these two or three-week surveys</li> <li>with background monitors, and it's not easy but you can</li> <li>tease out what the project level is doing on a long-term</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. What is your overall recommendation, having heard the testimony and read all of the filings?</li> <li>A. Well, the project was designed to the county 45 limit and is meeting that. I think the highest predicted level at anyone's house right now is 41.9. Now there's been an extraordinary push back from folks that don't want this project so you know, normally we recommend 45 independent of what the county says. Now we think 45 is a fair limit for most projects just based on our experience and seeing how many complaints there are and what the levels are at those houses.</li> <li>But, at the same time, we've recommended for many years that every project should shoot for an ideal design goal of 40. That would serve to much better protect the community against complaints and annoyance.</li> <li>Now here, because almost all the houses are already below 40, it seems to me that it's wouldn't be inconceivable to modify the project slightly so that so as to achieve the 40 here. I think there's 11 houses that are over right now, and many of those are just over by a tenth or two tenths of a dB, which isn't</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 61		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 63
1	the testimony?	1	you weighed in on or had any input on prior to today?
2	A. This morning, yes.	2	A. I haven't seen this exact document, but I understood
3	<b>Q.</b> Did you hear the back and forth about whether there	3	from the beginning that the Applicant had committed to
4	may or may not have been a suggestion for a 35 dBA at	4	meeting Bon Homme County 45 noise limit, not only in that
5	some point?	5	county but the other two counties in which the project
6	A. Yes, I did see that, and I did see a copy of that	6	was sited.
7	e-mail the day before yesterday. Basically stating that	7	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. No further questions.
8	the wind turbine developer at that time, that fellow,	8	I will tender him for cross.
9	Roland Jurgens, I think, said the 35 was a great idea and	9	MR. DE HUECK: We're going to take a recess at
10	that would protect everyone.	10	this point for our court reporter. Let's come back at
11	Well, that's true. 35's extremely quiet and no one	11	10:30.
12	would be bothered, but I'm not sure he knew what he was	12	(A short recess is taken.)
13	advocating for because the setbacks to achieve that would	13	MR. DE HUECK: We're back in session.
14	be huge and most of the projects I'm familiar with just	14	Mr. Hessler is on the stand and now subject to
15	wouldn't be viable with that kind of a limit.	15	cross-examination.
16	Q. When you say huge, what are what are you talking,	16	And you're still under oath, Mr. Hessler.
17	generally speaking?	17	Prevailing Winds, you may proceed.
18	A. Did I say huge?	18	MS. SMITH: Thank you.
19	They would be on the order of a mile and a half or	19	CROSS-EXAMINATION
20	something like that.	20	BY MS. SMITH:
21	Q. Okay.	21	Q. Good morning, Mr. Hessler.
22	A. And most projects are not that sparsely populated	22	A. Good morning.
23	that that's doable.	23	<b>Q.</b> As I understood your written testimony you did not
24	<b>Q.</b> Okay.	24	take issue with the noise modeling methodology and
25	A. And I would further add I talked about the	25	assumptions that were used by Burns & McDonnell in
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 62		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 64
1	background level a few minutes ago. When the wind is	1	preparing their analysis for the project; is that
2	blowing, and the wind has to below for the project to	2	correct?
3	operate, the background level is fairly high. It's	3	<b>A.</b> That's correct. They used the same assumptions and
4	between 40 and 50. So to design to 35 would be	4	even modeling software that I used.
5	there's really no need for that. The background level's	5	Q. Okay. Thank you. And you also agreed that the
6	going to cover up the project at that kind of a level.	6	modeling showed compliance with the Bon Homme County
7	All you're going to hear is the wind blowing in the	7	requirement of 45 dBA?
8	trees. There's kind of a bottom limit to how quiet you	8	A. That's correct.
9	need to make it, and generally speaking we find that's	9	<b>Q.</b> You mentioned a criticism of not taking into account
10	around 40. Once you go below that there's diminishing	10 11	community perception. Is that accurate? A. That's correct.
11 12	returns. You're not getting any further improvement	12	<ul><li>A. That's correct.</li><li>Q. And community perception would be a subjective</li></ul>
13	really. Q. Okay. I'm going to draw your attention to Exhibit A	13	analysis; is that true?
14	33, which I'll provide for you.	14	A. In general, yes. But it is possible to make a
15	Mr. Hessler, are you familiar with that exhibit?	15	judgment as to how impacted people are likely to be.
16	Take a minute to look at it.	16	For example, when we do impact assessments, and
17	(Witness examines document.)	17	we've done probably over 70, we do a thorough background
18	<b>A.</b> Well, it's the first time I've seen it. Let me just	18	study for a matter of weeks and correlate the sound level
19	look at it for a sec.	19	to wind speed measured at the top of the met towers to
20	(Witness examines document.)	20	get the wind speed at the turbine height and then predict
21	A. Okay. Yeah. 45 dBA.	21	the project level under identical wind conditions. And
22	<b>Q.</b> Can you identify what the title of that exhibit is	22	it's the differential between what's there now and what's
23	for the record?	23	going to be there at the project that really determines
24	A. The Applicant's proposed conditions.	24	the possible impact.
25	<b>Q.</b> Is that an exhibit that you or a proposal that	25	Q. And you indicated that ambient noise levels vary

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 65		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 67
1	from 40 to 50 typically when the wind is blowing in your	1	operational and you also testified here today that most
2	Direct Testimony just now; correct?	2	of those fears are found to be unfounded. Is that
3	<b>A.</b> That's right. And the background studies that we	3	accurate?
4	do, we find that just about every site the background	4	<b>A.</b> That has been my experience, yes.
5	level ranges from 20 to 50, purely a function of wind	5	<b>Q.</b> What's been proposed on Exhibit A 33 and do you
6	speed. So when wind is blowing there's a significant	6	still have that in front of you? It's that one sheet?
7	background noise that's often overlooked by a lot of	7	A. Yes, I do.
8	people that are opposed to wind turbines. They think the	8	<b>Q.</b> Of the Applicant's proposed conditions?
9	background is 30 dBA or 25 dBA. But that's when it's	9	A. Yes.
10	calm and the project is not operating so it's not	10	<b>Q.</b> You indicated you had seen similar language before.
11	relevant.	11	Is that accurate?
12	<b>Q.</b> And as far as community perception when you're	12	A. I had seen in the noise study where it summarized
13	talking about your ideal limits, the concept is to avoid	13	what the applicable regulations were, which was the 45 in
14	complaints; correct?	14	Bon Homme County and then the voluntary agreement to that
15	A. That's correct.	15	in the other two counties.
16	<b>Q.</b> Is it true in your testimony that you noted that	16	<b>Q.</b> You also testified on behalf of the Staff in the
17	there isn't really a regulatory sound level that would	17	Crocker Wind Farm Docket and the Dakota Range Wind farm
18	satisfy everyone?	18	dockets; is that right?
19	A. Yeah. That's correct. You can never sit back and	19	A. That's correct.
20	be comfortable and everybody be all right with a wind	20	<b>Q.</b> And in those matters there was a condition agreed to
21	project.	21	among Staff at 45 dBA for nonparticipating residences; is
22	<b>Q.</b> So someone may complain regardless of how low the	22	that true?
23	level is that is set; is that correct?	23	A. That's correct. And I think on one of them the area
24	A. I have seen instances of that.	24	was so sparsely populated that I think all the predicted
25	<b>Q</b> . In this case you stated in your testimony, and I	25	levels were below 40 to begin with so the 45 limit was
			ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 68
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 66		
1	believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate	1	largely irrelevant.
1 2		1 2	
-	believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate		largely irrelevant.
2	believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at	2	largely irrelevant. Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the
2 3	believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?	2 3	largely irrelevant. <b>Q.</b> And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a
2 3 4	<ul><li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate</li><li>reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at</li><li>nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li><li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under</li></ul>	2 3 4	largely irrelevant. <b>Q.</b> And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate</li> <li>reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at</li> <li>nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under</li> <li>normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	largely irrelevant. <b>Q.</b> And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Iargely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Iargely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we see very few complaints.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we see very few complaints.</li> <li>Q. When you in your own testimony, your written</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we see very few complaints.</li> <li>Q. When you in your own testimony, your written testimony, you indicate that a lot of fear and resistance</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Iargely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. With respect to the potential for health effects,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we see very few complaints.</li> <li>Q. When you in your own testimony, your written testimony, you indicate that a lot of fear and resistance to wind projects is created during the development phase</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. With respect to the potential for health effects, you referenced an article regarding or by Steven</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate</li> <li>reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at</li> <li>nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under</li> <li>normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of</li> <li>opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal</li> <li>recommendation of 40.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And that's just simply based on complaints that have</li> <li>been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Those numbers come from our experience at completed</li> <li>projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the</li> <li>Complainant locations and a number of other locations so</li> <li>we know what the sound level is at the people that are</li> <li>complaining and that's why we say it's the situation</li> <li>is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we</li> <li>see very few complaints.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> When you in your own testimony, your written</li> <li>testimony, you indicate that a lot of fear and resistance</li> <li>to wind projects is created during the development phase</li> <li>by largely attributable to highly biased even scary aunt</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. With respect to the potential for health effects, you referenced an article regarding or by Steven Cooper; is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we see very few complaints.</li> <li>Q. When you in your own testimony, your written testimony, you indicate that a lot of fear and resistance to wind projects is created during the development phase by largely attributable to highly biased even scary aunt I wind websites. Do you remember that testimony?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Iargely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. With respect to the potential for health effects, you referenced an article regarding or by Steven Cooper; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we see very few complaints.</li> <li>Q. When you in your own testimony, your written testimony, you indicate that a lot of fear and resistance to wind projects is created during the development phase by largely attributable to highly biased even scary aunt I wind websites. Do you remember that testimony?</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. That's absolutely true. All you have to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>largely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. With respect to the potential for health effects, you referenced an article regarding or by Steven Cooper; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And it talked about the potential for a small</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>believe you restated here, that 45 dBA is an appropriate reasonably fair noise limit for wind projects at nonparticipating residences. Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. Yeah. We consider that a reasonable limit under normal circumstances. When there's not a lot of opposition.</li> <li>Now here I would lean more towards our ideal recommendation of 40.</li> <li>Q. And that's just simply based on complaints that have been lodged in advance of the project being constructed?</li> <li>A. Those numbers come from our experience at completed projects. Like I briefly described, we measure at the Complainant locations and a number of other locations so we know what the sound level is at the people that are complaining and that's why we say it's the situation is generally okay up to 45, not ideal, but below 40 we see very few complaints.</li> <li>Q. When you in your own testimony, your written testimony, you indicate that a lot of fear and resistance to wind projects is created during the development phase by largely attributable to highly biased even scary aunt I wind websites. Do you remember that testimony?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Iargely irrelevant.</li> <li>Q. And on this case it would be reasonable for the Commission to impose a limit of 45. That would be a reasonable and fair limit in this case as well, would it not?</li> <li>A. In what I would call normal circumstances it's a reasonable and fair limit, but where there's quite a bit of opposition, as there obviously is here, I think further consideration should be given to that.</li> <li>Q. Was there not opposition in the last two dockets?</li> <li>A. Not to the extent of this case.</li> <li>Q. And you're basing that on simply numbers? Are you aware of the number of Intervenors I guess I should ask?</li> <li>A. I'm basing it on the amount of time it took me to read all the Intervenor submittals.</li> <li>Q. So it's based on anticipate tore complaints for the project?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. With respect to the potential for health effects, you referenced an article regarding or by Steven Cooper; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>

		Ι	
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 69		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 71
1	A. That's correct.	1	until they left the project area.
2	<b>Q.</b> And are you basing your statements regarding	2	And but out of the 15 projects we've gone and
3	potential health effects solely on that article?	3	measured that's the only one where that complaint, that
4	A. That article I found to really put me over the	4	specific kind of complaint, was made. At all the rest of
5	I've read a lot of articles and attended a lot of	5	them it was simply the audible noise, thumping noise.
6	conferences where this issue has been discussed but I	6	You could hear it at night. It was bothering me, that
7	find that to be pretty unequivocal, that experiment that	7	kind of thing. There was no health complaints at any
8	he recently did.	8 9	other site.
10	So to me it's very clear that some people are	10	<b>Q.</b> And did you listen to Mr. Fuerniss's testimony in this matter?
	susceptible and are very adversely affected, but it's a	11	
11	very small minority.	12	
12 13	<b>Q.</b> You're not making a medical judgment here? You're not speaking as a medical practitioner regarding that top	12	testimony? Is that what you're referring to? Q. Are you aware of the physical symptoms and the
14	is that true?	14	complaints that Mr. Fuerniss has been has been feeling
15	A. No, not at all. I'm in my mind I'm thinking of	15	the last 18 months? Have you read anything about that or
16	the Shirley wind project in Wisconsin that I went to and	16	heard him testify about that?
17	we did a study there to try to figure out what was	17	A. No. That's news to me.
18	driving the complaints there, the nausea and the ill	18	<b>Q.</b> You stated that you believe that the number of
19	feeling complaints. And we went to the houses of those	19	individuals affected by this inaudible infrasound is
20	people, we talked to them, we took measurements. They	20	quite small, and that's based off of the fact that you've
21	weren't making it up. And so something's going on.	21	studied what's that based off of?
22	And what we found in that study was that you could	22	A. It's based partially off of the sites that I've been
23	detect the wind turbine blade passing frequency, which is	23	to and talked to everyone, but more than that, it's
24	as I mentioned around 1 hertz but the magnitude of it is	24	there's 90,000 megawatts of wind power in this country
25	incredibly small and it's really hard to believe that	25	right now. That's over 50,000 turbines. And the only
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 70	_	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 72
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!70that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!72and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six
1 2			
	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work	1	and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six
2	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.	1 2 3	and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.
23	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. <b>Q.</b> So just to make it clear you're convinced based	1 2 3	and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago. If this problem were common at all, it would be in
2 3 4	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. <b>Q.</b> So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the	1 2 3 4	and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago. If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5	and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago. If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link. MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link. MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Just following up on that last question, what did	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link. MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link. MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between? A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link. MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between? A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is. Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link. MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between? A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MR. ALMOND</u>:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did</li> <li>Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the complaints of the Shirley Wind individuals and their</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> <li>A. Well, as I mentioned, they described it as just kind</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the complaints of the Shirley Wind individuals and their complaints of I guess I'll let you say the complaints</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> <li>A. Well, as I mentioned, they described it as just kind of a dizziness, a mild nausea, and it was particularly</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MR. ALMOND</u>:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the complaints of the Shirley Wind individuals and their complaints of I guess I'll let you say the complaints because you're the one that was there but</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> <li>A. Well, as I mentioned, they described it as just kind of a dizziness, a mild nausea, and it was particularly one woman said right here in this corner of the kitchen</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the complaints of the Shirley Wind individuals and their complaints of I guess I'll let you say the complaints because you're the one that was there but</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> <li>A. Well, as I mentioned, they described it as just kind of a dizziness, a mild nausea, and it was particularly one woman said right here in this corner of the kitchen in that chair it's real bad so I sat there the whole</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the complaints of the Shirley Wind individuals and their complaints of I guess I'll let you say the complaints because you're the one that was there but</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. What were the complaints?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> <li>A. Well, as I mentioned, they described it as just kind of a dizziness, a mild nausea, and it was particularly one woman said right here in this corner of the kitchen in that chair it's real bad so I sat there the whole night but I couldn't hear anything at all. I couldn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did</li> <li>Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the complaints of the Shirley Wind individuals and their complaints of I guess I'll let you say the complaints because you're the one that was there but</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. What were the complaints?</li> <li>A. That they just felt some funny feeling and had a</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> <li>A. Well, as I mentioned, they described it as just kind of a dizziness, a mild nausea, and it was particularly one woman said right here in this corner of the kitchen in that chair it's real bad so I sat there the whole night but I couldn't hear anything at all. I couldn't measure anything. But, you know, she wasn't just saying</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that has any effect but I'm convinced from Cooper's work that that's what it is.</li> <li>Q. So just to make it clear you're convinced based solely on Cooper's work that that's the</li> <li>A. I think he finally made the link. Or demonstrated the link.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I don't have any further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Just following up on that last question, what did Cooper demonstrate the link between?</li> <li>A. That the extremely low frequency pulsations produced by wind turbines can be they're completely inaudible can be perceived by people who have a sensitivity to it but not by everybody.</li> <li>Q. And you believe that study gives credence to the complaints of the Shirley Wind individuals and their complaints of I guess I'll let you say the complaints because you're the one that was there but</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. What were the complaints?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>and we're still talking about Shirley, which was from six or seven years ago.</li> <li>If this problem were common at all, it would be in the forefront of every project's Application and would really be a totally disruptive issue.</li> <li>Q. So if I'm understanding maybe I'll just ask you.</li> <li>Are you aware of any literature or research that discusses people making the same types of complaints as those made in Shirley in other wind farms around the world?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm only familiar with a handful of sites. I think Falmouth in Massachusetts. I'm having a hard time I'm thinking there's just a couple.</li> <li>Q. Just so we know about the complaints that were taking place in Shirley and that you're saying aren't a national or worldwide significant number of, what are those complaints specifically?</li> <li>A. Well, as I mentioned, they described it as just kind of a dizziness, a mild nausea, and it was particularly one woman said right here in this corner of the kitchen in that chair it's real bad so I sat there the whole night but I couldn't hear anything at all. I couldn't</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 73		
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 73 measured the number of people that have that sensitivity	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 75
1		1	and study and survey the population they ask them
2	to infrasound?	-	basically are you annoyed by the project? Would you
3	A. No. That would be good to know, but, no, I don't	3	agree that that's how most studies are created or the
4	know of any organized or scientific counting.	4	method most studies that are analyzed for the purposes of
5	<b>Q.</b> And given this missing link that was found by	5	the peer review stuff?
6	Mr. Cooper, do you anticipate those types of studies will	6	<b>A.</b> I would say that was the case some years ago when
7	start being performed in the near future?	7	some of the studies in Sweden were survey kind of
8	A. I think work will continue along those lines because	8	studies. That's the way their questions were posed.
	it's a big issue. And up until that work the discussions		It wasn't until later that this infrasound issue
10	mainly centered around theories about the inner ear	10	started emerging.
11	and but nothing that was demonstrable. But now I've	11	<b>Q.</b> Right. So if people responded they were annoyed,
12 13	found that work to be excellent, and yeah, I would expect	12 13	they may have been annoyed because of nausea, dizziness,
14	it to continue. Q. And to date aren't most studies talking about wind	14	whatever or they may have been annoyed because they just didn't like it; right?
15	farms and adverse effects, aren't they typically talking	15	MS. SMITH: Objection calls for speculation.
16	about annoyance?	16	MR. DE HUECK: Can you rephrase?
17	A. Well, there's really two things going on. There's	17	MR. ALMOND: Yeah.
18	audible noise around the mid frequencies, 500 hertz, a	18	<b>Q.</b> Based off your review of the studies that have been
19	thousand hertz. That's just the sound of the blades	19	performed and how they've been conducted, isn't it true
20	squishing, and it sounds like a like a washing	20	that when they've asked whether or not an individual's
21	machine, kind of.	21	been annoyed, there's no distinction about where the
22	And then there's low frequency, and that's	22	annoyance comes from, whether it's nausea, dizziness,
23	completely at the bottom end of the frequency spectrum.	23	vertigo, or just they don't like the project?
24	It's a totally separate issue.	24	A. Yeah. I guess I would agree with that.
25	<b>Q.</b> Yeah. As far as your opinion that you don't believe	25	<b>Q.</b> Can you get Exhibit A 33 back in front of you.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 74		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 76
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 74 had people are affected by the infrasound and the	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 76 A. Okay.
1		1	
	had people are affected by the infrasound and the	_	A. Okay.
2	had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the	2 3	<ul><li>A. Okay.</li><li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition,</li></ul>
23	had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind	2 3	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to</li> </ul>
2 3 4	had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound? <b>A.</b> Well, I think when they are affected it's it	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse effects caused by wind turbines, isn't what people are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to the test location and then radio in for them to turn off</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse effects caused by wind turbines, isn't what people are asked about annoyance and they aren't specifically asked about nausea, dizziness? I mean large studies determine population amounts and do you understand the question</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to the test location and then radio in for them to turn off all the turbines and then take measurements of what's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse effects caused by wind turbines, isn't what people are asked about annoyance and they aren't specifically asked about nausea, dizziness? I mean large studies determine population amounts and do you understand the question I'm asking?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to the test location and then radio in for them to turn off all the turbines and then take measurements of what's happening without the project.</li> <li>And I will add it is amazing that it sounds the same.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse effects caused by wind turbines, isn't what people are asked about annoyance and they aren't specifically asked about nausea, dizziness? I mean large studies determine population amounts and do you understand the question I'm asking?</li> <li>A. It sounds like you're maybe talking about the Health</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to the test location and then radio in for them to turn off all the turbines and then take measurements of what's happening without the project.</li> <li>And I will add it is amazing that it sounds the same.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that that would maybe be a better</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse effects caused by wind turbines, isn't what people are asked about annoyance and they aren't specifically asked about nausea, dizziness? I mean large studies determine population amounts and do you understand the question I'm asking?</li> <li>A. It sounds like you're maybe talking about the Health Canada Study. It was a large study about the Canadian</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to the test location and then radio in for them to turn off all the turbines and then take measurements of what's happening without the project.</li> <li>And I will add it is amazing that it sounds the same.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that that would maybe be a better way to measure compliance with a 45 or a 40 or whatever</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse effects caused by wind turbines, isn't what people are asked about annoyance and they aren't specifically asked about nausea, dizziness? I mean large studies determine population amounts and do you understand the question I'm asking?</li> <li>A. It sounds like you're maybe talking about the Health Canada Study. It was a large study about the Canadian Health Department.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to the test location and then radio in for them to turn off all the turbines and then take measurements of what's happening without the project.</li> <li>And I will add it is amazing that it sounds the same.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that that would maybe be a better way to measure compliance with a 45 or a 40 or whatever noise standard?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>had people are affected by the infrasound and the sensitivities to it, would you agree that that the population hasn't really been studied or the wind farms haven't been studied to actually determine what percentage of people are affected by infrasound?</li> <li>A. Well, I think when they are affected it's it becomes known. And the fact that it does not appear to be a problem at 95 percent of operating projects tells me it must be rare.</li> <li>Q. So you're saying you have knowledge that 95 percent of projects these complaints of nausea, dizziness, vertigo haven't taken place, or you just haven't heard of it?</li> <li>A. I haven't heard of it.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And in the academic literature about adverse effects caused by wind turbines, isn't what people are asked about annoyance and they aren't specifically asked about nausea, dizziness? I mean large studies determine population amounts and do you understand the question I'm asking?</li> <li>A. It sounds like you're maybe talking about the Health Canada Study. It was a large study about the Canadian</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. And that's the Applicant proposed condition, specifically Proposed Condition No. 27. And I want to talk to you a little bit about the measurement of this condition. And it's over a two-week period; right?</li> <li>A. That's how long we normally measure for because then we're assured of getting periods of high wind, calm wind, different atmospheric conditions.</li> <li>Q. Have some of your colleagues suggested a method, an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. I don't know about colleagues but we do that ourselves.</li> <li>Q. What's an on off compliance test?</li> <li>A. When the wind is blowing and the project is operating at or near capacity, in many cases we'll get to the test location and then radio in for them to turn off all the turbines and then take measurements of what's happening without the project.</li> <li>And I will add it is amazing that it sounds the same.</li> <li>Q. Would you agree that that would maybe be a better way to measure compliance with a 45 or a 40 or whatever</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 77		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 79
1	of projects aren't happy about turning off the turbines.	1	<b>A.</b> No. Actually to get truly stable conditions you
2	<b>Q.</b> But it's for a short amount of time to get the	2	need very low wind speeds to stratify the atmosphere
3	measurements; right?	3	thermal lie. But in stable conditions it's warmer above
4	A. Yeah. I know. That's what I tell them.	4	so that the speed of sound is faster so it refracts the
5	<b>Q.</b> Earlier you were testifying about how the background	5	sound waves so they travel more easily.
6	noise, specifically noise caused by the wind, often masks	6	But in windy conditions that kind of atmosphere can
7	the noise created from the turbines.	7	exist and windy conditions are when turbines run.
8	Do you recall that testimony?	8	<b>Q.</b> Is it common for the atmospheric conditions to exist
9	A. Yes. That's what I was just alluding to on these on	9	where it's calm at ground level but there are strong
10	and off tests. When you arrive at the site it sounds	10	enough winds at the height of a turbine that the wind
11	tremendously loud. I'm thinking of one case in	11	turbine's still operational?
12	particular. And they turned off all the turbines. The	12	MS. EDWARDS: I'm going to object simply because
13	level was the same. It sounded exactly the same. It was	13	we did not proffer him as a meteorological expert.
14	just the trees around the house blowing.	14	MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to overrule your
15	<b>Q.</b> And in terms of complaints from those individuals	15	objection, allow you to answer.
16	living around projects regarding wind turbine noise, in	16	A. That does happen, but I wouldn't call it common. I
17	your experience have you found most often the complaints	17	think it happens seasonal lie, more commonly than other
18	come at night?	18	times, but it's not an every day or every week
19	A. Yeah. Yeah. It's	19	occurrence, I don't think.
20	Q. Rather than	20	<b>Q.</b> And in a given year how frequently?
21	A. It's audible at night and I can hear it and it's	21	<b>A.</b> It depends on the site and everything else.
22	bothering me and never heard anything about a daytime	22	<b>Q.</b> And under that scenario the sound around a residence
23	issue.	23	would be the sound created from the wind at least
24	<b>Q.</b> And is there a reason we would expect more	24	would be relatively quiet or nonexistent because the wind
25	complaints to happen at night?	25	wouldn't be blowing at ground level; right?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 78		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 80
1	A. Well, people are trying to sleep and want it to be	1	A. Yeah. That scenario is brought up in every project.
2	quiet.	2	That happens occasionally, but I wouldn't base the entire
3	<b>Q.</b> What about the atmospheric conditions that	3	design on that or anything.
5	frequently exist at night? Can that lead or is that perhaps an explanation for why we see more complaints at	5	Q. And during these very quiet ground levels and if MR. ALMOND: Well, you can strike that, Cheri.
6	night?	6	<b>Q.</b> If you have a rural community like we have here in
7	MS. SMITH: Objection. Vague. I don't know	7	this project and if those conditions exist, what would
8	what he means by atmospheric conditions that frequently	8	you expect would be the largest generator of noise?
9	occur at night.	9	<b>A.</b> It would depend on how far away you're observing the
10	MR. DE HUECK: Either do I, but maybe	10	turbines. If you're very far away, the turbine sound
11	Mr. Hessler does.	11	signal's so weak that it doesn't make any difference. If
12	A. Yeah. Yeah. At night sometimes there's temperature	12	you're very close at a 1,000 foot setback, then you'd
13	inversions and things that enhance or allow sound to	13	notice. You'd notice it more strongly.
14	propagate more easily. But it's not every night.	14	<b>Q.</b> And at what distance would you be able to start
15	Sometimes that happens.	15	noticing the turbines?
16		16	A. I can't say.
	But, no. I don't think that's the reason. It's		
17	But, no. I don't think that's the reason. It's just at night people have the expectation of quiet. If	17	<b>Q.</b> Can you give us a rough distance?
17 18		17 18	<ul><li>Q. Can you give us a rough distance?</li><li>A. Are you asking when they first become fairly audible</li></ul>
18 19	just at night people have the expectation of quiet. If they have the windows open and they hear it sounds like a washing machine going, they don't like it.	18 19	<b>A.</b> Are you asking when they first become fairly audible over the background as you approach a project, for
18 19 20	just at night people have the expectation of quiet. If they have the windows open and they hear it sounds like a washing machine going, they don't like it. <b>Q.</b> What are stable atmospheric conditions?	18 19 20	<b>A.</b> Are you asking when they first become fairly audible over the background as you approach a project, for instance?
18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>just at night people have the expectation of quiet. If they have the windows open and they hear it sounds like a washing machine going, they don't like it.</li> <li>Q. What are stable atmospheric conditions?</li> <li>A. That's when it's cold or above the service warmer</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Are you asking when they first become fairly audible over the background as you approach a project, for instance?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>just at night people have the expectation of quiet. If they have the windows open and they hear it sounds like a washing machine going, they don't like it.</li> <li>Q. What are stable atmospheric conditions?</li> <li>A. That's when it's cold or above the service warmer excuse me. I always get this mixed up. It's hot above</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Are you asking when they first become fairly audible over the background as you approach a project, for instance?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. I'm going to say it's hard to put a specific</li> </ul>
18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>just at night people have the expectation of quiet. If they have the windows open and they hear it sounds like a washing machine going, they don't like it.</li> <li>Q. What are stable atmospheric conditions?</li> <li>A. That's when it's cold or above the service warmer excuse me. I always get this mixed up. It's hot above and cold below.</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Are you asking when they first become fairly audible over the background as you approach a project, for instance?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. I'm going to say it's hard to put a specific number on. When we do operational surveys we put</li> </ul>
18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>just at night people have the expectation of quiet. If they have the windows open and they hear it sounds like a washing machine going, they don't like it.</li> <li>Q. What are stable atmospheric conditions?</li> <li>A. That's when it's cold or above the service warmer excuse me. I always get this mixed up. It's hot above</li> </ul>	18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Are you asking when they first become fairly audible over the background as you approach a project, for instance?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. I'm going to say it's hard to put a specific</li> </ul>

				02
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 81 what we get. There's no turbine influence at that level.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 8 waivers existed wouldn't give preferential treatment to	83
2	-	2		
	And so maybe a mile. You might be able to discern	3	certain people, would it?	
3	the project under certain conditions.		<b>A.</b> I'm not sure I follow the waiver aspect of that	
4	<b>Q.</b> In changing gears here, during your testimony	4	question. What waiver?	
5	earlier you said that one and a half mile setbacks		<b>Q.</b> Well, if an individual can waive that setback, for	
6	basically generally make projects not viable. Do you	6	example. In this project I don't know if you're that	
7	recall that testimony?	7	familiar with it but certain individuals have waived	
8	A. Yes. Yes.	8	setback requirements. Have you seen that?	
9	<b>Q.</b> Have you analyzed this project to determine whether	9	<ul> <li>A. Not here, but I know of that.</li> </ul>	
10	or not a mile and a half setback is viable for the	10	<b>Q.</b> You're aware of the wind industry there are	2
11	project?	11	agreements where individuals waive setback requirements	5?
12	A. No.	12	A. Yeah.	
13	<b>Q.</b> Okay. And have you seen any evidence in the record	13	MS. EDWARDS: Objection. This is outside the	
14	that suggested that if anyone tried to implement a mile	14	scope of his direct. He didn't testify about setbacks.	
15	and a half setback to this project?	15	MR. DE HUECK: Sustained.	
16	<b>A.</b> No.	16	MR. ALMOND: In his direct this witness has	
17	<b>Q.</b> So just as a general notion, mile and a half	17	testified about proposed regulations. He's given	
18	setbacks aren't typically that viable?	18	opinions on some distances, setback distances, et cetera.	
19	A. Yeah. Most project sites are fairly densely	19	I think talking to him about setback distances	
20	populated and there's just not that much room between	20	in this hearing and setback distances with other	
21	houses.	21	projects, especially given that he's testified at other	
22	<b>Q.</b> Do you think it would be more viable if you were to	22	projects are what he's using as support partially as	
23	separate a mile and a half setback or distinguish a mile	23	support for some of his opinions, is fair game to talk	
24	and a half setback for nonparticipants versus	24	with him about his experience with those setbacks.	
25	participants?	25	MR. DE HUECK: Which I think you've done, and	
			DOLLOU DDAFT DO NO OLIOTEL	~ 4
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 82			84
1	A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about	1	now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal	84
2	<b>A.</b> I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a	2	now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.	84
23	<b>A.</b> I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an	2 3	now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony. <b>Q.</b> In your past experience looking at wind projects,	
2 3 4	<b>A.</b> I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's	2 3 4	now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony. <b>Q.</b> In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements?	
2 3 4 5	<b>A.</b> I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony. <b>Q.</b> In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is? MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony. Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is? MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony. MR. DE HUECK: Correct.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly unhappy with this project, I thought it was a good idea</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of his testimony as well. He's not testifying as a</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly unhappy with this project, I thought it was a good idea if the project if we could appeal to the project to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of his testimony as well. He's not testifying as a health expert.</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly unhappy with this project, I thought it was a good idea if the project if we could appeal to the project to try to increase to maximize those setback distances</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of his testimony as well. He's not testifying as a health expert.</li> </ul>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly unhappy with this project, I thought it was a good idea if the project if we could appeal to the project to try to increase to maximize those setback distances for those individuals that on further reflection you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of his testimony as well. He's not testifying as a health expert.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm merely asking if he's familiar with the study.</li> </ul>	?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly unhappy with this project, I thought it was a good idea if the project if we could appeal to the project to try to increase to maximize those setback distances for those individuals that on further reflection you can't give special treatment to certain people. It's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of his testimony as well. He's not testifying as a health expert.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm merely asking if he's familiar with the study.</li> </ul>	?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly unhappy with this project, I thought it was a good idea if the project if we could appeal to the project to try to increase to maximize those setback distances for those individuals that on further reflection you can't give special treatment to certain people. It's just it would set such a precedent that it would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of his testimony as well. He's not testifying as a health expert.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm merely asking if he's familiar with the study.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Are you familiar with the study?</li> </ul>	?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I would like to see that. In fact, I thought about advocating for that here, but that would create a precedent for all future projects. All to do is be an Intervenor and you can get all kind of elbow room so it's not really a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. But you thought about advocating for a mile and a half setback?</li> <li>A. 2 mile.</li> <li>Q. You thought about advocating for a 2 mile setback for</li> <li>A. For Intervenors but that's not a practical suggestion.</li> <li>Q. Well, if there was a waiver system that allowed nonparticipants to waive the setback requirement, what would be impractical about it?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I'm not sure I follow the question. But what I was suggesting was that for those that were clearly unhappy with this project, I thought it was a good idea if the project if we could appeal to the project to try to increase to maximize those setback distances for those individuals that on further reflection you can't give special treatment to certain people. It's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>now we've moved into some sort of abstract personal feeling regarding outside the scope of Direct Testimony.</li> <li>Q. In your past experience looking at wind projects, are you aware of are you of good neighbor agreements? Do you know what that term is?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is also outside the scope of his testimony.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Correct.</li> <li>Q. With the Applicant's medical experts there was a lot of discussion about that Massachusetts study. Are you familiar with the Massachusetts study?</li> <li>A. Which Massachusetts study?</li> <li>Q. Talking about health effects of wind turbines, the Massachusetts government got a panel together to study wind turbines. Are you familiar with that Massachusetts study?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of his testimony as well. He's not testifying as a health expert.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I'm merely asking if he's familiar with the study.</li> </ul>	?

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 85		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 87
1	together and studied wind farms and the purpose of which	1	firms, some with kind of known opposition views.
2	was to see what regulations should be put in place.	2	<b>Q.</b> So just so I understand correctly, the Wisconsin
3	My question to you because nobody else has been able	3	Public Service Commission was considering whether or not
4	to answer it is what is Massachusetts regulations as far	4	to approve a wind farm project. And before it was doing
5	as noise limits on wind farms?	5	that before it would do that you recommended that we
6	A. The Massachusetts noise state noise limit is to	6	should go study this other project?
7	measure the background L90 statistical. That's the near	7	A. That's right. And what I expected to find was that
8	minimum background level. And then the project can be	8	the low frequency signal was extremely strong at that
9	10 above that.	9	site or something odd was happening there. But the
10	So it starts at a very low level, and then they have	10	signal was detected but at incredibly low amplitude.
11	a big adder. It's unusual.	11	<b>Q.</b> I just handed you a document titled The Cooperative
12	<b>Q.</b> So whatever the L90 level; the project can go 10	12	Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency Sound
13	above that?	13	and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County,
14	A. That's right.	14	Wisconsin.
15	<b>Q.</b> How far does the type of infrasound and low	15	Is this the report that was generated following the
16	frequency noise that Steven Cooper was studying travel?	16	study of the Shirley Wind Farm we've been talking about?
17	<b>A.</b> That's a good question. It travels very far.	17	A. I think this was the final version. There was a lot
18	Miles.	18	of drafts.
19	Q. Miles?	19	<b>Q.</b> And if you turn to page 8, please.
20	A. Yeah.	20	A. Okay.
21	<b>Q.</b> Again, shifting gears, going back to this Shirley	21	<b>Q.</b> What ultimately did you recommend to the Wisconsin
22	project that you've studied, what was the regulatory	22	Public Service Commission in terms of a noise limit?
23	limit in that Shirley project?	23	<b>A.</b> I don't really remember recommending much of
24	A. I don't recall. And the reason is it was irrelevant	24	anything. We couldn't really determine what was going on
25	to the problems there. They were merely about the low	25	at that site.
			ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 88
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 86		
1	frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in	1	<b>Q.</b> Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler
2	frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.	2	<b>Q.</b> Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the
23	frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit. <b>Q.</b> If I were to give you the report that was generated	2 3	<b>Q.</b> Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?
2 3 4	frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit. <b>Q.</b> If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit. <b>Q.</b> If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> </ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing for another wind project. They planned to use the same</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing for another wind project. They planned to use the same turbines and people from the Shirley site were at this hearing saying, you know, look at our site. You know, watch out and don't let this happen again.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Any objection?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: No objection.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing for another wind project. They planned to use the same turbines and people from the Shirley site were at this hearing saying, you know, look at our site. You know, watch out and don't let this happen again.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Any objection?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: No objection.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: No objection.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing for another wind project. They planned to use the same turbines and people from the Shirley site were at this hearing saying, you know, look at our site. You know, watch out and don't let this happen again.</li> <li>So I said, well, it sounds like, you know, we need to investigate what's going on at Shirley, so that was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Any objection?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: No objection.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: And I have no objection other</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing for another wind project. They planned to use the same turbines and people from the Shirley site were at this hearing saying, you know, look at our site. You know, watch out and don't let this happen again.</li> <li>So I said, well, it sounds like, you know, we need to investigate what's going on at Shirley, so that was the impetus for the study and that it was, I think,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Any objection?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: No objection.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: And I have no objection other than I think maybe next time hand a copy to me. That</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing for another wind project. They planned to use the same turbines and people from the Shirley site were at this hearing saying, you know, look at our site. You know, watch out and don't let this happen again.</li> <li>So I said, well, it sounds like, you know, we need to investigate what's going on at Shirley, so that was the impetus for the study and that it was, I think, funded by the Public Service Commission.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Any objection?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: No objection.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: And I have no objection other than I think maybe next time hand a copy to me. That would be good.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>frequency content, which isn't represented or captured in any way by the A-weighted limit.</li> <li>Q. If I were to give you the report that was generated from that project, would that help refresh your recollection?</li> <li>A. As to what the A-weighted limit was?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. I think it's in the report. I don't know if it was mentioned.</li> <li>Q. After conducting your study in Shirley did you give a recommendation? What was the body that was overlooking the Shirley project, the governmental body?</li> <li>A. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission. By the way, that study was the whole impetus of that study was from my recommendation to study it during a hearing for another wind project. They planned to use the same turbines and people from the Shirley site were at this hearing saying, you know, look at our site. You know, watch out and don't let this happen again.</li> <li>So I said, well, it sounds like, you know, we need to investigate what's going on at Shirley, so that was the impetus for the study and that it was, I think,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Do you see the third paragraph where it says Hessler associates recommends approval of the Application if the following noise condition is placed on approval?</li> <li>A. Okay. Oh, that's right. Yeah. We this number comes from talking with Paul Schomer who was one of the other guys there.</li> <li>Yeah. It's 39 and a half is the number in here, which is essentially 40 or the 40 limit that we've been recommending all along as an ideal goal.</li> <li>Q. I want you to flip to page 9. Is that your signature there on the bottom?</li> <li>A. Halfway down, yes.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to offer and move for the admission of Exhibit I 36, the document entitled Cooperative Measurement Survey and Analysis of Low Frequency and Infrasound at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Any objection?</li> <li>MS. SMITH: No objection.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: And I have no objection other than I think maybe next time hand a copy to me. That</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 89		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 91
1	So I 36, is that what you said?	1	conducted.
2	MR. ALMOND: Yeah.	2	MR. ALMOND: It's an ultimate conclusion
3	MR. DE HUECK: Will be admitted. Thank you.	3	opinion. Experts are offered to provide ultimate
4	<b>Q.</b> Let's step away from the Shirley project.	4	conclusions, ultimate opinions. That's what I'm asking
5	I want to talk a little bit about what you started	5	him to do.
6	with Ms. Edwards talking about in terms of the community	6	MR. DE HUECK: But not as to whether or not they
7	response to a project. Do you remember that part of your	7	will be in compliance with a particular law.
8	testimony?	8	MR. ALMOND: I have not asked him about a law.
9	A. Yes.	9	I've asked him a question.
10	<b>Q.</b> And there are ways in which to gauge how a	10	MR. DE HUECK: It sounds like it.
11	community's going to respond to a project when it comes	11	Ask again, Reiss. Or maybe
12	to noise and how that noise is going to affect the	12	MR. ALMOND: Cheri, can you just repeat the
13	community; right?	13	question so we can hear what I asked again.
14	A. I believe so, yeah.	14	(Reporter reads back the last question.)
15	<b>Q.</b> And are those and do the ANSI standards talk	15	MR. DE HUECK: So asking if it will comply with
16	about what calculations should be done to gauge community	16	the law.
17	response to a project?	17	Can you
18	<b>A.</b> There is an ANSI standard that addresses that, but	18	MR. ALMOND: I have not referenced the law. I'm
19	it wasn't written with wind turbines in mind. It was	19	not asking if it complies with the law. I'm asking that
20	picturing some coal plant or a gas turbine or something,	20	question.
21	which is a much simpler situation.	21	MS. EDWARDS: I guess I would just object as
22	Our approach is, as I went through before, was to do	22	vague and ask maybe the inquirer to be more clear on the
23	an initial survey, find out what the background is going	23	social condition.
24	to be at the wind speeds required to operate the project,	24	MS. SMITH: And I'm going to object because it
25	and then see how the predictions under those same wind	25	is
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 90		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 92
1	speeds compare. And depending on that differential, you	1	MR. ALMOND: I'll rephrase the question.
2			
2	can get an idea of whether it's going to be very audible	2	MS. SMITH: May I object?
3	can get an idea of whether it's going to be very audible or inaudible.	2 3	MS. SMITH: May I object? It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2.
	or inaudible.		
3	or inaudible.	3	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2.
3 4	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this	3 4	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on
3 4 5	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project?	3 4 5	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance.
3 4 5 6	or inaudible. <b>Q.</b> Has that type of study been conducted for this project? <b>A.</b> No. No. That's completely missing from the	3 4 5 6	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the
3 4 5 6 7	or inaudible. <b>Q.</b> Has that type of study been conducted for this project? <b>A.</b> No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study.	3 4 5 6 7	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection.
3 4 5 6 7 8	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in	3 4 5 6 7 8	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project;	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>or inaudible.</li> <li>Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project?</li> <li>A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study.</li> <li>Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct?</li> <li>A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row.</li> <li>Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row. Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>or inaudible.</li> <li>Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project?</li> <li>A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study.</li> <li>Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct?</li> <li>A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row.</li> <li>Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the social condition of those living in it?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why we're curious about the community response and why it's
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row. Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the social condition of those living in it? MS. SMITH: Objection. Calls for a legal	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why we're curious about the community response and why it's important to look at that. He's offered opinions that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row. Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the social condition of those living in it? MS. SMITH: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why we're curious about the community response and why it's important to look at that. He's offered opinions that this Applicant should have done that. I'm curious as to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row. Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the social condition of those living in it? MS. SMITH: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. MR. ALMOND: It's a question.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why we're curious about the community response and why it's important to look at that. He's offered opinions that this Applicant should have done that. I'm curious as to why.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row. Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the social condition of those living in it? MS. SMITH: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. MR. ALMOND: It's a question. MR. DE HUECK: Well, you're basically asking it	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. <b>Q.</b> How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why we're curious about the community response and why it's important to look at that. He's offered opinions that this Applicant should have done that. I'm curious as to why. MR. DE HUECK: Just go ahead and answer this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row. Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the social condition of those living in it? MS. SMITH: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. MR. ALMOND: It's a question. MR. DE HUECK: Well, you're basically asking it will comply with that regulation.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why we're curious about the community response and why it's important to look at that. He's offered opinions that this Applicant should have done that. I'm curious as to why. MR. DE HUECK: Just go ahead and answer this one.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or inaudible. Q. Has that type of study been conducted for this project? A. No. No. That's completely missing from the Applicant's noise study. Q. And you would like to see that type of study in order to gauge the community's response to a project; correct? A. I think it's the duty of the engineer to do that. I don't know why it keeps getting left out of these. This is the third one in a row. Q. And without doing that, do you think we're able to gauge whether or not this project's going to injure the social condition of those living in it? MS. SMITH: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion. MR. ALMOND: It's a question. MR. DE HUECK: Well, you're basically asking it will comply with that regulation. MR. ALMOND: And experts are capable of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	It's basically stating 49-41B-22.1 or 2. Excuse me. And so he's basically asking him to opine on the statute compliance. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So let's sustain the objection. Ask another question. Q. How the community responds to a project deals with the social well-being of the community; right? MS. SMITH: Objection. That's not why he was brought here to testify, on the social feelings of the community. MR. ALMOND: He's been testifying about community response I'm just trying to figure out why we're curious about the community response and why it's important to look at that. He's offered opinions that this Applicant should have done that. I'm curious as to why. MR. DE HUECK: Just go ahead and answer this one. A. Well, when I do an assessment I think the purpose of

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 93		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	95
1	report normally.	1	2010 that was published in the noise control engineeri	ing
2	No. I think you want to model the project, see what	2	journal January 2011.	9
3	the sound levels are going to be at people's houses. And	3	MR. ALMOND: At this point I'd like to move for	
4	I always say I think I think there's going to be a	4	the admission of Exhibit I 37.	
5	problem or 1 think it's a low probability of complaints,	5	MS. EDWARDS: No objection from Staff.	
6	a high probability, whatever it is goes into my report.	6	MR. DE HUECK: Any objection?	
7	My clients aren't often happy with my reports, but	7	MS. SMITH: No objection.	
8	that's the purpose of an assessment.	8	MR. DE HUECK: It will be admitted as I 37.	
9	Q. All right. Shifting gears again, you've reviewed	9	Q. Can you turn to page 97 of that paper for me. What	
10	the modeled limits provided by Burns & McDonnell;	10	is that table 1 at the top of that page?	
11	correct? Mr. Howell?	11	A. It's titled typical worldwide wind turbine noise	
12	A. Yeah. I looked at the at the noise prediction,	12	limits.	
13	the sound contour map, yes.	13	<b>Q.</b> And it looks like the different jurisdictions are	
14	Q. Yeah. That was a poorly asked question.	14	all outside the United States in that table. Would you	
15	A. I knew what you were talking about.	15	agree?	
16	<b>Q.</b> The predicted sound measurements.	16	A. They are, yes.	
17	A. Yeah.	17	<b>Q.</b> And if you flip back to the previous page, it states	
18	<b>Q.</b> Would you agree that the modeled levels can have	18	"wind turbine development in usual even countries and	
19	spikes in the order of 15 to 20 dBA above the model	19	other parts of the world has been proceeding for some	
20	levels?	20	time now while widespread development has only started in	
21	A. Yes.	21	the U.S. within the last five years or so do you see that	
22	<b>Q.</b> So if you're looking at a modeled level of 35, you	22	language?	
23	could experience spikes up to 55 dBA?	23	A. Yes. Uh-huh.	
24	A. Well, not 20, but yeah. Wind turbine noise is	24	<b>Q.</b> So would you agree that it would be appropriate to	
25	highly variable. And depending on, you know, the wind's	25	look to other jurisdictions and European and other	
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 94			
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 94		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	96
1	not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it	1	countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind	96
2	not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.	2	countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?	96
	not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it		countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations? A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.	96
2 3 4	not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time. That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.	2 3 4	<ul><li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li><li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li><li>Q. Precisely.</li></ul>	96
2 3 4 5	not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time. That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance. <b>Q.</b> Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. And looking at table 1 for one example, for example,</li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6	not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time. That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance. <b>Q.</b> Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely.</li> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely.</li> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think so.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think so. (Exhibit 37 is marked for identification.)</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think so. (Exhibit 37 is marked for identification.)</li> <li>Q. I'm going to hand you what has been marked as</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely.</li> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think so.     (Exhibit 37 is marked for identification.)</li> <li>Q. I'm going to hand you what has been marked as Exhibit I 37. What is exhibit what is I just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely.</li> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think so.     (Exhibit 37 is marked for identification.)</li> <li>Q. I'm going to hand you what has been marked as Exhibit I 37. What is exhibit what is I just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely.</li> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>P. Hello, Mr. Hessler. You and I have one thing in</li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think so.     (Exhibit 37 is marked for identification.)</li> <li>Q. I'm going to hand you what has been marked as Exhibit I 37. What is exhibit what is I just handed you what has been marked Exhibit I 37. What is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely.</li> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul>	96
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>not blowing in a nice laminar manner, it's turbulent, it changes all the time.</li> <li>That's why in every test you can only test over a long-term average. You can't capture every exceedance.</li> <li>Q. Well, the on/off condition test we don't need to measure over a long period of time; correct?</li> <li>A. No. No. Most of the time the noise is fairly steady but it does it certainly does vary over time.</li> <li>Q. Have you written a paper on recommended noise level design goals for wind turns?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that paper?</li> <li>A. To recommend noise design goals, which namely are 45 under most normal circumstances and an ideal target of 40.</li> <li>Q. And you didn't attach that paper to your testimony, did you?</li> <li>A. No. I don't think so.     (Exhibit 37 is marked for identification.)</li> <li>Q. I'm going to hand you what has been marked as Exhibit I 37. What is exhibit what is I just handed you what has been marked Exhibit I 37. What is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>countries to see what's going on when it comes to wind regulations?</li> <li>A. Yeah. That's why we did that, this paper.</li> <li>Q. Precisely. <ul> <li>And looking at table 1 for one example, for example, at the very top is Alberta, Canada. It says, "Criteria values, 50D/40N. What does that mean, the 50D/40N?</li> <li>A. 50 during the day, and 40 at night.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. And the D and N, is that what it means for the entire list of <ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Are you aware of any regulations on this project that deal with infrasound or low frequency noise?</li> <li>A. No. There are none on this project or any other project I can think of. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. Hessler. I don't have any other questions for you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> </ul> </li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. FUERNISS:</li> <li>Q. Hello, Mr. Hessler. You and I have one thing in common. At least we both have had the privilege to work</li> </ul></li></ul>	96

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 97		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 99
1	<b>A.</b> I think it's great. I just have one question. This	1	<b>A.</b> Okay.
2	goes way back earlier in your testimony. You talk about	2	<b>Q.</b> Maybe they built it and sold it. I'm not sure.
3	some people being much more sensitive than others.	3	Starting to sound familiar?
4	Does that sensitivity can that increase with	4	<b>A.</b> Go on.
5	prolonged exposure, or do you have a level of sensitivity	5	<b>Q.</b> Well, my understanding that there were four
6	and that's it or	6	different I believe it was four, might have been three
7	A. I'm not sure that's really known or understood. I	7	different residences that were experiencing either health
8	think I've seen papers speculating or thinking that maybe	8	concern or not being able to sleep on their top floor.
9	the more exposure the more sensitivity would develop.	9	And so a sound study was done there, and that must be
10	But I don't know myself.	10	this study that you peer reviewed?
11	MR. FUERNISS: Thank you.	11	A. What I recall is it was a noise study prepared for
12	THE WITNESS: Sure.	12	the permitting Application, and I just reviewed it and
13	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.	13	commented on its shortcomings or good parts. That's all
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION	14	I remember about it really.
15	BY MS. JENKINS:	15	Q. Okay. The project was built in 2008, and the
16	<b>Q.</b> Yes. I have some questions. On your Direct	16	study your peer review was in 2013.
17	Testimony, your prefiled I was looking at your resume and	17	A. Okay.
18	at the very end of that section is you talked about a	18	Q. Still nothing?
19	project in Maine? Freedom, Maine?	19	A. Yeah. That just goes to show how many wind turbine
20	A. Was it Clinton, Maine?	20	projects I've been mixed up in.
21	Q. Freedom.	21	<b>Q</b> . Okay.
22	A. Freedom.	22	A. Yeah. I'm not recalling the situation you're
23	Q. It was called the Beaver Ridge Wind Project. Maybe	23	talking about with people having problem I don't
24	let's find the exhibit. It's Exhibit D M H-1 in his	24	remember anything about that.
25	MR. ALMOND: S 3.	25	<b>Q.</b> Okay. The reason it came up was when I saw you
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 98		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 100
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 98 MS. EDWARDS: S 3.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 100 were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent
1 2		1 2	
-	MS. EDWARDS: S 3.	2	were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent
2 3 4	<ul><li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li><li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I</li></ul>	2 3 4	were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit? A. Yeah.
2 3 4 5	MS. EDWARDS: S 3. A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> <li>Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</pre> A. Yeah. Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt. MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff. MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in. Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the panel. It looked like a bunch of satisfy captains up</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> <li>Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too far.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the panel. It looked like a bunch of satisfy captains up there in Maine.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> <li>Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too far.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: So, Ms. Jenkins, it is as if</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the panel. It looked like a bunch of satisfy captains up there in Maine.</li> <li>Q. Can I refresh your memory?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</pre> A. Yeah. Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt. MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff. MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in. Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too far. MR. DE HUECK: So, Ms. Jenkins, it is as if you're introducing your own testimony as to what you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the panel. It looked like a bunch of satisfy captains up there in Maine.</li> <li>Q. Can I refresh your memory?</li> <li>A. Please do. The whole project is kind of vague to me</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> <li>Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too far.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: So, Ms. Jenkins, it is as if you're introducing your own testimony as to what you think happened out in Maine into the record now so we</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the panel. It looked like a bunch of satisfy captains up there in Maine.</li> <li>Q. Can I refresh your memory?</li> <li>A. Please do. The whole project is kind of vague to me now.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> <li>Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too far.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: So, Ms. Jenkins, it is as if you're introducing your own testimony as to what you think happened out in Maine into the record now so we want to avoid that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the panel. It looked like a bunch of satisfy captains up there in Maine.</li> <li>Q. Can I refresh your memory?</li> <li>A. Please do. The whole project is kind of vague to me now.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I believe it was three turbines?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> <li>Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too far.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: So, Ms. Jenkins, it is as if you're introducing your own testimony as to what you think happened out in Maine into the record now so we want to avoid that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MS. EDWARDS: S 3.</li> <li>A. Okay. All right. It's pretty bad when I have to be reminded of my own resume. Yeah. Yeah. I remember that project. That was in the town of Clinton, Maine, I believe.</li> <li>Q. Can you just tell a little bit about what your it looks like you appeared before the Maine State Government of energy and utilities committee. It says a peer review of operational sound testing by others:</li> <li>A. Oh, yeah. I remember that one now. Yeah. I was engaged by the state, very similar to this case, to look at somebody else's Application, the noise study for an Application for this wind project and give my opinion on it.</li> <li>Q. And do you remember any specifics like the size of the project?</li> <li>A. I think it was fairly small. All I remember was the panel. It looked like a bunch of satisfy captains up there in Maine.</li> <li>Q. Can I refresh your memory?</li> <li>A. Please do. The whole project is kind of vague to me now.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>were going to testify, I was looking for your most recent note on your resume, and that was in 2014. And so I researched it a little bit?</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. And the reason I bring it up now is that you said that it was just a handful of people that are having health concerns. And in this in my research I just went to the</li> <li>MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. At this point it sounds like Ms. Jenkins is testifying. Unfortunately, I think we have to interrupt.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. Go ahead, Staff.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: I guess since it's my witness I should probably attempt to weigh in.</li> <li>Because we are a neutral party I attempt to afford a great deal of latitude. I would say this is impeachment but going down that track going a little too far.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: So, Ms. Jenkins, it is as if you're introducing your own testimony as to what you think happened out in Maine into the record now so we want to avoid that.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 101		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 103
1	MS. JENKINS: Okay. So I'll just summarize	1	turbines are. You know, it's supposed to explain it to
2	that, that you earlier said that you have witnessed only	2	the degree where you don't have to go out there and find
3	a handful of people with health effects, complaints, and	3	out for yourself.
4	out of all the projects in the United States.	4	Now this report was very vague on that. The sound
5	A. Yeah.	5	contour map was printed on a White paper, there was no
6	<b>Q.</b> And you don't remember this project, your latest one	6	map. I couldn't tell where the houses were, whose house
7	that you reviewed. I'm sorry. I'm not trying to be	7	was which, so it was a shortcoming of the study.
8	unkind. I I'm just trying to	8	Q. Okay. And you don't remember testifying before the
9	A. No. You have every right. I'm so sorry I can't	9	board or at that hearing before the Maine State
10	remember that project.	10	Government Energy, Utilities, and Technology Committee on
11	Q. Okay.	11	behalf of Patriot Renewables and the Beaver Ridge Wind
12	A. It was a very small project and I think I just	12	project in 2014?
13	looked over someone's work and testified for 10 minutes	13	A. Yeah. I remember being there and I remember what
14	on it. I never went to the site or anything. I don't	14	the room looked like but I forgot what the substance of
15	know too much about it really.	15	the testimony was about.
16	<b>Q.</b> So to do a sound study or to peer review a sound	16	<b>Q.</b> Okay. So you don't really remember the case?
17	study you don't need to see the site or know the	17	A. I don't remember the case. It was
18	complaints or anything?	18	MS. JENKINS: Okay. Thank you.
19	<b>A.</b> I'm fairly certain that this study had nothing to do	19	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.
20	with the complaints. I don't remember anything about	20	MS. PAZOUR: No.
21	that. I would remember that. If there was problems,	21	MR. DE HUECK: That will bring us over here to
22	somebody went out, did a survey, tried to understand the	22	Commission questions. I'm down here with Commissioner
23	problems. That doesn't ring any bells at all to me.	23	Nelson. I have a quick question if that's okay.
24	Yeah. I'd have to pull out the file for this	24	Help me understand this because the Cooper
25	project, and I just don't remember it.	25	study's got me thinking. And I think I recall you saying
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 102		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 104
1	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, do you actually have	1	that often whether on or off, the wind turbines, the
2	a copy of what it is you're referring to?	2	sound can be the same just due to the wind itself.
3	MS. JENKINS: Well, I could go to the website where the where the people in the community were	3	So a noisy night, you could turn off the
4 5	attempting to get their sound levels up to the state	4 5	turbines and you're still going to be at, say, 45 dBA just based on the wind itself. And the turbines don't
6	level.	6	run unless it's windy; correct.
7	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. I think we have just a bit	7	THE WITNESS: That's absolutely correct. It was
8	of confusion going on. I'm not sure. But I think we	8	surprising even to me.
9	should just move on.	9	MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. That is. So does wind
10	MS. JENKINS: Okay. Let me just make sure	10	itself carry these sound we can't hear, infrasounds?
11	there's nothing else I can ask.	11	THE WITNESS: They're not carried on the wind.
12	MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead.	12	They just radiate out from the source.
13	(Pause.)	13	MR. DE HUECK: So could tell wind itself be the
14	<b>Q.</b> Okay. I think my last question would be just to	14	source of infrasound?
15	understand the process, if you do a sound study you don't	15	THE WITNESS: No. For example, in the Shirley
16	necessarily or peer review a sound study, you don't	16	study we used very specialized instrumentation to be able
17	necessarily have to go to the project site?	17	to detect the blade passing frequency. And that's every
18	<b>A.</b> No. Like in this case there wasn't a whole lot of	18	time a blade goes bit tower of the three blades so that
19	need to go to the site.	19	the frequency of that is about .7 to 1 hertz. And that
20	<b>Q.</b> And can you tell me how you can deduce that if you	20	was detectable.
21	don't remember the project?	21	And I think it's the repeated pulsations of
22	<b>A.</b> Well, the noise study is supposed to explain and	22	that, those waives going out, that some people are
23	show you what the site is like. Like in our reports we	23	sensitive to. It's like on a boat, you know, and satisfy
24	put a site description. We have maps. We show what's	24	sick. Just kind of that low rocking. I think it's
25	going on at the site, where the houses are, where the	25	related to that.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 105		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 107
1	MR. DE HUECK: I understand that it could be	1	hard to pick up.
2	related to that. But so does the wind let's say we	2	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so you have attempted
3	remove the turbines and we still have it's a windy	3	to measure it. Is that
4	night and could infrasounds from the wind	4	THE WITNESS: Oh, yes.
5	THE WITNESS: No. No. It takes this specific	5	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Do I take it from your
6	source to generate it. No. Wind noise is very	6	testimony that using the Shirley example that you weren't
7	broadband.	7	comfortable that you accurately captured what was going
8	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Thank you.	8	on?
9	THE WITNESS: Okay.	9	THE WITNESS: Yeah. You could see a little
10	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Hessler for	10	blip, but it was so small that we said how is this a
11	being here to help us sort this out.	11	problem. It's orders and orders of magnitude below the
12	THE WITNESS: Always a pleasure.	12	threshold of human perception. But evidently it's the
13	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Looking at your Direct	13	the frequency of the pulses that go out apparently have
14	Testimony on page 8, there was a question about I	14	an effect.
15	think Mr. Fuerniss had recommended that sound levels be	15	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Within the last week I saw
16	measured using satisfy weighted sound levels, and you	16	a presentation on the folks that are trying to capture
17	said, no, no, that that would be inappropriate.	17	neutrinos and when I read through this I for some reason
18	So my ultimate question is how is infrasound	18	thought of that. And we're trying to capture something
19	measured? What is the scale? What is the	19	that's apparently very difficult.
20	instrumentation? Have you done it? Help me understand	20	THE WITNESS: Yeah. It is.
21	all of that.	21	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Did you read through
22	THE WITNESS: Yeah. No. That's a very good	22	Dr. Roberts's Rebuttal Testimony?
23	question.	23	THE WITNESS: I did read through it, yes.
24	You know, it's extremely difficult to even	24	<b>Q.</b> Could you pull out Exhibit A5-1, which is Exhibit 1
25	detect. That's why there's no practical way to put a	25	attached to his Rebuttal Testimony.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 106		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 108
1	regulatory limit on it. C-weighting only goes down to 10	1	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yes. A 5-1. And if you
2	hertz, and this is happening at less than 1 hertz. So	2	could go to page 10.
3	it's off the chart. So C-weighting is not going to	3	THE WITNESS: Okay.
4	capture it or do anything.	4	COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the lower left corner
5	How it is measured is to use very specialized	5	there's a bullet point, and this is talking about the
6	low frequency microphones that can measure down to less	6	results of some work that was done in Germany. And that
7	than 1 hertz and very specialized instrumentation. It's	7	bullet point says, "At a distance of 700 meters from the
8	also complicated by the fact that whenever you try to	8	wind turbines it was observed by means of measurements
9	measure sound in windy conditions the wind blowing over	9	when the turbine was switched on the measured infrasound
10	the microphone creates a false signal, and that happens	10	level did not increase or only increased to a limited
11	in the low end of the frequency spectrum. So it's very	11	extent."
12	easy for any kind of measurement to get completely	12	And then it says infrasound was generated mainly
13	covered up by nonrelated, self-generated noise. Very	13	by the wind and not by the turbines.
14	difficult to measure.	14	There's two things here that contradict what you
15	So there's no way I could think of to place a	15	have said already today. And I'm trying to sort this
16	regulation or a limit on it.	16	out. I mean, at some point infrasound has to dissipate.
17	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So we've heard reference	17	This study seems to indicate that by 700 meters it has
18	to dB(G). Is that the measurement that is used for	18	dissipated. I heard you testify today that infrasound
19	infrasound?	19	travels for "miles."
20	THE WITNESS: It can be. That's essentially not	20	So that's my first question.
		21	THE WITNESS: Okay.
21	putting any weighting on the frequency spectrum, not	<i></i>	
21 22	subtracting some number. But it's very very difficult in	22	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Help me understand how far
21 22 23	subtracting some number. But it's very very difficult in practical terms to even detect. In that Shirley	23	this travels.
21 22	subtracting some number. But it's very very difficult in		-

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 109		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 111
1	and so on.	1	be heard without that sound changing the ambient dBA
2	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So help me unpack that.	2	level?
3	THE WITNESS: Yeah. Well, I can see in the	3	THE WITNESS: Yes. If the sound has a
4	picture here, in the lower left picture titled C they've	4	distinctive character to it, then you can identify and
5	got a black dome sitting on the ground on a white circle.	5	pick it out even though the magnitude of it, whether it's
6	Do you see that?	6	on or off may be about the same.
7	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yes.	7	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Like a wind turbine.
8	THE WITNESS: That is a method that we use to	8	THE WITNESS: Yeah. Which has a that washing
9	measure wind turbines outdoors where the microphone is	9	machine sound. Yeah.
10	laying horizontally on this reflective surface and then	10	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So we had well,
11	this huge wind screen is put over it.	11	Ms. Jenkins, Intervenor, testified yesterday, again
12	Now that only works to a certain extent, and it	12	contrary to what I heard from you this morning, that her
13	does not allow measurements down at one hertz. That's	13	house is 3 miles away from a wind turbine and inside of
14	all covered even with this set up the measurements are	14	her house she can hear the wind turbine 3 miles away.
15	blown away by wind self-generated wind noise. Because	15	THE WITNESS: That's surprising to me.
16	I've used this exact equipment before.	16	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So we'll set that
17	That's why they say all they measured was wind.	17	aside. But it would be let's say you're outside. It
18	Because you really can't pick it up. But no. I think it	18	may be possible to actually hear a wind turbine because
19	can travel 700 meters or more under other circumstances.	19	of the unique sound even though it doesn't raise the dBA
20	Let me see. At Shirley one of the houses was	20	level. Is that accurate?
21	very far from any turbines, miles away. We did measure	21	THE WITNESS: Right. If you're able to identify
22	inside of that house out of the wind to avoid this	22	that distinctive sound and you know what you're listening
23	contamination. I don't think we were able to detect	23	for and so on.
24	anything at that house, though.	24	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Just so I'm clear,
25	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm	25	changing again, you've recommended for this project an
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 110		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 112
1	THE WITNESS: That doesn't	1	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured
2	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a	2	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed;
2 3	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me.	2 3	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct?
2 3 4	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles",	2 3 4	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to	2 3 4 5	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it.
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate	2 3 4 5 6	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that?	2 3 4 5 6 7	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, ultimately I have to make a decision here based upon how far this could travel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at the revised the latest sound study?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, ultimately I have to make a decision here based upon how far this could travel and how far it's going to affect folks, if it affects	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at the revised the latest sound study? THE WITNESS: Yes. I saw one Intervenor house
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, ultimately I have to make a decision here based upon how far this could travel and how far it's going to affect folks, if it affects folks. I mean, that's a whole nother question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at the revised the latest sound study? THE WITNESS: Yes. I saw one Intervenor house identified in the table in the back but that's the only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, ultimately I have to make a decision here based upon how far this could travel and how far it's going to affect folks, if it affects folks. I mean, that's a whole nother question. THE WITNESS: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at the revised the latest sound study? THE WITNESS: Yes. I saw one Intervenor house identified in the table in the back but that's the only one. And that's what I was looking for when I wrote my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, ultimately I have to make a decision here based upon how far this could travel and how far it's going to affect folks, if it affects folks. I mean, that's a whole nother question. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm trying to just figure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at the revised the latest sound study? THE WITNESS: Yes. I saw one Intervenor house identified in the table in the back but that's the only one. And that's what I was looking for when I wrote my Direct Testimony. I wanted to know what the levels were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, ultimately I have to make a decision here based upon how far this could travel and how far it's going to affect folks, if it affects folks. I mean, that's a whole nother question. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm trying to just figure out how far does it actually go.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants.</li> <li>Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at the revised the latest sound study?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes. I saw one Intervenor house identified in the table in the back but that's the only one. And that's what I was looking for when I wrote my Direct Testimony. I wanted to know what the levels were at the Intervenor's house but I couldn't tell which house</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: That doesn't COMMISSIONER NELSON: going to press you a little harder because this is terribly important to me. So somewhere between 700 meters and your quote, "miles", this dissipates. So help me understand what's going to determine how far it goes and what causes it to dissipate and how can we quantify that? THE WITNESS: It travels a long distance. I can't put a number on it for you. These are the kind of frequencies that like elephants communicate with each other over huge distances, if you've ever heard about that. This is as low as it gets in terms of frequency. So in theory it takes a very long time. Now how far, I don't know. Can't help you. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, ultimately I have to make a decision here based upon how far this could travel and how far it's going to affect folks, if it affects folks. I mean, that's a whole nother question. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm trying to just figure out how far does it actually go. THE WITNESS: I wish I could give you a figure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ideal design goal of 40 dBA and that would be measured over the two-week period that the Applicant has proposed; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Right. I don't know of any other way to do it. COMMISSIONER NELSON: You talked earlier about the fact that that might impact 11 different receptors based on their sound study. I just quickly looked at their revised sound study, and it looks like it would only impact two of the nonparticipants. Did you separate out participants and nonparticipants as you looked at that. THE WITNESS: At least in my copy it doesn't distinguish between who was who. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you looking at the revised the latest sound study? THE WITNESS: Yes. I saw one Intervenor house identified in the table in the back but that's the only one. And that's what I was looking for when I wrote my Direct Testimony. I wanted to know what the levels were at the Intervenor's house but I couldn't tell which house was which.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 113		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 115
1	the questions I've got. Thank you.	1	me I'm wrong without
2	THE WITNESS: You're welcome. Sorry I couldn't	2	Are you familiar with kids in school who carry
3	help you with that one.	3	phones and they have the frequency dialed so that people
4	MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen. No questions.	4	over 40 or 50 years old cannot hear the frequency but
5	Commissioner Hanson, any questions?	5	they can?
6	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Yes, I do.	6	THE WITNESS: I did hear about that.
7	Good almost afternoon, Mr. Hessler. You came	7	COMMISSIONER HANSON: And that's fairly typical.
8	out swinging in your remarks at the beginning. At least	8	So kids would be more sensitive would one assume than
9	on page 3 you faulted the Applicant for the graphical	9	adults would to the challenges that low frequency would
10	presentation, called it fairly primitive, and said you	10	have from wind turbines? I mean that's just one premise
11	can't even distinguish identify where the specific	11	but
12	residence are.	12	THE WITNESS: Well, it's the phone thing is
13	You faulted the study for focusing entirely on	13	ultrasound. It's very high frequency sound, and that is
14	the noise limit of 45 dBA rather than assessing,	14	usually the first thing to go as people age. So that's
15	addressing in any way. So you said, Focusing entirely on	15	why there's a built in advantage there to that whole
16	the dBA and not assessing or addressing in any way the	16	concept.
17	other aspects, potentially low frequency and sound	17	But we're talking about the other end of the
18	emissions. And I appreciate the questions that	18	frequency spectrum, and that typically does not decay
19	Commissioner Nelson asked in regard to that and the	19	with age.
20	others.	20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Interesting. So higher
21	I'm curious. You said I also appreciate the	21	frequency, have you studied that from wind turbines,
22	way you tried to be fair. I think that you placed a lot	22	from
23	of weight on the other side of the scale as well, almost	23	THE WITNESS: No. There's no high frequency.
24	to the point to which you seemed to favor wind farms and	24	COMMISSIONER HANSON: There's no high frequency.
25	wanted to support them and so I I'm trying to figure	25	THE WITNESS: No. Most of the noise, the
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 114		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 116
1	out where that scale lands but	1	churning sound, is about 500 hertz to 1,000 hertz.
2	You said you sat in a home I believe it was in	2	That's in the middle of the audible frequency range.
3	Wisconsin, was it, and listened sat there all night	3	Above that there's no significant noise.
4	or I don't know if it was all night	4	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Interesting. Appreciate
5	THE WITNESS: Hours.	5	that.
6	COMMISSIONER HANSON: And that the husband could	6	You spoke also at adverse health effects such as
7	not hear it, you could not hear it, but the wife could	7	sleep disturbance and vertigo which really can be
8	hear it.	8	crippling to people from the standpoint of going through
9 10	THE WITNESS: That's right. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't want to sound	9 10	their lives. THE WITNESS: Yeah.
11	misogynistic here, but isn't it somewhat typical	11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: What about children with
12	especially on a farm that work with machinery even	12	ADHD? Have you studied any of that or familiar at all
13	though wives work beside their husbands on farms and	13	with those effects?
14	though wives work beside their husbands on furnis and	14	THE WITNESS: No. I don't know about that but I
15	such is that men typically lose their hearing a little		
16	such, is that men typically lose their hearing a little bit before women do?	15	wouldn't be surprised.
	bit before women do?	15 16	wouldn't be surprised. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised
17	bit before women do? THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't audible sound	15 16 17	COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised
17 18	bit before women do?	16	
	bit before women do? THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't audible sound from the project. It was just a sensitivity to a feeling	16 17	COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised what.
18	bit before women do? THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't audible sound from the project. It was just a sensitivity to a feeling of low pressure, low frequency pulsations. Nobody could	16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised what. THE WITNESS: If they were sensitive to it or
18 19	bit before women do? THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't audible sound from the project. It was just a sensitivity to a feeling of low pressure, low frequency pulsations. Nobody could hear anything. Everybody admitted that. It was the	16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised what. THE WITNESS: If they were sensitive to it or affected by it.
18 19 20	bit before women do? THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't audible sound from the project. It was just a sensitivity to a feeling of low pressure, low frequency pulsations. Nobody could hear anything. Everybody admitted that. It was the sensing of it.	16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised what. THE WITNESS: If they were sensitive to it or affected by it. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You state about the very
18 19 20 21	bit before women do? THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't audible sound from the project. It was just a sensitivity to a feeling of low pressure, low frequency pulsations. Nobody could hear anything. Everybody admitted that. It was the sensing of it. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Interesting.	16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised what. THE WITNESS: If they were sensitive to it or affected by it. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You state about the very small minority of the people and that it is extremely
18 19 20 21 22	bit before women do? THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't audible sound from the project. It was just a sensitivity to a feeling of low pressure, low frequency pulsations. Nobody could hear anything. Everybody admitted that. It was the sensing of it. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Interesting. My wife is 220 miles away and she can hear my	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HANSON: You wouldn't be surprised what. THE WITNESS: If they were sensitive to it or affected by it. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You state about the very small minority of the people and that it is extremely rare, small handful of sites, quite rare, et cetera.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 117		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 119
1	the greater good some people are going to suffer?	1	THE WITNESS: I think people end up getting used
2	THE WITNESS: Yeah. That's that's up to you	2	to it like your railroad, but I don't know. I've never
3	guys. Yeah. Well, just to reiterate, you know, if this	3	done any follow up study to see if people are still upset
4	commonly happened, it would be all over the news. It	4	about it years later. I don't know.
5	would be well understood, and everyone would know that a	5	COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Thank you very
6	new wind project was going to cause this.	6	much for your testimony. Appreciate it. And enjoyed it.
7	But that's not the case. It's only occurred at	7	Thank you.
8	certain specific sites out of many, many, many projects.	8	THE WITNESS: Okay.
9	So based on that alone, I'm concluding that it must be a	9	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And an additional
10	rare sensitivity.	10	question. If I'm standing a mile away from an operating
11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Commissioner Nelson would	11	wind turbine, I can hear the whoosh and I know what it
12	love to sit and chat with you an extended period of time,	12	is. I know where the whoosh is coming from.
13	enjoy the conversation and what we're learning here.	13	If you're measuring infrasound or attempting to
14	For folks who have lived out in the country for	14	measure infrasound, how can you tell the origin of it?
15	a long long time and just simply enjoy the enjoy the	15	Or can you?
16	sound of the wind going through the trees, granted	16	THE WITNESS: Well, this infrasound has a
17	turbines may be at a similar volume but of a different	17	distinctive frequency signature. It would be a .7 hertz,
18	pitch and so they hear it instead of the it starts to	18	which corresponds to the how often the blades go by
19	irritate them.	19	the tower. So you would look you would see it in the
20	For those folks who live out in the country I'm	20	industry.
21	going to assume they would be far more susceptible to	21	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.
22	hearing noises and problems and being discomforted by	22	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
23	them than folks who live in the city.	23	MR. DE HUECK: Well, I think Reece, how long
24	THE WITNESS: Well, every wind project that I	24	is your well, okay. Do you have how long would
25	can think of that we worked on has been in a rural area.	25	your redirect be? How long a while? Should we break
4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 118	4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 120
1	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Right. THE WITNESS: Probably very similar to this.	1	for lunch? Okay. It's 12:07. 1:30 we come back? MR. ALMOND: As we discussed earlier this
3	COMMISSIONER HANSON: So is my assumption	2	morning we were hoping to have the telephonic witnesses
4	correct that folks who live out in the country are going	4	start right after lunch so we can get them set up during
5	to be bothered more by noise by a new introduction of	5	the lunch break. If we don't want to finish I get that
6	a new noise than folks in the city, for instance?	6	we can take a break but
7	THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah. Definitely.	7	MR. DE HUECK: Well, okay. That will work.
8	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I grew up three houses	8	MR. ALMOND: I don't have very much.
9	away from a railroad track, and I can sleep through the	9	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Let's go ahead and do some
10	horns and a thunderstorm and everything else but a clock	10	redirect and recross.
11	ticking on the wall or a water dripping really bothers	11	MS. EDWARDS: All right.
12	the heck out of me.	12	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
13	So with that type of a challenge I can go move	13	BY MS. EDWARDS:
14	that clock. I can fix the water faucet do. We suggest	14	<b>Q.</b> Mr. Hessler, you stated there is a lot of opposition
15	ear plugs for the folks out in the country?	15	to this project. Was that based off of your knowledge of
16	THE WITNESS: No. And, as I mentioned, there's	16	other projects you've worked on?
17	always I can't there might have been one or two	17	A. Yeah. I would say there was a high level of
18	that there were no reported complaints. But there's	18	apprehension about this project just by the sheer volume
19	always a few people that are bothered, and they're really	19	of all the testimony and Intervenor witnesses and so on
20	bothered, really bothered.	20	compared to other projects.
21	COMMISSIONER HANSON: In your experience, do	21	<b>Q.</b> You also stated once this morning that Mr. Cooper
22	most of the people who are bothered at first adapt to it?	22	had finally demonstrated a link. Did you have reason to
23	We're talking about the people who are really bothered.	23	believe prior to that study that link was already there,
24	Do they ever adjust to it or do they, as you suggested,	24	or was this all new to you?
25	some people move?	25	A. Prior to that study I thought something was

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 121		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 123
1	happening but wasn't entirely convinced what was going	1	of nausea, dizziness, et cetera that you talked about
2	on, and that study kind of put me to the other side where	2	Shirley or attributed to this infrasound, that there are
3	it's pretty clear that those pulsations can be perceived	3	wind farms all around the country, you've studied 15 of
4	by certain people. I mean, I thought that before, but	4	them or maybe more but you haven't heard many complaints.
5	there was never any evidence, although there's been many,	5	Wouldn't you expect that the number of complaints
6	many studies and papers about it.	6	might be skewed if there are confidentiality provisions
7	<b>Q.</b> So with that in mind and with your testimony in	7	and certain contractual provisions that would prevent
8	response to Commissioner questions that it's a fairly	8	people from living around turbines from making such
9	small number of people, would you in the project that	9	complaints?
10	you've worked on have you seen it just people be	10	MS. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the
11	irreparably split in the community and just fight in the	11	scope of his testimony.
12	streets forever or	12	MR. DE HUECK: I agree.
13	A. Yeah. It is very did I advice I have, yeah. Almost	13	A. I would say that I've seen cases
14	all projects, especially before they're built. At this	14	MR. DE HUECK: Dr. Hessler, I'm sorry. Don't
15	stage there's a lot of dread and apprehension about it.	15	answer the question.
16	That's mostly attributed to attributable to the	16	THE WITNESS: Okay.
17	internet sites.	17	<b>Q.</b> Your opinion on the quantity of people affected by
18	Q. In response to Ms. Jenkins's questions about that	18	infrasound is based off of those is based off
19	study in I believe it was Maine?	19	complaints that people have made; correct?
20	A. Yeah.	20	A. It is based off of our experience at Shirley and our
21	<b>Q.</b> There was some confusion about what your role was.	21	experience at all other projects where we did not hear
22	Could there have been another sound expert that was	22	about that, and the fact that I have I'm not aware of
23	involved that would answer what she was getting at and	23	any other projects where that was an issue, out of 50,000
24	that was outside of your role?	24	wind turbines out there in this country.
25	A. Well, what I do know about that is it was somebody	25	<b>Q.</b> Are you aware of your other projects whether or not
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 122		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 124
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 122 else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 124 anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't
1 2	else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.	2	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants
_	else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the		anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't
2 3 4	else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it. <b>Q.</b> Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?	2 3 4	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. FUERNISS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. FUERNISS: Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. FUERNISS: Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. FUERNISS: Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. FUERNISS: Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> <b>Q.</b> Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. FUERNISS: Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. FUERNISS:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?</li> <li>A. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints.</li> <li>MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Recross. Prevailing Winds.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with</li> <li>that. MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any</li> <li>other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u>:</li> <li><b>Q</b>. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the</li> <li>bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound</li> <li>especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less</li> <li>hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a</li> <li>difference?</li> <li><b>A</b>. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there</li> <li>was a value I in between and your house or some point of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Recross. Prevailing Winds. MS. SMITH: No, I don't have any. Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. FUERNISS:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?</li> <li>A. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there was a value I in between and your house or some point of observation was on the next hill, you would there</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Recross. Prevailing Winds. MS. SMITH: No, I don't have any. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?</li> <li>A. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there was a value I in between and your house or some point of observation was on the next hill, you would there would be a loss of ground absorption attenuation because</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Recross. Prevailing Winds. MS. SMITH: No, I don't have any. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. MR. ALMOND: Briefly.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?</li> <li>A. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there was a value I in between and your house or some point of observation was on the next hill, you would there would be a loss of ground absorption attenuation because of the value I in between so the sound would get over</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it.</li> <li>Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor?</li> <li>A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project?</li> <li>Q. This project.</li> <li>A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42.</li> <li>Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior?</li> <li>A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Recross. Prevailing Winds. MS. SMITH: No, I don't have any. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially. Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?</li> <li>A. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there was a value I in between and your house or some point of observation was on the next hill, you would there would be a loss of ground absorption attenuation because</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it. Q. Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor? A. You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project? Q. This project. A. On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42. Q. Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior? A. Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross. Prevailing Winds. MS. SMITH: No, I don't have any. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. MR. ALMOND: Briefly. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li><u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. FUERNISS:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially.</li> <li>Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?</li> <li>A. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there was a value I in between and your house or some point of observation was on the next hill, you would there would be a loss of ground absorption attenuation because of the value I in between so the sound would get over there more than it would over flat ground.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	else's work that I was asked to look at. I didn't do the study or anything. I just was commenting on it. <b>Q.</b> Do you recall based upon the noise assessments you reviewed what the max dBA was at a receptor? <b>A.</b> You mean what was the highest predicted on any other project? <b>Q.</b> This project. <b>A.</b> On this project. Okay. Right now I believe it's 41.9, which I would call 42. <b>Q.</b> Would you expect 42 dBA would, in your experience, cause people to change their daily lives and behavior? <b>A.</b> Hard to say. That's a pretty low level getting down towards the ideal point of 40. But there's still a possibility of complaints in between 40 and 45 there's a definite possibility of complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Recross. Prevailing Winds. MS. SMITH: No, I don't have any. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond. MR. ALMOND: Briefly. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>anyone was prohibited from making complaints I don't know, but my understanding is that participants MS. SMITH: Objection. This is speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. I would agree with that.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Based on that, I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. Hessler. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li><u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. FUERNISS:</li> <li>Q. Yes. Commissioner Nelson is trying to get at the bottom of how far this could go, the infrasound especially.</li> <li>Could that be affected or enhanced by more or less hilly terrain, valleys, so forth? Would that make a difference?</li> <li>A. In theory if the turbine were on a hilltop and there was a value I in between and your house or some point of observation was on the next hill, you would there would be a loss of ground absorption attenuation because of the value I in between so the sound would get over there more than it would over flat ground.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 125		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 127
4		1	
1	talking, I would say it doesn't make too much difference.		RECROSS-EXAMINATION
2	<b>Q.</b> Okay. When you're talking 40 dBA or 45 dBA, which	2	BY MS. JENKINS:
3	metric are you using? Are you talking L90?	3	<b>Q.</b> I'm sorry, but I missed. The Shirley Wind Farm when
4 5	<b>A.</b> Well, that's interesting you should say that because	4 5	you visited that, what year was that?
	that is the descriptor that we use to actually try to	6	<ul> <li>A. 2010 it's right here. December 24, 2012.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. Can infrasound be measured inside a</li> </ul>
6	measure an operating project because it filters out cars	7	<b>Q.</b> Thank you. Can infrasound be measured inside a house?
7 8	going by and sporadic contaminating events and gets out	8	A. That's probably the only place it can be measured.
9	the underlying steady and it is more or less steady sound level.	9	<ul><li>Q. Okay.</li></ul>
10	So we use the L90 at houses and then the L90 miles	10	<ul><li>A. Because you're out of the elements there.</li></ul>
11	away as a background, and then we subtract the two to get	11	<ul><li>Q. And was your the main project that I mentioned</li></ul>
12	what is the project doing. And if you try to use any	12	earlier, was your role at that project the same as your
13	other statistical like the average, the Leg or the L10 or	13	role is here? Did you review this sound study?
14	the Lmax, you're getting progressively worse in your	14	<b>A.</b> I reviewed a sound study. What it was about, I
15	ability to detect the project alone and you're only	15	can't recall. I'm taking it off my resume.
16	detecting other things that are unrelated to the project.	16	<b>Q.</b> I'm sorry. You could just refresh your memory
17	Q. Okay.	17	because you might need it again.
18	A. That was a good question.	18	<b>A.</b> I'll have to pull the folder out back at the office.
19	<b>Q.</b> Would it be appropriate to recommend different	19	Big embarrassment.
20	levels for time of day, daytime, evening, nighttime?	20	<b>Q.</b> Yeah. When you do a sound study or when a sound
21	<b>A.</b> Well, the trouble with that, it's not practical to	21	study is ordered is it done at a certain time of year or
22	change the noise emissions in the project. They are what	22	how do you choose when you're going to do a sound study?
23	they are 24 hours a day. There's no way to substantially	23	<ul><li>A. You typically want to do them during the cold</li></ul>
24	change the sound at night, for instance, to lower it,	24	weather season of the year when the leaves are off the
25	other than possibly putting some or all of the units in a	25	trees just to minimize the contamination from leaves
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 126		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 128
1	low noise mode.	1	rattling and and summertime you get crickets and all
2	But the improvement in doing that isn't all that	2	kinds of stuff that messes up the measurements. So
3	dramatic, in my experience.	3	during the winter.
4	<b>Q.</b> Are there some jurisdictions that do, in fact,	4	<b>Q.</b> Okay. When you do a sound study is there do you
5	require different levels from day and night?	5	get a report from the like the operation maintenance
6	A. Yeah. Many, many ordinances are expresses day	6	facility of how the wind turbines are operating, meaning
7	night. But when it comes to wind turbines you just have	7	are they operating at the speed of the conditions or are
8	to take the nighttime level as the design and forget	8	they do you have proof of that?
9	about the daytime. Because like I said, the sound level	9	A. Yeah. We get a log of what the megawatt output was
10	is the sound level, and you don't have any control over	10	for all the units as a function of time over the survey
11	it really.	11	so we can identify if there's any down for maintenance or
12	<b>Q.</b> Okay. One last question. Are you familiar with	12	anything else.
13	bone attached hearing aids and if you are one question	13	<b>Q</b> . And can you tell whether they're operating at the
14	at a time.	14	normal level they would when they just do it on their
15	Are you familiar with those?	15	own?
16	A. I'm familiar with hearing aids. My wife really	16	A. Yeah. Because we also get the wind speed throughout
17	relies on them but I'm not an expert on it.	17	the survey and once the wind speed gets above usually 7
18	<b>Q.</b> Okay. So you wouldn't be able to address that for	18	meters per second, they're at full power.
19	us then?	19	Q. Okay. I think there's just one more.
20	A. I don't think so.	20	MS. JENKINS: No. I have no more questions.
21 22	MR. FUERNISS: Thank you.	21 22	Thank you.
22	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.	22	THE WITNESS: All right. You're welcome.
23 24	MS. JENKINS: Just a couple questions.	23 24	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.
24 25		24 25	
20		23	

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 129		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 131
1	RECROSS-EXAMINATION	1	experience?
2	BY MS. PAZOUR:	2	<b>A.</b> My name is Richard James. I go by the name Rick for
3	<b>Q.</b> I have a question for you. Like infrasounds next to	3	all practical and business persons, Rick James. I'm an
4	a wind turbine, like with somebody that's sensitive to	4	acoustician who has been working in the field of
5	noise, would that be more bother some for them?	5	measurement noise and the impact of noise on people since
6	<b>A.</b> If that person had this particular sensitivity that	6	the late '60s, officially 1972 after I formed a new
7	we've been talking about, then yes.	7	company.
8	Q. Like somebody with like a like a hearing aid.	8	I started working for Chevrolet motor division and
9	A. No. No. I don't think that would make any	9	left them to form my own company in 1972.
10	difference.	10	In the intervening years my companies and I had
11	Q. With the ear or nothing?	11	two became the consultants who were considered the
12	<b>A.</b> Huh-uh.	12	subject matter experts for noise to corporations like
13	MS. PAZOUR: Okay.	13	General Motors, good year, Anheuser-Busch, major
14	MR. DE HUECK: Did you have anymore questions?	14	corporations who had both employee issues and who desired
15	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: She can just word it, and	15	to keep their names out of the newspaper for noise
16	you'll make a decision.	16	complaints with community noise.
17	MR. DE HUECK: Just throw it out there. Throw	17	So my focus has always been on how do you design a
18	it out there.	18	new project or how do you operate a project so as to
19	<b>Q.</b> I guess is it possible between infrasounds and	19	minimize the adverse impacts on a community and on
20	reversible systems that the inner ear could feel	20	workers although it's less of an issue here. And I am
21	infrasounds?	21	very much a pro business acoustician but my focus is not
22	A. That sounds like a question for one of those doctors	22	on getting the project done one way or the other. It's
23	mixed up in this thing.	23	getting a project done that's compatible with a host
24	MS. PAZOUR: Okay.	24	community.
25	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Mr. Hessler, thank you for	25	In 2006 due to some serious health issues with my
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 130		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 132
1	your testimony. You're excused.	1	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James
1 2		1 2	
	your testimony. You're excused.		heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James
2	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.)	2	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go
2 3	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on	2 3	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually
2 3 4	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45.	2 3 4	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls
2 3 4 5	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.)	2 3 4 5	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been
2 3 4 5 6	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're	2 3 4 5 6	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one
2 3 4 5 6 7	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in	2 3 4 5 6 7	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll let Reiss continue with his case in chief and call his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll let Reiss continue with his case in chief and call his next witness.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll let Reiss continue with his case in chief and call his next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Rick James.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll let Reiss continue with his case in chief and call his next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Rick James. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. James, we can see you up there on the Skype TV. And welcome to South Dakota James James thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>your testimony. You're excused.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>your testimony. You're excused.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>your testimony. You're excused.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time off.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>your testimony. You're excused.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time off.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>your testimony. You're excused.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time off. Over the past 10 years I 've really become very interested in one issue of why is it that wind turbines
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>your testimony. You're excused.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time off. Over the past 10 years I've really become very interested in one issue of why is it that wind turbines which don't produce high levels of audible noise as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll let Reiss continue with his case in chief and call his next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Rick James. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. James, we can see you up there on the Skype TV. And welcome to South Dakota James James thank you. MR. DE HUECK: My name is Adam de Hueck. I'm the hearing examiner for this proceeding and I'm going to go ahead and swear you in. (The oath is administered by Mr. de Hueck.) MR. DE HUECK: You are sworn in. Go ahead, Mr. Almond. <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time off. Over the past 10 years I've really become very interested in one issue of why is it that wind turbines which don't produce high levels of audible noise as measured on a dBA scale generate so much complaints and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll let Reiss continue with his case in chief and call his next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Rick James. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. James, we can see you up there on the Skype TV. And welcome to South Dakota James James thank you. MR. DE HUECK: My name is Adam de Hueck. I'm the hearing examiner for this proceeding and I'm going to go ahead and swear you in. (The oath is administered by Mr. de Hueck.) MR. DE HUECK: You are sworn in. Go ahead, Mr. Almond. <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time off. Over the past 10 years I've really become very interested in one issue of why is it that wind turbines which don't produce high levels of audible noise as measured on a dBA scale generate so much complaints and why are we seeing symptoms such as dizziness, tinnitus,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your testimony. You're excused. (The witness is excused.) MR. DE HUECK: We'll break for lunch and plan on getting things rocking at 1:45. (A lunch recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: Welcome back, everyone. We're going to get back in our proper order. We're back in session in EL18-026. I guess we are missing an Intervenor but I'm sure she'll be here soon. And we'll let Reiss continue with his case in chief and call his next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Rick James. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. James, we can see you up there on the Skype TV. And welcome to South Dakota James James thank you. MR. DE HUECK: My name is Adam de Hueck. I'm the hearing examiner for this proceeding and I'm going to go ahead and swear you in. (The oath is administered by Mr. de Hueck.) MR. DE HUECK: You are sworn in. Go ahead, Mr. Almond. <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	heart, my partner and I closed my old company, James Anderson and associates and I decided that I would go into semi retirement. Shortly thereafter, actually almost immediately there after I started getting calls from people in Michigan where wind projects had been proposed. One of those wind projects is actually one that Mr. Hessler worked on back in the late 2000s. My first analysis of that was these machines don't belong in quiet rural areas. They're going to cause a problem. And I presented that to the County Commissioners but they decided to build the project my way. Since then I have focused mainly on wind turbine noise, although I do other types of complaint driven noise generally as an expert related to hearings like this or lawsuits. I don't seek out just general business. At 70 years old I need a little bit of time off. Over the past 10 years I've really become very interested in one issue of why is it that wind turbines which don't produce high levels of audible noise as measured on a dBA scale generate so much complaints and

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 133		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 135
1	area of kind of going into detail into infrasound.	1	in response to questions raised by PUC Staff?
2	<b>Q.</b> I think that's a good recap of your experience	2	A. Yes, they are.
3	unless you want to add anything in addition to that that	3	<b>Q.</b> At least responses next to your name?
4	you think	4	A. Yes.
5	A. Well, I was just going to add one thing. In 2009 I	5	<b>Q.</b> And if I were to ask you all of the questions that
6	had an opportunity to use very high end acoustical	6	are included in your prefiled testimony, as well as those
7	equipment, and that was the first time we managed to	7	questions that the PUC Staff asked you, would you give
8	measure the infrasound pulses from wind turbines.	8	the same answers today?
9	The measurement methods that I used were the same	9	A. Yes, I would.
10	ones that the Shirley Wind study team used. And since	10	MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd move for the
11	then I have focused basically on that type of	11	admission of Exhibit I-1 as well as exhibits I-1 A
12	measurement, along with micro barometers.	12	through F.
13	So I'll open it up for any of your questions,	13	MS. EDWARDS: No objection from Staff.
14	Mr. Reiss.	14	MR. DE HUECK: I'll hear any objection from
15	Q. Thank you, Mr. James. Did you prepare prefiled	15	Prevailing Wind.
16	testimony in this matter?	16	MS. SMITH: No objection.
17	A. Yes, I did.	17	MR. DE HUECK: So admitted, Mr. Almond.
18	<b>Q.</b> And that prefiled testimony has been marked as	18	<b>Q.</b> Mr. James, were you listening in to the testimony
19	Exhibit I-1. I understand you want to make a change to	19	from earlier this morning?
20	that testimony?	20	A. I was able to hear parts of it.
21	A. Yes, I do.	21	<b>Q.</b> And there was some discussion about the measurement
22	<b>Q.</b> And what change to the testimony do you want to	22	of infrasound, how to do it, et cetera. Have you ever
23	make?	23	measured infrasound?
24	<b>A.</b> This is on page 1, line 24. The question is, "what	24	A. Yes, I have.
25	experiences have you had that qualify you as an and it	25	<b>Q.</b> And how far have you measured infrasound let me
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 134		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 136
1	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind	1	ask you a different question.
2	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise."	2	ask you a different question. Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a
2 3	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched	2 3	ask you a different question. Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?
2 3 4	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would	2 3 4	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>ask you a different question. Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise. Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise. Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>ask you a different question. Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise."</li> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>ask you a different question. Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise."</li> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise."</li> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make? <ol> <li>None that are substantive.</li> <li>And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> </ol> </li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>ask you a different question. Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>Q. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>Q. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>ask you a different question. Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states. And those measurements are always inside a home</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched</li> <li>out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would</li> <li>read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled</li> <li>testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there</li> <li>exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>Q. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> <li>Q. And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>Q. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> <li>Q. And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through F.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate infrasound measurement outside of a home.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise."</li> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>Q. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> <li>Q. And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through F.</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate infrasound measurement outside of a home.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience and I think a question was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>Q. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> <li>Q. And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through F.</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And during the course of this proceeding did you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate infrasound measurement outside of a home.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience and I think a question was asked earlier, approximately how far infrasound from a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Q. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>Q. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>Q. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> <li>Q. And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through F.</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And during the course of this proceeding did you have an opportunity to respond to some questions raised</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate infrasound measurement outside of a home.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience and I think a question was asked earlier, approximately how far infrasound from a wind turbine can travel, can you answer that question?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li><b>A</b>. None that are substantive.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li><b>A</b>. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. I count six?</li> <li><b>A</b>. Six. Excuse me.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through F.</li> <li><b>A</b>. That's correct.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. And during the course of this proceeding did you have an opportunity to respond to some questions raised by the PUC Staff via a data request?</li> </ol></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York,</li> <li>Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate infrasound measurement outside of a home.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience and I think a question was asked earlier, approximately how far infrasound from a wind turbine can travel, can you answer that question?</li> <li>A. Yes. And if you'd give me permission, I'd like to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Are there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li><b>A.</b> None that are substantive.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> I count six?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Six. Excuse me.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through F.</li> <li><b>A.</b> That's correct.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And during the course of this proceeding did you have an opportunity to respond to some questions raised by the PUC Staff via a data request?</li> </ol></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate infrasound measurement outside of a home.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience and I think a question was asked earlier, approximately how far infrasound from a wind turbine can travel, can you answer that question?</li> <li>A. Yes. And if you'd give me permission, I'd like to reference one of my exhibits, which gives a visual</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>currently reads health expert in cases involving wind turbine noise." <ol> <li>I would ask that the words "a health" be scratched out and be replaced with "an acoustical." So it would read what experiences have you had that qualify you as an acoustical expert in cases involving wind turbine noise.</li> <li>A re there any other changes to your prefiled testimony that you'd like to make?</li> <li>A. None that are substantive.</li> <li>And long with your prefiled testimony were there exhibits attached to that?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were. There were five exhibits.</li> <li>G. I count six?</li> <li>A. Six. Excuse me.</li> <li>G. And those have been marked as Exhibits 1-1 A through F.</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>G. And during the course of this proceeding did you have an opportunity to respond to some questions raised by the PUC Staff via a data request?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>G. And I don't know if you have Exhibit I-34 in front</li> </ol></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>ask you a different question.</li> <li>Have you ever measured infrasound generated by a wind turbine?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have. Very specifically I understand turbine from a sound as contrasted to other types of infrasound from wind. Low frequency trucks, et cetera.</li> <li>Q. And in your how many times have you measured infrasound generated by wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I probably measured infrasound in over 50 homes ranging from projects here in the U.S., ridge top projects out west to in Oregon, New York, Massachusetts, Maine, West Virginia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois. Pretty much almost all of the states.</li> <li>And those measurements are always inside a home because it is almost impossible to get an accurate infrasound measurement outside of a home.</li> <li>Q. And in your experience and I think a question was asked earlier, approximately how far infrasound from a wind turbine can travel, can you answer that question?</li> <li>A. Yes. And if you'd give me permission, I'd like to reference one of my exhibits, which gives a visual depiction, and that is I guess it would be my Exhibit</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 137		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 139
1	was which was Exhibit I-1 F. And it's a three-page	1	miles infrasound inside a home is measurable, and the
2	exhibit with colorful graphs. Is that what you're	2	occupant of that home, the reason we were there was
3	referring to?	3	reporting to the Brown County board of health that she
4	<b>A.</b> That's what I'm referring to, yes. Colorful graphs.	4	was suffering headaches whenever the wind turbines
5	Q. Okay.	5	operated.
6	A. Pictures.	6	Now when I investigated the home I found that it was
7	If we could look at page 3 of that exhibit, I'll	7	impossible to see the wind turbines from their home.
8	explain it because I'm sure that it's not	8	They're actually down in a little valley with a hill
9	self-explanatory to most people.	9	separating them from the wind turbines so there wasn't
10	These two graphs, the top one and the bottom one,	10	even a line of sight.
11	represent measurements using a micro barometer and that's	11	My point here is that people who say that wind
12	an instrument designed specifically to measure infrasound	12	turbine noise blends in with the background, infrasound
13	that was left in a home. In both cases the one on top	13	or that it's not measurable beyond a short distance,
14	represents a home that's actually the same home that	14	really that's a result of them not having the right tools
15	Mr. Hessler was talking about, R-1 from Shirley Wind,	15	and not having the right analysis methods, properly
16	where the people living in it were very sensitive to the	16	analyzed a simple instrument like a micro barometer
17	infrasound, and the top one shows a period of about, oh,	17	produces very clear graphs.
18	let's say 12 hours or so from the left to the right.	18	And this has now become a norm within measuring wind
19	The bottom one is a home 4 miles away over much of	19	turbine from a sound micro barometers are the preferred
20	the same period. If you look at the big circle with	20	tool because of their simplicity and the durability of
21	the big white circle with the dashes, those two correlate	21	infrasound sonic microphone is very delicate, very
22	to the same time period.	22	expensive. A micro barometer is durable enough you can
23	What we're looking at in the top graph, you'll see	23	drive a truck over it if you need to.
24	these horizontal bands of light blue lines. Those are	24	So that's my explanation for how far. And also to
25	the spikes or the tones produced by the wind turbine	25	show just how clearly wind turbine from a sound can be
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 138		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 140
1	blade as it passes in front of the tower, releasing the	1	defined when properly measured.
2	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over	2	<b>Q</b> . And have you had the opportunity to review that
23	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look	2 3	<b>Q.</b> And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct
2 3 4	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in	2 3 4	<b>Q</b> . And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?
2 3 4 5	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning. When you have a microphone outside, any air movement</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning. When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning. When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed circle and then when they're not is dramatic. We see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning. When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air movement causing the microphone diagram to move. So it's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed circle and then when they're not is dramatic. We see that there's no longer any tones. There's also a lot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning.</li> <li>When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air movement causing the microphone diagram to move. So it's not surprising that they were doing tests outside and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed circle and then when they're not is dramatic. We see that there's no longer any tones. There's also a lot less scatter on the bottom, the red and yellow spikes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning.</li> <li>When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air movement causing the microphone diagram to move. So it's not surprising that they were doing tests outside and couldn't find any difference between the wind turbines on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed circle and then when they're not is dramatic. We see that there's no longer any tones. There's also a lot less scatter on the bottom, the red and yellow spikes along the bottom.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning.</li> <li>When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air movement causing the microphone diagram to move. So it's not surprising that they were doing tests outside and couldn't find any difference between the wind turbines on or off because they weren't measuring they weren't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed circle and then when they're not is dramatic. We see that there's no longer any tones. There's also a lot less scatter on the bottom, the red and yellow spikes along the bottom.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning.</li> <li>When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air movement causing the microphone diagram to move. So it's not surprising that they were doing tests outside and couldn't find any difference between the wind turbines on or off because they weren't measuring they weren't measuring wind turbine infrasound. They weren't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed circle and then when they're not is dramatic. We see that there's no longer any tones. There's also a lot less scatter on the bottom, the red and yellow spikes along the bottom. We come down to the bottom graph, this shows a home for the same period of time roughly four miles away. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning.</li> <li>When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air movement causing the microphone diagram to move. So it's not surprising that they were doing tests outside and couldn't find any difference between the wind turbines on or off because they weren't measuring they weren't measuring wind turbine infrasound. They weren't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	energy causing a pulse. And when we look at it over compressed into like a 12-hour window they begin to look like narrow bands. This is actually specific enough in this case you can see where the solid circle is on the top, you can see the waive. And that shows that the wind turbines that were being measured were changing in RPM. So we can trace using this kind of a method we can trace very specifically the sound from a wind turbine as contrasted to other sounds. If we look over at the right-hand side of that graph, just to the right of the white solid circle, we see a period where wind turbines aren't operating. And so the comparison between what's happening in the home when the wind turbines are operating within that dashed circle and then when they're not is dramatic. We see that there's no longer any tones. There's also a lot less scatter on the bottom, the red and yellow spikes along the bottom. We come down to the bottom graph, this shows a home for the same period of time roughly four miles away. And we can see within the dashed circle there that even at 4	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And have you had the opportunity to review that German study that was attached to Dr. Roberts's Direct Testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. That discussed the measurement of infrasound and seemed to suggest that infrasound dissipated at 700 meters?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Do you have a response for that?</li> <li>A. Yes. And I believe this corresponds fairly well with what Mr. Hessler said this morning.</li> <li>When you have a microphone outside, any air movement over that microphone will generate what's called pseudo noise. It looks like noise but it's really just the air movement causing the microphone diagram to move. So it's not surprising that they were doing tests outside and couldn't find any difference between the wind turbines on or off because they weren't measuring they weren't measuring wind turbine infrasound. They weren't measuring ambient wind turbine sound or nonwind turbine sound. They were really just measuring the artifact of</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 141		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 143
1	mistake in that report is that they started with the	1	feel it you can't hear it. I mean, if you can't hear it,
2	premise that unless the sound pressure levels were	2	you can't feel it.
3	sufficient to be audible this is the threshold of	3	The problem here is Dr. Kelly moved him wrong four
4	audibility that they weren't of any significance.	4	years after he made that statement. But that concept of
5	And what we have found in fact we've known since the	5	that infrasound has to exceed the thresholds of
6	1980s when Dr. Neal Kelly first did an experiment using	6	audibility has been promoted very heavily through other
7	pressure pulsations what we found is when the infrasound	7	acousticians who have picked up on it, not done the
8	is pulsed, when it occurs as a whoomp whoomp whoomp	8	proper research and have repeated test after after test
9	although you feel it rather than hearing it, <mark>that the</mark>	9	saying well I've tested wind turbines in Australia and
10	human vestibular system can pick that up.	10	they don't exceed the threshold of audibility so there
11	And the sensations when they're picked up, when	11	can't be any problem.
12	people have that sensitivity we can get into	12	But there is a problem. In fact, the German paper
13	Dr. Schomer's paper later that explains how that happens.	13	you referenced earlier made an interesting comment. They
14	But when the vestibular system is triggered the body	14	said they noticed some tones it the very low frequent
15	tends to produce nausea. It's an impact caused by the	15	infrasound but those didn't matter. Actually those are
16	eyes are giving a certain input. The body sensations	16	the ones that matter. So that whole German paper and
17	don't pick up movement. But we have vestibular data	17	many of the others that are similar to it have
18	saying something's moving.	18	consistently ignored the place where the problem is,
19	The end result of that is people get dizzy or they	19	looked at places where the problem is not and then
20	get nauseous or they have headaches.	20	concluded there is no problem, which whether for the
21	Q. Thank you, Mr. James.	21	purposes of pleasing a client or through improper
22	<b>Q.</b> Are you familiar with the Steven Cooper study that	22	research has led to the confusion we have.
23	we've been discussing quite a bit this morning?	23	We know that we know that infrasonic pulses can
24	<b>A.</b> Yes. I've worked with Steven Cooper since my first	24	be perceived. My home office where I'm sitting right now
25	paper in 2010 demonstrating how to measure the infrasound	25	is on the flight path between Detroit and Lansing for
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 142		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 144
1	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 144 helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area
2	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and	2	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump
2 3	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.	2 3	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area
2 3 4	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and	2 3 4	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either
2 3 4 5	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.	2 3 4 5	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel
2 3 4 5 6	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it. Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this	2 3 4 5 6	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it. Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make the same complaints.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it. As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 13	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make the same complaints. Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> <li>As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make the same complaints. Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> <li>As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make the same complaints. Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> <li>As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make the same complaints. Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints. It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> <li>As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible. I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make the same complaints. Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints. It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> <li>As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from an infrasound sonic pulse caused by the blade passing in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible.</li> <li>I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people <ul> <li>I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building</li> <li>syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge</li> <li>worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make</li> </ul> </li> <li>the same complaints.</li> <li>Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.</li> <li>It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li>Q. And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> <li>As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from an infrasound sonic pulse caused by the blade passing in front of the tower.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible.</li> <li>I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people <ul> <li>I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building</li> <li>syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge</li> <li>worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make</li> </ul> </li> <li>the same complaints.</li> <li>Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.</li> <li>It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.</li> </ul> <li><b>Q.</b> Thank you, Mr. James. I want to switch topics now away from infrasound and focus talk a little bit more</li>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it. <b>Q.</b> And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound? <b>A.</b> Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it. As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from an infrasound sonic pulse caused by the blade passing in front of the tower. The wind industry was aware of that. It was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible.</li> <li>I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the I raq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people <ul> <li>I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building</li> <li>syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge</li> <li>worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make</li> </ul> </li> <li>the same complaints.</li> <li>Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.</li> <li>It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. Thank you, Mr. James. I want to switch topics now away from infrasound and focus talk a little bit more on your prefiled testimony, page 3 and the ANSI standard</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape</li> <li>Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies.</li> <li>I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound?</li> <li><b>A.</b> Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it.</li> <li>As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from an infrasound sonic pulse caused by the blade passing in front of the tower.</li> <li>The wind industry was aware of that. It was presented at conferences but has chosen instead to argue</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible.</li> <li>I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the I raq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people <ul> <li>I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building</li> <li>syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large</li> <li>buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge</li> <li>worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out</li> <li>of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make</li> </ul> </li> <li>the same complaints.</li> <li>Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.</li> <li>It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr. James. I want to switch topics now away from infrasound and focus talk a little bit more on your prefiled testimony, page 3 and the ANSI standard ASA S 12.9 and this notion of modeling the community's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it. <b>Q.</b> And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound? <b>A.</b> Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it. As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from an infrasound sonic pulse caused by the blade passing in front of the tower. The wind industry was aware of that. It was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible.</li> <li>I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the I raq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people <ul> <li>I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building</li> <li>syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge</li> <li>worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make</li> </ul> </li> <li>the same complaints.</li> <li>Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.</li> <li>It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. Thank you, Mr. James. I want to switch topics now away from infrasound and focus talk a little bit more on your prefiled testimony, page 3 and the ANSI standard</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it. <b>Q.</b> And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound? <b>A.</b> Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it. As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from an infrasound sonic pulse caused by the blade passing in front of the tower. The wind industry was aware of that. It was presented at conferences but has chosen instead to argue and do so very effectively that unless the pressure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible.</li> <li>I've had many people who were combatants in either</li> <li>Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people <ul> <li>I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building</li> <li>syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge</li> <li>worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make</li> </ul> </li> <li>the same complaints.</li> <li>Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.</li> <li>It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Thank you, Mr. James. I want to switch topics now away from infrasound and focus talk a little bit more on your prefiled testimony, page 3 and the ANSI standard ASA S 12.9 and this notion of modeling the community's response to a new project.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sonic pulses. Steve modeled his study at Cape Bridgewater after the design that we used at Shirley and at other studies. I also helped him in his analysis of his data and I'm quite familiar with it. <b>Q.</b> And did you hear testimony from Mr. Hessler this morning that said once he saw this Cooper study it really linked up in his opinion the issue of infrasound and the complaints related there to? I guess can you just expand on that or comment on that and how that relates to everything you've just been talking to about infrasound? <b>A.</b> Okay. Yes. I can expand upon it. As I said back in the 1980s Dr. Neal Kelly working for the Department of energy and NASA did a study of early model wind turbines and the complaints of , the similar complaints of dizziness, nausea, tinnitus, headaches, et cetera, and he concluded that it was from an infrasound sonic pulse caused by the blade passing in front of the tower. The wind industry was aware of that. It was presented at conferences but has chosen instead to argue and do so very effectively that unless the pressure pulses exceed the threshold of audibility that they can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>helicopters. The Governor comes in and out of this area all the time. I can hear that helicopter coming thump thump of its blades long before it's audible.</li> <li>I've had many people who were combatants in either Vietnam or the Iraq wars who said they can also feel infrasound long before it's audible. With people <ul> <li>I wrote a paper in 2012 often sick building</li> <li>syndrome, the other evidence, when people are in large buildings and the large high-rise buildings, knowledge</li> <li>worker high-rise offices, if the fan is a little bit out of balance, it causes a pulse and people begin to make</li> </ul> </li> <li>the same complaints.</li> <li>Acousticians who have dealt with these low frequency problems over the years have no problem understanding why people in homes in wind projects are having complaints.</li> <li>It's the acousticians who have not dealt with that who seem to be causing the confusion.</li> </ul> <li><b>Q.</b> Thank you, Mr. James. I want to switch topics now away from infrasound and focus talk a little bit more on your prefiled testimony, page 3 and the ANSI standard ASA S 12.9 and this notion of modeling the community's response to a new project.</li>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 145		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 147
1	<b>A.</b> Well, there are standards that we follow as	1	<b>Q.</b> And what are the what's your opinion in terms of
2		2	this area and the ambient measurements of the area?
3	acoustical professionals to try to guide our work. One of them is the standard ANSI ASA I'm reading line 69	3	<ul> <li>A. Well, I looked at the table that Mr. Howell</li> </ul>
4	of page 3, S 12.9 part 4, noise assessment and prediction	4	presented. I know he summarizes it as ranging from 21 to
5	of long-term community response.	5	45 dB. And the only columns on those that are of
6	This is a standard designed, for example, when I was	6	significance for background sound are those labeled L90,
7	designing noise for new automotive plants that I would	7	the 90th percentile. The LEQs are of little use for
8	refer to as a way to determine what would be the type of	8	anticipating annoyance. But he says the range is 21 to
9	levels that would be acceptable.	9	45.
10	That standard includes a caution in part 4 of	10	Well, 45 dB is an outlier. There's no way that a
11	appendix F that says F 3.4.4 "in newly created situations	11	normal, rural community background sound would be that
12	especially when the community not familiar with the sound	12	high. But if we look at the table for trends we can see
13	source in question higher community annoyance can be	13	that even at 10 o'clock in the morning, 5 o'clock in the
14	expected and that difference is worth up to 5 dB."	14	afternoon, and at midnight the sound levels in most of
15	Also if there's in quiet rural communities there's a	15	those measurement sites were between 22 dB and maybe 28,
16	greater expectation for piece and quiet worth 10	16	29 dBA. And that's what I find in rural communities.
17	decibels. And if you take the two factors and for a	17	The other thing is that that includes the sound of
18	project like Prevailing Winds both would apply what this	18	normal wind. Not high winds. And then I heard
19	is saying is that guidelines that would be compatible in	19	Mr. Hessler this morning talking about wind noise masking
20	the Suburban environment for example 45 dBA need to be	20	wind turbines. That's not the time when people have
21	reduced either by 10 or 5 dB to result in the same level	21	their complaints. They complain about it when it's a
22	of annoyance for a quiet rural environment.	22	quiet night, no wind at the ground and the wind turbines
23	And it's this part of it's this part of our	23	overhead are whooshing away.
24	professional standards that seem to be routinely ignored	24	So this background sound level issue is critical.
25	by people like Mr. Howell. We can't quibble we can't	25	We know that if we know that if the project was
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 146		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 148
1	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural,	1	designed to not increase that level significantly then
1 2		1 2	
	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural,	-	designed to not increase that level significantly then
2	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If	2	designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that
2 3	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have	2 3	designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from
2 3 4	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the	2 3 4	designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is
2 3 4 5	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to	2 3 4 5	designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the
2 3 4 5 6	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project	2 3 4 5 6	designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be
2 3 4 5 6 7	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance.	2 3 4 5 6 7	designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then</li> <li>we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that</li> <li>looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from</li> <li>10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is</li> <li>that is just a prescription for complaints once the</li> <li>project is permitted and operating. There will be</li> <li>complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then</li> <li>we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that</li> <li>looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from</li> <li>10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is</li> <li>that is just a prescription for complaints once the</li> <li>project is permitted and operating. There will be</li> <li>complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the</li> <li>project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects</li> <li>in I owa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally</li> <li>east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in</li> <li>projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases</li> <li>because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then</li> <li>we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that</li> <li>looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from</li> <li>10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is</li> <li>that is just a prescription for complaints once the</li> <li>project is permitted and operating. There will be</li> <li>complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the</li> <li>project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects</li> <li>in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally</li> <li>east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in</li> <li>projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases</li> <li>because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy</li> <li>to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in I owa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in I owa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying to avoid. When you have people whose live style is for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> <li>M. Mo based upon what I have seen in those studies and what I can see about Prevailing Winds, I think I have a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying to avoid. When you have people whose live style is for quiet they sleep with their windows open. They enjoy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then</li> <li>we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that</li> <li>looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from</li> <li>10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is</li> <li>that is just a prescription for complaints once the</li> <li>project is permitted and operating. There will be</li> <li>complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the</li> <li>project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects</li> <li>in I owa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally</li> <li>east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in</li> <li>projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases</li> <li>because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy</li> <li>to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had</li> <li>taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> <li>And based upon what I have seen in those studies and</li> <li>what I can see about Prevailing Winds, I think I have a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying to avoid. When you have people whose live style is for quiet they sleep with their windows open. They enjoy the outdoors, then a new noise source that may have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> <li>And based upon what I have seen in those studies and what I can see about Prevailing Winds, I think I have a reasonably good understanding of the Prevailing Wind project.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be. The result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying to avoid. When you have people whose live style is for quiet they sleep with their windows open. They enjoy the outdoors, then a new noise source that may have been more than acceptable in an urban environment or Suburban	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in lowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> <li>And based upon what I have seen in those studies and what I can see about Prevailing Winds, I think I have a reasonably good understanding of the Prevailing Wind project.</li> <li>Q. And you said there was no way that one measurement</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying to avoid. When you have people whose live style is for quiet they sleep with their windows open. They enjoy the outdoors, then a new noise source that may have been more than acceptable in an urban environment or Suburban environment becomes a serious source of complaints.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> <li>And based upon what I have seen in those studies and what I can see about Prevailing Winds, I think I have a reasonably good understanding of the Prevailing Wind project.</li> <li>Q. And you said there was no way that one measurement was 45 and to be fair to Mr. Howell you don't know</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying to avoid. When you have people whose live style is for quiet they sleep with their windows open. They enjoy the outdoors, then a new noise source that may have been more than acceptable in an urban environment or Suburban environment becomes a serious source of complaints. <b>Q.</b> And have you seen the ambient measurements taken for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li><b>A.</b> No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> <li><b>A</b> And you said there was no way that one measurement was 45 and to be fair to Mr. Howell you don't know exactly what was there next to that measuring tool.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	equate annoyance potential for a community that is rural, residential to one that is more adjusted to noise. If people come to the wind turbine project, then they have no expectation of quiet. But they move there with the expectation of peace and quiet. The project's coming to them. Therefore, the burden should be on the project developer to not increase annoyance. And levels of 40, 45 dBA, as I show in my testimony with the Health Canada will result in about one out of every 10 people one out of every 15 people people being highly annoyed. And highly annoyed means they're annoyed enough that over a long-term we have health effects, whether the annoyance is due to sleep or due to dizziness or nausea, whatever the high annoyance may be, the result is that over periods of weeks or months it leads to deteriorating health. And that's what this whole section of ANSI is trying to avoid. When you have people whose live style is for quiet they sleep with their windows open. They enjoy the outdoors, then a new noise source that may have been more than acceptable in an urban environment or Suburban environment becomes a serious source of complaints.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>designed to not increase that level significantly then we'd have few complaints but we see a project here that looks like it's going to raise the levels anywhere from 10 dB or higher at many of these homes and that is that is just a prescription for complaints once the project is permitted and operating. There will be complaints.</li> <li>Q. And just to be fair, you've never been to the project area, have you?</li> <li>A. No, I haven't but I've been to many similar projects in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana. All over the principally east of the Mississippi. But I've also been involved in projects out in Oregon. And in many of these cases because they were parts of formal proceedings I was privy to the data that the opposing parties' acousticians had taken and able to re-analyze it.</li> <li>And based upon what I have seen in those studies and what I can see about Prevailing Winds, I think I have a reasonably good understanding of the Prevailing Wind project.</li> <li>Q. And you said there was no way that one measurement was 45 and to be fair to Mr. Howell you don't know</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 149		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 151
1	right?	1	infrasound is very small? Did you hear that testimony?
2	A. Well, no way that that's a background sound. A	2	<ul> <li>A. Yes. Yes, I did.</li> </ul>
3	truck could have driven by that had a bad muffler. When	3	Q. Do you want to respond to that?
4	we're taking averages with a sound level meter a single	4	<ul><li>A. Well, many of the projects that I 've studied are</li></ul>
5	loud noise has a very significant impact.	5	projects that Mr. Hessler and his father developed. And
6	So let's say the sound level was 30 and a truck	6	while he may not be aware that complaints occurred, I am
7	drives by at 55 but it's only there for a minute, that	7	constantly in contact, usually as the recipient of
8	could easily give you a 45 average over the limit or an L	8	e-mails saying here's another day when I couldn't take
9	90 could mean that they parked the truck and was there	9	it.
10	for the full 90 percent of the time.	10	What happens in the communities in the Wisconsin
11	Either way a 45 dBA sound level at in a rural	11	communities in the middle of the state have had wind
12	community means that something not related to the	12	projects now for almost 10 years. A, the complaints have
13	background sounds background sounds are those things	13	not stopped. B, the complaints have increased. And, C,
14	you hear from a distance they're not the things up close.	14	the reason why nobody does anything about it is once a
15	They're when you walk outside at night you can hear	15	project is permitted no one has the funds to contest it.
16	the barking dog in your neighbor's farm a quarter mile or	16	In Brown County, for example, they declared a 2 and
17	a half-mile away. Those sounds that you hear are the	17	a half mile radius around Shirley Wind as a human health
18	background sound and that's what our auditory system uses	18	hazard. That's a Wisconsin legal definition for an area
19	as the basis for assessing annoyance. It's always	19	that has a problem and they want to notify the public.
20	comparing the sound it's hearing to those quiet periods.	20	When the operator of Shirley Wind was asked to
21	And that's why when you put a noise source into a quiet	21	respond to that they just denied that there was any
22	community you can expect complaints.	22	problem. That denial has gone on now for almost eight
23	Q. And the question was raised earlier about whether or	23	years leaving the Brown County board of health having
24	not once a noise source is introduced to a quiet area if	24	monthly meetings on noise and concluding that even the
25	the area will just get used to that noise source. Can	25	city of Green Bay and the town of the County of Brown
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 150		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 152
1	you respond or answer that question?	1	do not have the funds to pursue a lawsuit against the
1 2	you respond or answer that question? A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond	1 2	do not have the funds to pursue a lawsuit against the utility.
2	A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond	2	utility.
2	<b>A.</b> Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s	2 3	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to
2 3 4	<b>A.</b> Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't	2 3 4	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond</li> <li>with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s</li> <li>in which they found that given time, complaints don't</li> <li>decrease. They increase. Or the people become so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution
2 3 4 5 6	<b>A.</b> Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their	2 3 4 5 6	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the L am balancing of
2 3 4 5 6 7	<b>A.</b> Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or	2 3 4 5 6 7	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<b>A.</b> Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. <b>Q.</b> And have you seen how the Applicant wants this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. <b>Q.</b> And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. Q. And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the Lam balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. Q. And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that? A. L don't know if L remember. T heard Mr. Hessler
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the L am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. Q. And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that? A. I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about expectation of peace and quiet come into play. And so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>utility.</li> <li>So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success.</li> <li>Get it right the first time or you live with it forever.</li> <li>Q. And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that?</li> <li>A. I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of measurement and an average level or something like that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about expectation of peace and quiet come into play. And so I'll see if that answered your question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. Q. And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that? A. I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of measurement and an average level or something like that. Q. Yeah. The measurement is over a two week level.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about expectation of peace and quiet come into play. And so I'll see if that answered your question.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr. James.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>utility.</li> <li>So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success.</li> <li>Get it right the first time or you live with it forever.</li> <li>Q. And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that?</li> <li>A. I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of measurement and an average level or something like that.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The measurement is over a two week level.</li> <li>A. Yes. That completely misses the point annoyance.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about expectation of peace and quiet come into play. And so I'll see if that answered your question.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr. James.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the L am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. <b>Q.</b> And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that? <b>A.</b> I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of measurement and an average level or something like that. <b>Q.</b> Yeah. The measurement is over a two week level. <b>A.</b> Yes. That completely misses the point annoyance. Is not about a long-term average
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about expectation of peace and quiet come into play. And so I'll see if that answered your question.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr. James.</li> <li>Were you listening in when Mr. Hessler opined on the number of people who have complained about infrasound or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>utility.</li> <li>So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success.</li> <li>Get it right the first time or you live with it forever.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that?</li> <li><b>A.</b> I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of measurement and an average level or something like that.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Yeah. The measurement is over a two week level.</li> <li>I. Yes. That completely misses the point annoyance. Is not about a long-term average</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about expectation of peace and quiet come into play. And so I'll see if that answered your question.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr. James.</li> <li>Were you listening in when Mr. Hessler opined on the number of people who have complained about infrasound or complained about the symptoms that they believe were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	utility. So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success. Get it right the first time or you live with it forever. Q. And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that? A. I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of measurement and an average level or something like that. Q. Yeah. The measurement is over a two week level. Is not about a long-term average MS. SMITH: I'm going to object. I'm not sure what the witness has seen what is being asked. And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yeah. I can respond to that. I'll first respond with a study that was done in Britain back in the 2000s in which they found that given time, complaints don't decrease. They increase. Or the people become so resolved to the fact that no one will listen to their complaints that they what I say suffer in silence. Or they abandon their homes.</li> <li>Ontario where there are many projects designed to meet a 40 dBA criteria now have abandoned homes all over the rural communities because people have just left them. Or they were elderly and when they passed away the family just left them to deteriorate.</li> <li>Having the experience of dealing with people who are the who are living in wind projects and who find something objectionable, I call them the complainant, has made me really sensitive to how the ANSI standards about expectation of peace and quiet come into play. And so I'll see if that answered your question.</li> <li>Q. Thank you, Mr. James.</li> <li>Were you listening in when Mr. Hessler opined on the number of people who have complained about infrasound or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>utility.</li> <li>So what answer is there? The answer is it needs to be done right the first time. Once that project is permitted, if the complaints occur, there is no solution that is economically viable, and the I am balancing of funding between the operators and the local communities or for that matter a complainant trying to file a lawsuit is so unbalanced that there will be very little chance of success.</li> <li>Get it right the first time or you live with it forever.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> And have you seen how the Applicant wants this project to be measured in order to comply with a 45 dBA limitation? Have you seen that?</li> <li><b>A.</b> I don't know if I remember. I heard Mr. Hessler talking this morning about several weeks worth of measurement and an average level or something like that.</li> <li><b>Q.</b> Yeah. The measurement is over a two week level.</li> <li>I. Yes. That completely misses the point annoyance. Is not about a long-term average</li> </ul>

1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 153	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 155
	MR. DE HUECK: I was thinking the same thing,	_	A whoosh when you describe it means that there is a
2	that we're having new Direct Testimony introduced on today's date. Though I appreciate you fleshing out some	2	sound that rises and then falls. What we should be
4	of the unanswered questions just as the Applicant does	4	trying to do is eliminate that whooshing sound by controlling how much it can rise. And in our Michigan
5	when they call a witness as well. This one just talks a	5	cases which I think Dr. Punch referenced we said 45 dBA.
6	lot more.	6	<b>Q.</b> I think you've answered the question.
7	So just keep in mind that we don't need new	7	And I've got to push back on you here a little bit
8	filed testimony today orally. And, additionally, if you	8	because if you read Condition No. 27, it actually I think
9	could clarify how sound will be measured for this project	9	calls to not take into account when the wind turbines are
10	before we go any farther.	10	operational.
11	<b>Q.</b> Do you have access to Exhibit A 33, the PUC's web	11	If you can look at line 4.
12	portal in front of you?	12	A. Yes, it does. But wind turbines operate over a
13	A. I will pull it up here. Prefiled exhibits. It's	13	broad range.
14	A	14	Mr. Hessler, for example, in his Naroof (check)
15	<b>Q.</b> 33. It's proposed condition	15	document said that measurements will be plus or minus 5
16	A. A 33. Okay. Proposed conditions.	16	dB around the predicted mean. So there will be periods
17	<ul><li>Q. Yep. Number 27. If you could read that quickly,</li></ul>	17	
18	please.	18	during that two weeks where that wind turbine let's say it was 40 is running at 35, and there will be
19	A. Okay. That was basically what I understood.	19	periods where it's running at 45. And the complaint
20	<b>Q.</b> And if you could explain whether you believe that's	20	times are when it's running at 45, not the average over
20	an appropriate way to measure any limitation on noise and	21	those times.
22	why or why not.	22	If we were going to use an Leq or an average as a
23	A. That is not an appropriate way to measure wind	23	criteria, it should be a short-term average, a 10 minute
24	turbine noise. The reason being that if you measure over	24	average, because anything else is not looking at the
25	a period of at least two weeks the average level will	25	characteristic we're trying to control, which is the
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 154		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 156
1	always be low because there's periods when the wind	1	fluctuating low frequency noise.
2	turbines don't operate.	2	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Mr. James. I don't have
3	And the condition that we're trying or the	3	anymore direct for you. We will turn this witness over
4	characteristic of wind turbines that cause annoyance have	4	for cross.
5	nothing to do with the long-term average. They have to	5	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. James, I'm now going to turn
6	do with short-term fluctuations. If for example we did a	6	you over for cross-examination, and we'll begin with the
7	long-term average and it came out to 40 dBA Leq but we	7	Applicant, Prevailing Winds.
8	then looked at how the sound fluctuated around that, we	8	THE WITNESS: Okay.
9	would see that there were periods when it might have been	9	MR. DE HUECK: We're just going to move our
10	55, periods where it might have been 35. It's these	10	video camera over to the attorney who will be questioning
11	fluctuations above and below the average that cause the	11	you.
12	annoyance, cause sleep disturbance and are the root of	12	(The camera is adjusted.)
13	the complaints.	13	THE WITNESS: I have no audio on this end.
14	So using a long-term measurement as a criteria is	14	MS. SMITH: I think we're all just very quiet
15	essentially an open door to the project creating	15	Mr. Hessler or Mr. James. I apologize.
16	annoyance and there being no method whatsoever then to	16	CROSS-EXAMINATION
17	ask for mitigation because over a two-week period it will	17	BY MS. SMITH:
18	always average less than 45, particularly if we're	18	Q. Mr. James, my name is Mollie Smith. You will see
19	looking at a project that was designed where we now say	19	me. I'm raising my hand, if you can see me. I'm over
20	the maximum levels are 42, let's say dBA Leq.	20	here.
21	It's the fluctuation that is important, and that's	21	Do you have anyone in the room with you?
22	why in my testimony I referenced the use of Lmax or an	22	A. No, I don't.
23	L10 or some other measurement that looks at the peaks.	23	<b>Q.</b> And do you have any documents in front of you other
24	When someone describes a wind turbine and Mr. Howell	24	than your filed exhibits or the filed exhibits in this
25	did a whooshing sound.	25	case?

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 157		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 159
1	<b>A.</b> No, I do not.	1	they live near a neighbor who wishes to host wind
2	<b>Q.</b> You haven't conducted any acoustic modeling related	2	turbines. This position influences my response to this
3	to the Prevailing Winds project; is that correct?	3	question."
4	A. No, I have not.	4	There's no citation here for any source to support
5	<b>Q.</b> And I would that was not part of the scope of	5	that statement, is there?
6	your work why you were retained?	6	A. Just my belief that I've grown up in the
7	A. No, it was not.	7	United States where property rights are protected by the
8	Q. And you also did not conduct any analysis of	8	government.
9	existing sound levels at the project site; is that	9	<b>Q.</b> So that's your personal opinion?
10	correct?	10	A. I think that's personal and legal.
11	A. That is correct. I relied upon the information from	11	<b>Q.</b> You're not testifying as a medical expert, is that
12	Mr. Howell.	12	true?
13	<b>Q.</b> And you did not conduct any site specific surveys of	13	A. That's correct.
14	either low frequency or infrasound for the project area.	14	Q. And you're not a licensed physician. Is that also
15	Is that also correct?	15	correct?
16	A. I relied upon the information from Mr. Howell's	16	A. That would be obvious, yes.
17	reports.	17	<b>Q.</b> And you are not testifying as an economics expert.
18	<b>Q.</b> In your testimony you indicate that the purpose of	18	Is that also true?
19	your testimony is to provide your opinion regarding	19	A. That's correct.
20	appropriate thresholds for audible and inaudible wind	20	<b>Q.</b> And you're not testifying as a psychology expert.
21	turbine sound at nonparticipating properties; is that	21	Is that also true?
22	correct?	22	A. Only to the extent that acousticians are cross
23	A. That would be fair to say, yes.	23	trained in both health and psychology because otherwise
24	<b>Q.</b> So given, as you just noted that you didn't conduct	24	when you investigate complaints you are hampered.
25	any site-specific studies, you're relying solely on the	25	I have 45 years of investing complaints, and I've
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 158		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 160
			ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 100
1	information that's either provided by others in this	1	learned a lot about people and psychology that would not
1 2		1 2	
-	information that's either provided by others in this Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?	-	learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.
2	information that's either provided by others in this Docket you're not relying on your own data for the	2	learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience. <b>Q.</b> It's experience. You're not a licensed
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the</li> <li>project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects</li> <li>similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li><li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the</li> <li>project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects</li> <li>similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I</li> <li>relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I 've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I 've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I 've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please. MR. ALMOND: Can the witness be allowed to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> <li>A. My opinions are based upon complaints and my own</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please. MR. ALMOND: Can the witness be allowed to answer the questions without being interrupted.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I 've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> <li>A. My opinions are based upon complaints and my own personal experiences.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please. MR. ALMOND: Can the witness be allowed to answer the questions without being interrupted. MR. DE HUECK: Everything's fine as is.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> <li>A. My opinions are based upon complaints and my own personal experiences.</li> <li>Q. And again, you're not a medical doctor; is that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please. MR. ALMOND: Can the witness be allowed to answer the questions without being interrupted. MR. DE HUECK: Everything's fine as is.</li> <li>A. Page 6, line 174?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> <li>A. My opinions are based upon complaints and my own personal experiences.</li> <li>Q. And again, you're not a medical doctor; is that true?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please. MR. ALMOND: Can the witness be allowed to answer the questions without being interrupted. MR. DE HUECK: Everything's fine as is.</li> <li>A. Page 6, line 174?</li> <li>Q. Yes. And so I'm looking at the first lines 175</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> <li>A. My opinions are based upon complaints and my own personal experiences.</li> <li>Q. And again, you're not a medical doctor; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true. But I don't see the relevance to your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please. MR. ALMOND: Can the witness be allowed to answer the questions without being interrupted. MR. DE HUECK: Everything's fine as is.</li> <li>A. Page 6, line 174?</li> <li>Q. Yes. And so I'm looking at the first lines 175 through 177. It says "I am a strong supporter of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> <li>A. My opinions are based upon complaints and my own personal experiences.</li> <li>Q. And again, you're not a medical doctor; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true. But I don't see the relevance to your question.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>information that's either provided by others in this</li> <li>Docket you're not relying on your own data for the project; correct?</li> <li>A. As I explained earlier, I have studied many projects similar conditions with similar wind turbines, and I relied upon that plus Mr. Howell's data.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In your testimony you indicate that you believe the noise limit should be imposed at the property line; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. The reason for that is so that the</li> <li>Q. You did not cite excuse me. You didn't cite any specific data to support that, did you, in your testimony? Did you cite any specific data in your testimony to support that statement?</li> <li>A. I stated that yes, I did, in my testimony.</li> <li>Q. Can we go to your testimony, please. MR. ALMOND: Can the witness be allowed to answer the questions without being interrupted. MR. DE HUECK: Everything's fine as is.</li> <li>A. Page 6, line 174?</li> <li>Q. Yes. And so I'm looking at the first lines 175</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>learned a lot about people and psychology that would not be tossed in a court. So, yes, I have some background, but it's experience.</li> <li>Q. It's experience. You're not a licensed psychologist?</li> <li>A. That's right.</li> <li>Q. And yet in your testimony you provide statements regarding health effects from wind turbines. Is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct. Because as an acoustician I've been trained to read medical journals to interpret them for my purposes.</li> <li>Q. Object. I didn't ask you offered health effects testimony in your written testimony; is that true?</li> <li>A. Only those within the scope of my profession.</li> <li>Q. Are your opinions based on complaints that you have heard from people?</li> <li>A. My opinions are based upon complaints and my own personal experiences.</li> <li>Q. And again, you're not a medical doctor; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's true. But I don't see the relevance to your question.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 161		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 163
1	is that also a fair statement?	1	A. Indirectly it does.
2	<b>A.</b> No. But I've reviewed the medical records that the	2	<b>Q.</b> It does not directly address health effects, does
3	doctors provided.	3	it?
4	Q. I only asked you if you	4	A. The recommendation from Dr. Schomer included the
5	Did you rely on other people's work for this as	5	consideration of health effects. He mentions the Health
6	well, other people's studies for your opinions?	6	Canada Study, which is about health effects
7	<b>A.</b> Yes. The reports from medical doctors who have	7	<b>Q.</b> Does this paper itself address health effects? Not
8	examined my clients.	8	the citations? Does the paper itself address health
9	<b>Q.</b> Would you agree that anyone who is relying on other	9	effects? Do they offer any opinions on health effects in
10	people's work that the what they're relying on has to	10	this document?
11	also be credible?	11	A. Without having to read it very carefully, I'll say
12	<b>A.</b> That is true. But that's the that's the purpose	12	it was not directly about health effects. It was about
13	of an expert to make that decision	13	the criteria needed to prevent them.
14	Q. I'm just going to ask you, Mr. James, if you can	14	<b>Q.</b> If we look then at the noise wind farms article so
15	just answer my question because I don't you'll have	15	that would be 2 or B to your
16	your opportunity to elaborate if your counsel so chooses	16	A. Okay.
17	to ask you additional questions.	17	<b>Q.</b> If you could turn to the last page in that article.
18	You provided some exhibits with your testimony; is	18	And I hold on. I think it would be actually page 13.
19	that correct?	19	A. Yes.
20	A. That is correct.	20	<b>Q.</b> Make sure I'm looking at the correct one here.
21	Q. And I believe and I may have not the same	21	So if we look under conclusions at the I'm going
22	numbering so I will try to look at the versions that are	22	to read the last sentence of the first paragraph under
23	online. Mine are sort of 5 and 6 to your testimony,	23	the conclusion. It says, "Unfortunately then for
24	which may be I'll see if I can find yours.	24	policymakers there appears to be no proportional
25	So I think it is listed as maybe I 1 E and I 1 F.	25	relationship between wind turbine noise levels and health
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 162		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 164
1	It may also be 5 and 6 on yours. I have two different	1	as these outcome factors will be influenced by
	, , ,		as these outcome factors will be influenced by
2	labels.	2	characteristics associated with both the noise and the
2 3			
-	labels.	2	characteristics associated with both the noise and the
3	labels. A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go	2 3	characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener."
3 4	labels. A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.	2 3 4	characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." Is that accurate?
3 4 5	<ul><li>labels.</li><li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li><li>Q. Let's see here.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener."</li><li>Is that accurate?</li><li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of</li></ul>
3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener."</li> <li>Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener."</li> <li>Is that accurate?</li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is,</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. They explain the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is, Section 6, it says, "Additional research and data</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. They explain the</li> <li>Q. Do they address health effects?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is, Section 6, it says, "Additional research and data collection recommendations."</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. They explain the</li> <li>Q. Do they address health effects?</li> <li>A. No, they're not on health effects. No, they're not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is, Section 6, it says, "Additional research and data collection recommendations."</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. They explain the</li> <li>Q. Do they address health effects?</li> <li>A. No, they're not on health effects. No, they're not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. And if you look back one exhibit,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is, Section 6, it says, "Additional research and data collection recommendations."</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. If you look under that it says, "research to date</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. They explain the</li> <li>Q. Do they address health effects?</li> <li>A. No, they're not on health effects. No, they're not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. And if you look back one exhibit, so that would be 3 or D, I believe so this is a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is, Section 6, it says, "Additional research and data collection recommendations."</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. If you look under that it says, "research to date does not tend to just study the effects on humans</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. They explain the</li> <li>Q. Do they address health effects?</li> <li>A. No, they're not on health effects. No, they're not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. And if you look back one exhibit, so that would be 3 or D, I believe so this is a possible criterion for wind farms.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is, Section 6, it says, "Additional research and data collection recommendations."</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. If you look under that it says, "research to date does not tend to just study the effects on humans reported anecdotally in what is probably a minority of</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>labels.</li> <li>A. Okay. Just give me the titles. I'll be able to go from there.</li> <li>Q. Let's see here. So I believe that 5 what I'm looking at is one was one that you referenced previously with the colored charts, so I think that was the last exhibit to your testimony.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Then the one right before that one, which also has a wind turbine and a chart.</li> <li>A. Those are the two you're looking at now?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Neither of those exhibits address health effects; is that correct?</li> <li>A. They explain the</li> <li>Q. Do they address health effects?</li> <li>A. No, they're not on health effects. No, they're not.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Thank you. And if you look back one exhibit, so that would be 3 or D, I believe so this is a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>characteristics associated with both the noise and the listener." <ul> <li>Is that accurate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is an accurate way of stating a complex set of relationships, not just</li> <li>Q. I'm just asking if that is an accurate recitation of the statement in the article.</li> <li>A. It can't be answered yes or no.</li> <li>Q. Are those the words on the page?</li> <li>A. Those are the words on the page, yes.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll turn then to Exhibit 4, this may also be D. This is called a theory to explain some physiological effects of the infrasonic emissions at some wind farm sites.</li> <li>A. Okay. I'm going to that now.</li> <li>Q. And if you'll look at pages 1,364 I think it is, Section 6, it says, "Additional research and data collection recommendations."</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. If you look under that it says, "research to date does not tend to just study the effects on humans</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 165		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 167
1	<b>A.</b> I think Dr. Schomer believed that at the time he	1	it.
2	wrote the paper. Since then he's seen Steve Cooper's	2	<b>Q.</b> Can you turn to page 11 of the case.
3	<b>Q.</b> I'm just asking about the	3	<ul> <li>A. I assume these are numbered sequentially?</li> </ul>
4	(Discussion off the record.)	4	<b>Q.</b> Yes. I believe it's in the lower right-hand corner
5	MS. SMITH: Mr. de Hueck, for Cheri's sake and	5	that you'll see the number.
6	mine, could you direct the witness to please answer my	6	A. Yes.
7	questions.	7	<b>Q.</b> And if you'll look at the very last two sentences of
8	MR. DE HUECK: Yes.	8	the page so the initial you'll see a 13. It says
9	Mr. James, I know you want to elaborate on every	9	James. And that James, is that you that it's reference?
10	single question that's asked of you, but in order for our	10	A. Yes, it is. Yes.
11	court reporter to adequately capture this, we can't talk	11	<b>Q.</b> I'll read the bottom. It says, "He has a long
12	over each other. And I believe Ms. Smith would just like	12	career studying the noise and sound pressure produced by
13	you to specifically answer her questions as asked.	13	industrial wind turbines. However, he is not a doctor or
14	Thank you.	14	epidemiologist. As a result, he does not have the
15	THE WITNESS: Okay.	15	training to opine that the infrasound and audible noise
16	<b>Q.</b> Mr. James, in that section under additional research	16	created by wind turbines activates physiological
17	and data collection recommendations they're actually	17	mechanisms in the body which produce adverse health
18	making recommendations for additional research to do	18	effects."
19	regarding reports; is that correct?	19	Do you see that language?
20	A. That is correct.	20	A. Yes, I do.
21	<b>Q.</b> And they provide even a test case in their Appendix	21	<b>Q.</b> And we were discussing the information that had been
22	A; is that true?	22	submitted. The Court also noted that the documentation
23	A. That is correct.	23	that you were relying on for your opinions was also not
24	Q. Mr. James, you've been retained as an expert witness	24	credible; is that true?
25	in other proceedings; is that correct?	25	A. I don't I don't remember that specifically. Can
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 166		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 168
1	<b>A.</b> That is correct.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 168 you point to that?
1 2	<ul><li>A. That is correct.</li><li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a</li></ul>	1 2	
-	A. That is correct.	-	you point to that?
2	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	2	you point to that? <b>Q.</b> Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific knowledge. Moreover, there's no evidence that Kelly's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific knowledge. Moreover, there's no evidence that Kelly's study was published in a reputable scientific journal or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific knowledge. Moreover, there's no evidence that Kelly's study was published in a reputable scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that true?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific knowledge. Moreover, there's no evidence that Kelly's study was published in a reputable scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific knowledge. Moreover, there's no evidence that Kelly's study was published in a reputable scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. From 2016?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific knowledge. Moreover, there's no evidence that Kelly's study was published in a reputable scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review." And I'll skip down to the last sentence. "The study does not support the proposition that wind turbine</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. From 2016?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review."</li> <li>And I'll skip down to the last sentence. "The study does not support the proposition that wind turbine infrasound is capable of producing broader adverse health</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. From 2016?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. In this case were you excluded from testifying</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review." And I'll skip down to the last sentence. "The study does not support the proposition that wind turbine infrasound is capable of producing broader adverse health effects, including anxiety, panic attacks, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. From 2016?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. In this case were you excluded from testifying regarding the causal health effects from wind turbines?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review."</li> <li>And I'll skip down to the last sentence. "The study does not support the proposition that wind turbine infrasound is capable of producing broader adverse health effects, including anxiety, panic attacks, and sleeplessness."</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I believe you mentioned that you participated in a case in Oregon; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. So would that be Williams versus Invenergy, LLC?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. I'm going to Ms. Agrimonti is going to send you and maybe we can hand this out too. Give us just a second, Mr. James. We're just handing out and Ms. Agrimonti is sending to you what I'm referencing as Exhibit A 36. And, Mr. James, if you can let me know when you receive it.</li> <li>A. I have it up in front of me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And this is an Opinion and Order from United States District Court, District of Oregon case; is that true?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. From 2016?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. In this case were you excluded from testifying regarding the causal health effects from wind turbines?</li> <li>A. I was excluded from testifying to the cause and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>you point to that?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. So if we look first at let's stay on the same page. I believe you had referenced in your earlier testimony a Dr. Kelly; is that true?</li> <li>A. That's right. I referred to him earlier in my testimony today, Dr. Neal Kelly.</li> <li>Q. And so if we look down at the bottom of page 11 over on the left-hand column towards at the very bottom, the bottom paragraph, it says, "However, like James's other sources, the Kelly study has significant scientific shortcomings. First, Kelly takes data from only seven subjects. He admits that the experiment would have to be repeated with a much larger number of evaluators population to confirm his results as scientific knowledge. Moreover, there's no evidence that Kelly's study was published in a reputable scientific journal or that it was subject to any manner of peer review." And I'll skip down to the last sentence. "The study does not support the proposition that wind turbine infrasound is capable of producing broader adverse health effects, including anxiety, panic attacks, and sleeplessness." Is that accurate?</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 169		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 171
1	reference to the Cape Bridgewater study as well. And I	1	
		2	throughout his background in his prefiled testimony.
2	believe that's on page 10. Do you see that?	_	Certainly he can't make any medical diagnosis. He's not
3	<ul> <li>A. That is correct. Yes.</li> <li>C. If you look at more 0, it also addresses the Correct.</li> </ul>	3	doing so here. I don't think he's given the opinion that
4	<b>Q.</b> If you look at page 9, it also addresses the Cape	4	he's making any diagnoses or anything like that.
5	Bridgewater study and Mr. Schomer's review of the Cape	5	So I'd need to know exactly what opinion it is
6	Bridgewater study on pages 8 and 9. Do you agree?	6	or what statement Mr. James has made that Ms. Smith is
7	<b>A.</b> I agree there's that they're talking about it but	7	looking to strike, I guess.
8	what are you pointing to?	8	MS. SMITH: Mr. James is making assertions of a
9	<b>Q.</b> If you look at the bottom of page 8, it says "The	9	causal relationship between wind turbines and health
10	Court agrees with defendants that the Schomer documents	10	effects. He is not qualified to do so. He is not
11	do not represent reliable scientific knowledge which	11	As his own testimony, he is not a medical
12	James may use as a foundation for his expert	12	doctor. He's not an epidemiologist. He's not a
13	conclusions."	13	psychologist. There's no basis for him. The literature
14	Is that accurate? It's at the bottom of page 8.	14	he's relying on is not supportive of that either, as
15	MR. ALMOND: Objection. Vague. Are you asking	15	we're seeing. He doesn't have any basis to make those
16	if it's the statement's accurate, or you're accurately	16	statements.
17	reading the statement or	17	MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead, Staff.
18	MS. SMITH: Yes. I apologize. I should be	18	MS. EDWARDS: As much as I would like to speed
19	clearer.	19	it along, I would argue it goes to weight, not
20	<b>Q.</b> Am I accurately reading the statement on the bottom	20	admissibility, and it's an issue that's I would intend
21	of page 8?	21	to brief in my prehearing brief posthearing.
22	<b>A.</b> You're accurately reading it. I don't agree with	22	MR. DE HUECK: Just in terms of Mr. Fuerniss
23	the Court's agreement, but that's fine. Dr. Schomer is	23	Mr. Jenkins and Ms. Pazour, I'm assuming you're in
24	the Emeritus Director of the Acoustical Society of	24	agreement with Mr. Almond?
25	<b>Q.</b> I think that's all. I just needed to know if I read	25	Ms. Smith, I'm going to agree with you. He
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 170		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 172
1	it correctly.	1	should not be testifying about any health effects or
2	Mr. James, have you been excluded or had your	2	rendering any expert opinion regarding medical causation
3	testimony in part excluded in any other cases?	3	or along the lines of what you've stated.
4	<b>A.</b> Not in any significant manner other than issues	4	However, I'm concerned what is it that we're
5	where it treads into medical.	5	going to strike and who's responsible for pointing that
6	<b>Q.</b> So any would it be fair to say that you have been	6	out? Certainly it's not Cheri to go back through the
7	disqualified as an expert from testifying regarding	7	transcript and strike it out. So how do we actually deal
8	health effects?	8	with figuring out what statements need to be stricken?
9	<b>A.</b> Only those that are medical. Not health effects	9	To some degree I'd like to allow some of the
10	that are visually confirmable.	10	exhibits he relies on because they're based on
11	Acousticians have to be able to listen to the	11	infrasound. Not necessarily saying I want to allow it to
12	complaints	12	show that it's causing health effects, but the guy's an
13	<b>Q.</b> I'm just going to stop you there.	13	expert in infrasound and measuring that type of stuff as
14	MS. SMITH: And I would say that at this point I	14	an acoustician thank you.
15	would move to strike any testimony by Mr. James regarding	15	MS. SMITH: I can address the exhibits.
16	health effects attributable to wind turbines.	16	From my read of the exhibits, I don't believe
17	MR. DE HUECK: I'll allow Mr. Almond to respond	17	that those would support the causation assertion anyway.
18	and Staff if you so wish.	18	So to the extent that I'm not I don't have a problem
19	MR. ALMOND: Yeah. In Mr. James's Direct	19	with the exhibits themselves coming in, but his
20	Testimony, written Direct Testimony, he discusses an	20	testimony and I would be happy to propose in a written
21	acoustician's responsibility to be aware of vague health	21	format take his testimony and strike the portions that
22	effects the general health effects caused by certain	22	I believe should be stricken and provide that tomorrow.
23	wind turbines, facilities, et cetera when looking at	23	MR. DE HUECK: Let's do that.
24	projects.	24	MS. SMITH: Would that be appropriate?
25	Specifically he talks about I mean, it's all	25	MR. DE HUECK: That would be appropriate. So

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 173		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 175
1	I'm going to go ahead and sustain your objection and your	1	A. The term I used was pseudo noise, I believe. When
2	motion to strike, grant that, and we'll figure it out at	2	air microphone on a sound level meter is very, very
3	that point in time.	3	sensitive. If air moves over that microphone and causes
4	MS. SMITH: All right. Thank you.	4	a false sound, pseudo noise.
5	MR. DE HUECK: And then also I'd like to	5	That's why we put these foam balls on top of the
6	prohibit any oh, Commissioner Hanson.	6	microphones, to try to block that wind. Infrasound goes
7	COMMISSIONER HANSON: No. I was waiting for	7	right through the foam balls. So any movement of air
8	you. I was just signaling you that I had something to	8	around the microphone generates a false signal,
9	say pertaining too before you made your final decision	9	particularly in the infrasonic range.
10	here.	10	So when they're measuring outside even after they
11	I think that he certainly should be allowed to	11	take all of their cautions with foam balls, it's very
12	provide us with his opinion of observable health effects.	12	common to see no difference between wind turbine on or
13	Certainly not any medical. And I'm parsing it here, but	13	off just because what they're really measuring is the air
14	even I would be able to say that Commissioner Nelson was	14	moving over the diaphragm.
15	obviously happy to hear something because that's	15	And then Mr. Hessler, I think, agrees with me on
16	observable.	16	this. The proper place to take an infrasound measurement
17	I wouldn't be able to say what physical reaction	17	if you want to avoid that is inside the home where the
18	he had within his body, any medical effects from it and	18	complainant says when I sit in this chair I feel these
19	hearing or things of that nature, but anyone can talk	19	sensations.
20	about the health effects that are observable, readily	20	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Earlier you stated that one out of 15 people
21	observable.	21	are and correct me if I misstate this. Are at risk of
22	So I know that makes it more difficult.	22	being annoyed; is that correct?
23	MR. DE HUECK: It doesn't make it too much more	23	A. Yes. The Health Canada Study found that when the
24	difficult. I just don't want to get into the gray water	24 25	model sound levels were 35 dBA and below, 2 percent of
25	of allowing an expert testifier to enter into lay witness	25	the population were highly annoyed. Between 35 and 40,
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 174 testimony and start elaborating on matters of common	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 176 10 percent were highly annoyed. And between 45 and
2	knowledge because that's not why he's been here to	2	above, 14 percent and higher.
3	testify.	3	That's where I got my numbers from and that's from
4	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Excellent.	4	the Health Canada Study and there was a chart in my
5	MR. DE HUECK: So, with that, where did we leave	5	testimony graphing those results.
6	off? You're in the middle of cross-examination.	6	<b>Q.</b> Okay. So you anticipated my next question and
7	MS. SMITH: That probably concludes my	7	answer which was where did the number come from.
8	cross-examination at this point.	8	Would you say that the majority of your experience
9	MR. DE HUECK: So we'll move over to	9	with wind turbine noise and its effects on people comes
10	Mr. Fuerniss. Did you have cross-examination?	10	from firsthand observations and measurements at
11	MR. FUERNISS: No.	11	operational projects?
12	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.	12	A. For my own?
13	MS. JENKINS: No.	13	<b>Q.</b> Correct. Firsthand.
14	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour?	14	A. Yes. Yes. But I've corroborated that. I have a
15	MS. PAZOUR: No.	15	number of colleagues who do similar work and we compare
16	MR. DE HUECK: Staff.	16	our notes, we compare our findings and we compare our
17	MS. EDWARDS: Yes.	17	methodologies.
18	CDOCC EVANIMATION	18	Q. Have you ever
19 20	CROSS-EXAMINATION	19 20	<ul> <li>A. And we corroborate each other's work.</li> <li>Okay Have you over conducted a cound monitoring.</li> </ul>
20 21	BY MS. EDWARDS:	20	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Have you ever conducted a sound monitoring
21	<ul><li>Q. Earlier you stated that you were discussing I</li><li>believe it was somebody else's study, that there were</li></ul>	21	survey of at least one week at an operational wind project?
23	other types of infrasound from wind that needed to be	23	A. No. Because I find it pointless. If you if you
24	parsed out.	24	aren't standing at the microphone or standing in the

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 177		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 179
1	your own ears that's called an observed measurement	1	was also I was also appointed by the PSC to do a peer
2	then you have no idea what caused the high as, the lows,	2	review of that test, and I submitted that to the PSC with
3	the in-betweens.	3	data showing the pulsations in all three homes, although
4	Unobserved monitoring, which is what is used for two	4	strongest at the home R-1, I believe, the N's farmhouse
5	week measurements, requires an awful lot of guesswork	5	that Mr. Hessler also focuses on.
6	afterwards. Whereas, if you're on site and you're	6	<b>Q.</b> You just said you were appointed by the PSC. You
7	measuring the sound, you have your own senses to	7	were hired by the Commission?
8	corroborate the meter's measurements. You know whether	8	<b>A.</b> Part yeah. Part of the agreement between the PSC
9	there's wind. You know whether there's insects. You	9	and my clients to have access to their house was that I
10	know whether a car went, by dogs barked. And, therefore,	10	have access to all of the data from the test that
11	observed measurements are the preferred measurement in	11	Schomer, Hessler, Rand, and Walker conducted and have
12	acoustics, as codified in ANSI 12.93, measurements with	12	that for my own review and then report back to the PSC on
13	an observer present. And I focus on that kind of	13	what I found.
14	measurement.	14	<b>Q.</b> Was the PSC your client?
15	As to whether that measurement represents other	15	A. No. The client was the Intervenors but the PSC was
16	conditions, I rely upon operational data for the noise	16	the coordinator for the I guess for initializing the
17	source, whether it's a wind turbine or a machine in a	17	project. And my clients would not allow anyone in their
18	factory, to let me know other times when that noise might	18	homes unless I had an opportunity to review the work of
19	have been in a similar operating mode.	19	the study team.
20	<b>Q.</b> Have you ever worked on a wind turbine project for	20	<b>Q.</b> But you did not actually participate in the study;
21	any group or individual that was not opposed to or	21	correct?
22	complaining about the project?	22	A. No. Because since they were my clients I had
23	A. No. And that is because when I wrote my first paper	23	already done testing in the homes. I knew what would be
24	in 2008 the wind industry decided I was persona non	24	found. It would have been inappropriate for me to be one
25	grata. They don't hire consultants that recommend 35	25	of the testers. Everyone would have said it was biased.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 178		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 180
1	Leq. I don't even get the offers.	1	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further
2	Leq. I don't even get the offers. Q. Thank you.	2	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions.
23	<ul><li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li><li>Q. Thank you.</li><li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li></ul>		MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4	<ul><li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li><li>Q. Thank you.</li><li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm</li></ul>	2 3 4	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li><li>Q. Thank you.</li><li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners
2 3 4 5 6	Leq. I don't even get the offers. <b>Q.</b> Thank you. On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?	2 3 4 5 6	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin.</li> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin.</li> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by <ul> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by <ul> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is correct. <ul> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm <ul> <li>in Brown County, Wisconsin.</li> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion <ul> <li>to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my <ul> <li>clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me,</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm <ul> <li>in Brown County, Wisconsin.</li> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me, and we developed the protocols and we selected the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to encapsulate your theories on infrasound?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>Sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by <ul> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That is correct. <ul> <li>Q. You</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me, and we developed the protocols and we selected the acousticians and Hessler &amp; Associates is one of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to encapsulate your theories on infrasound? THE WITNESS: Infrasound is still something that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by </li> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his </li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct. </li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my </li> <li>clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me, and we developed the protocols and we selected the acousticians and Hessler &amp; Associates is one of the companies that I recommended be involved in that test</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to encapsulate your theories on infrasound? THE WITNESS: Infrasound is still something that hasn't been addressed in any regulatory setting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> </ul> </li> <li>Sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me, and we developed the protocols and we selected the acousticians and Hessler &amp; Associates is one of the companies that I recommended be involved in that test along with Schomer, Walker, and Rand.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to encapsulate your theories on infrasound? THE WITNESS: Infrasound is still something that hasn't been addressed in any regulatory setting. And there's a reason for that. Before we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. <ul> <li>On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a</li> <li>sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm</li> <li>in Brown County, Wisconsin. <ul> <li>Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> </ul> </li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by</li> <li>Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his</li> <li>Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me, and we developed the protocols and we selected the acousticians and Hessler &amp; Associates is one of the companies that I recommended be involved in that test along with Schomer, Walker, and Rand.</li> <li>Q. You also indicate that you you also indicate that</li> </ul></li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to encapsulate your theories on infrasound? THE WITNESS: Infrasound is still something that hasn't been addressed in any regulatory setting. And there's a reason for that. Before we started putting wind turbines in quiet rural areas there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me, and we developed the protocols and we selected the acousticians and Hessler &amp; Associates is one of the companies that I recommended be involved in that test along with Schomer, Walker, and Rand.</li> <li>Q. You also indicate that you you also indicate that you essentially orchestrated the study and developed the test protocol for it; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes. The test protocol was based on my 2011 or 2012</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to encapsulate your theories on infrasound? THE WITNESS: Infrasound is still something that hasn't been addressed in any regulatory setting. And there's a reason for that. Before we started putting wind turbines in quiet rural areas there was never a source of infrasound that caused pulsations so it's not studied. It hasn't been studied. The funding is not available and it is just now as with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Leq. I don't even get the offers.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. On page 7 of your Direct Testimony you refer to a sound study that was carried out at the Shirley Wind Farm in Brown County, Wisconsin. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?</li> <li>A. Oh, yes. That was at my client's home.</li> <li>Q. You indicated that this same study alluded to by Mr. David Hessler who just testified for PUC Staff in his Direct Testimony is that correct?</li> <li>A. That is correct.</li> <li>Q. You</li> <li>A. That's the same study when he made the suggestion to the Public Service Commission that a study be done my clients contacted me, the attorney for them contacted me, and we developed the protocols and we selected the acousticians and Hessler &amp; Associates is one of the companies that I recommended be involved in that test along with Schomer, Walker, and Rand.</li> <li>Q. You also indicate that you you also indicate that you essentially orchestrated the study and developed the test protocol for it; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. James. No further questions. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Okay, Mr. James. This is where we go to Commission questions, meaning the Commissioners get to cross-examine you so while Katlyn comes up here to move the camera down to Chairman Fiegen I'll just go ahead and kickoff with the only question that I have. And it is you've testified a lot and reported to a lot of commissions and governments across the United States. You've done that in situations such as this when the wind farm has yet to be built; correct. THE WITNESS: That is correct. MR. DE HUECK: And so are you aware of any Commission or government that has created a condition to encapsulate your theories on infrasound? THE WITNESS: Infrasound is still something that hasn't been addressed in any regulatory setting. And there's a reason for that. Before we started putting wind turbines in quiet rural areas there was never a source of infrasound that caused pulsations so it's not studied. It hasn't been studied. The

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 181		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 183
1	It's very much an unstudied area, but it's one that from	1	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
2	my point of view should be a major concern since the	2	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I want to look at the
3	people who are affected are severely affected.	3	witness box when I'm talking to you.
4	Some of my clients, for example, the people that	4	On page 5 of your prefiled testimony online 153
5	owned the house that Mr. Hessler tested in, have left it.	5	you state, "While it may appear that the difference is
6	That house has sat vacant for years. And they only	6	only a few decibels, it is important to remember that a
7	return when there's a need to do another test.	7	3-D B change in sound levels represents a doubling or
8	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Thank you.	8	halving of the acoustic energy."
9	So to date you're not aware of any permit being	9	So obviously to a layperson and we've had
10	denied based on infrasound?	10	these in previous wind dockets, discussions of a variety
11	THE WITNESS: Not infrasound specifically.	11	of different dockets and projects. However, it's always
12	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Thank you. And now I'm	12	curious to me, in your example then of moving down to a
13	going to move over to Chairman Fiegen to allow her to	13	40 dBA you state that it's equivalent to turning off half
14	cross-examine you.	14	of the wind turbines in a project designed to meet the 40
15	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So it seems like you have	15	dBA.
16	been in the field for a while, although in the U.S	16	If three dBA change is doubling or halving, what
17	you know, wind development has really increased the last,	17	is the going from a 45 to a 40 dBA? Do you know that?
18	I don't know, five to 10 years. I mean, if you look at	18	THE WITNESS: Well, it's 5 decibels. It could
19	the chart, it certainly has increased quickly. Yet	19	be the equivalent of somewhere between a quarter, maybe a
20	there's not a lot of research done and so do people	20	third. These are logarithms. I can't do them in my
21	mostly do people in the U.S. mostly look at research	21	head, but it would be a very significant change.
22	in foreign countries and has and I know I can't	22	And that's why these debates get so heated
23	introduce new evidence so yeah. I guess that's my	23	between a 40 or 45 dBA limit. It represents a big change
24	question.	24	in the number of wind turbines that can be put into any
25	THE WITNESS: I guess to your first question	25	given area of a project.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 182		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 184
1	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But	1	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that
2	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors,	2	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter?
23	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind	2 3	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the
2 3 4	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the	2 3 4	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example.
2 3 4 5	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also	2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have
2 3 4 5 6	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one	2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I
2 3 4 5 6 7	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on.	2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn
2 3 4 5 6	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I	2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have ideas that may inhibit current government policies and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is having nonparticipants negotiate agreements in easements
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have ideas that may inhibit current government policies and with the current government policy promoting wind the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is having nonparticipants negotiate agreements in easements and get compensation for the noise pollution.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have ideas that may inhibit current government policies and with the current government policy promoting wind the chance of getting funding for the kind of work I do is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is having nonparticipants negotiate agreements in easements and get compensation for the noise pollution. There's no easy way to site a wind turbine at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have ideas that may inhibit current government policies and with the current government policy promoting wind the chance of getting funding for the kind of work I do is nil so that also means that there's limited research	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is having nonparticipants negotiate agreements in easements and get compensation for the noise pollution. There's no easy way to site a wind turbine at levels that are going to satisfy everybody. So the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have ideas that may inhibit current government policies and with the current government policy promoting wind the chance of getting funding for the kind of work I do is nil so that also means that there's limited research available.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is having nonparticipants negotiate agreements in easements and get compensation for the noise pollution. There's no easy way to site a wind turbine at levels that are going to satisfy everybody. So the proper method in my mind is to set criteria that are safe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have ideas that may inhibit current government policies and with the current government policy promoting wind the chance of getting funding for the kind of work I do is nil so that also means that there's limited research available. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is having nonparticipants negotiate agreements in easements and get compensation for the noise pollution. There's no easy way to site a wind turbine at levels that are going to satisfy everybody. So the proper method in my mind is to set criteria that are safe and then allow monetary negotiations to occur for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	about wind turbines are new, yes, they're new. But because of serendipity and a number of other factors, I've been intimately involved in many of the early wind projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, out in the east, and have tracked at what's happened at those. Also in Wisconsin we started a wind project in 2008 the one that Mr. Hessler and his company worked on. So my experience I think is somewhat unique. There's three other acousticians in the country that I would say have similar experience. But all of this has been funded by local families. There is no research money available to fund my work. Steve Cooper is in the same boat. His whole lab and everything else was funded out of his own money. Research money doesn't go to people who have ideas that may inhibit current government policies and with the current government policy promoting wind the chance of getting funding for the kind of work I do is nil so that also means that there's limited research available. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. James, up next will be Vice	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, you just stated that it would be a change of about a quarter? THE WITNESS: It would be about a third of the wind turbines. Let me give you a simpler example. If I have a noisy fan in front of me and I have my sound level meter and the noisy fan is 40 dBA and I have another noisy fan right alongside of it and I turn that on, then the sound level's going to go up 3 decibels to 43. If I started out with four noisy fans and they were 45 and I cut them in half, turned two off, then it would drop to 43. So when we talk about small changes in decibels we're talking about big changes in acoustic energy. And that's the point I was trying to make. And it's also why I think the answer to this is having nonparticipants negotiate agreements in easements and get compensation for the noise pollution. There's no easy way to site a wind turbine at levels that are going to satisfy everybody. So the proper method in my mind is to set criteria that are safe and then allow monetary negotiations to occur for easements.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 185		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 187
1	And then I believe you said that it was a change of a	1	two-thirds of their machines.
2	third of turning off one-third of the machines. Am I	2	THE WITNESS: No. I'm advocating that those
3	hearing you incorrectly?	3	machines that are up in the model we see some levels
4	THE WITNESS: Well, like I said, the	4	about above 40. But they seriously look at getting
5	relationships are logarithmic. So as long as we move in	5	those levels down into 40. And that for the people who
6	3 decibel moves, it's easy to estimate but when you have	6	are in the impacted range that are nonparticipants, that
7	a 5 dB, I'd say that's harder. I would say it's	7	they work out easement agreements.
8	equivalent to turning off one out of every	8	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I understand that. Thank
9	one-third that would be equivalent to turning off	9	you for your participation and information. Appreciate
10	about two-thirds of the machines to drop 5 decibels. Or	10	it.
11	to increase the setbacks greater, which is really the	11	THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
12	answer. To increase the distance.	12	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Mr. James, this is
13	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay. Intuitively I'm	13	Commissioner Nelson.
14	having a little bit of a challenge with that because if	14	I understand that you heard most of
15	you're shutting off did you just say two-thirds of the	15	Mr. Hessler's testimony this morning; correct?
16	machines to turn off 5?	16	THE WITNESS: I heard probably 80 percent of it,
17	THE WITNESS: To have an equivalent drop in	17	yes.
18	sound level or to have a wind project the average	18	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Did you hear the portion
19	sound level over the whole wind project because we're	19	where he explained to me that from his perspective it is
20	talking about not just one location but the whole	20	very, very very difficult to measure infrasound?
21	project, to get a reduction of 5 decibels would require	21	THE WITNESS: Yes. But he's been doing that
22	turning off about two out of every three of the machines.	22	with instruments with microphones.
23	And then not being measured not taking a measurement	23	As illustrated in the example I gave and
24	right near one of the currently operating machines.	24	described earlier with all the blue lines and colors I've
25	My point my point in that statement was to	25	moved over to using a micro barometer which is much less
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 186		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 188
1	show how difficult it becomes to put wind turbines into	1	sensitive to air movement et cetera and it makes it much
2	rural residential areas as the limits are reduced unless	2	easier to get clear readings.
3	there is a safety valve to compensate people for the	3	With the right instruments infrasound is easy to
4	noise and allow them to enter into separate negotiations	4	measure. With the standard acoustical instruments it's
5	for an easement across their property.	5	very complicated and very expensive.
6	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. And I I	6	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So we've been talking
7	appreciate your clarifications and explanations as you've	7	about this whole issue of the test or study of the
8	gone through this. However, if you're at 45 dBA and you	8	Shirley Wind Farm and you developed the testing protocols
9	decrease by 5 to 40 dBA and in order to accomplish that	9	but apparently he didn't use your testing protocols; is
10	you have to eliminate two-thirds of the machines, that	10	that correct?
11	means one-third of them are creating the 40 dBA. And I $$	11	THE WITNESS: No. No. They followed the
12	know I understand it's not quantity there necessarily.	12	testing protocols exactly and that was to use infrasonic
13	One machine could produce 40 dBA.	13	rated microphones, make recordings and use what's called
14	THE WITNESS: If you're close to it.	14	narrow band analysis to do the subsequent analysis of
15	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Correct. But you're also	15	that data. And they executed the methods that I had
16	saying that you're eliminating those that are closest to	16	recommended exactly.
17	the receiver by	17	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so why didn't you
18	THE WITNESS: In my example I wasn't being that	18	recommend using the micro barometer.
19	precise. I was trying to give an example of the over all	19	THE WITNESS: Because at that time I wasn't
20	magnitude of the problem of putting a large number of	20	aware that it was a much less expensive tool. It became
21	wind turbines into an area and why a couple decibel	21	clear to me after that when I had calls from people to
22	difference in the criteria makes a big difference to the	22	come do testing that I needed a different way. So doing
23	Applicant.	23	some research into how other fields of science test
		0.4	information description for the state of the
24 25	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. And you're certainly not advocating that the Applicant should remove	24 25	infrasound particularly for weather detection, tsunami detection, et cetera that micro barometers are available.

1         There're highly reliable, very durable and relatively         1         Lines that show the specific frequency or the specific           2         Integrative was.		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 189		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 191
2         incorpoince was.         2         rotation species of the wind turbines and in this           3         microphone was.         2         rotation species of the wind turbines and in this           4         COMMISSIONER NELSON: So help me understand usi.         4         harts.           6         understand usi.         4         harts.           7         THE WITNESS: That's correct.         5         COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so a microbarometer works.           10         THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the lift.         7         THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the lift.           11         right = right = stand with or measure lift.         10         without any G-weighting, without any Havelighting           12         pressure.         12         The analysis, allows us to take that           13         inter inplay = stand with a pressure lift.         14         long string of pressures	1	They're highly reliable, very durable and relatively	1	lines that show the specific frequency or the specific
3         microphone was.         3         particular case I blink that was .7 hertz7, .75           4         COMMISSIONER NELSON: So help me understand just         5         COMMISSIONER NELSON: So what is the scale of measurement of the infrasound?           5         a little bit rats' correct.         6         measurement of the infrasound?           7         THE WTINESS: That's correct.         7         7           9         does the same thing.         0         on the right hand side. That's in declebit just like we would measure other sounds but without any A-weighting just like we would measure other sounds but without any A-weighting in whote any filtering of the sounds but without any G-weighting, without	2		2	
4         COMMISSIONER NELSON: So help me understand just         4         hertz.           5         a little bit about how a microbarometer works, I         5         COMMISSIONER NELSON: So what is the scale of measurement's of understand a typical barrowicer measures pressure.           7         THE WITNESS: That's correct.         7         THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the little           10         THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the little         10         without any G-weighting, without any Haweighting           11         THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the little         10         without any G-weighting, without any Haweighting           12         The WITNESS: Except that it measures the little         11         sound, Without any G-weighting, without any Haweighting           13         Transform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that         14         long stransform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that           14         the drain the upper right-hand iccner. We can see depitted in         15         and convert I: hint frequencies as we can see depitted in           15         the drain the upper right pressure plose brom a wind turbine is         16         the drain the upper right pressure plose brom a wind turbine is           16         variant on a standard Darrower program.         19         And It is on thy upper solution that           16         booked measure plose from a wind turbine is<	3		3	•
5         a little bit about how a microbarometer works. I         5         COMMISSIONER NELSON: So what is the scale of           6         measurement of the infrasound?         7         Tittle WITNESS: Thit's correct.           8         COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so a microbarometer         8         on the right-hand side. That's in dechebs but without any A-weighting.           10         THE WITNESS: The pressure you see when someone says the         10         would measure ther sounds but without any A-weighting.           11         pressure.         10         without any G-weighting. without any A-weighting.           12         pressure.         11         and convert is ind solution.         12           13         pressure.         13         and convert is ind frequencies as we can see depicted in           14         A microbarometer with the exception that         16         the chart in the upper right-hand conter.         We can be address and then the arrows pointing           18         measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze ope by, picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audble         17         It the draft in the upper right-hand conter.         We can be address in the regurnees are in the spectrogram.           19         pointing upper singe changes as a breeze ope by, picked up, and, lit has very little sensitivity to audble         10         We here those transes are in the spectrogram.	4		4	
7         THE WITNESS: That's correct.         7         THE WITNESS: Well, the scale of measurement's           8         COMMISSIONER RELSON: And is a microbarometer of does the same thing.         9         outh engute thand side. That's in ideoles just like we we would be theread to be the sound's but without any A-weighting without any A-weighting the sound's to 20.           10         THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the little         10         without any G-weighting, without any A-weighting the sound's to 20.           11         pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall pressure used is X inches of mercury is the overall pressure level. It's a         10         vithout any G-weighting, without any A-weighting the sound's to 20.           12         pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall pressure level. It's a         10         sound we're just looking at all of the sound's to 20.           13         pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall pressure level. It's a         11         sound we're just looking at all of the sound's to 20.           14         Instead of messuring the overall pressure light         11         11         the anysing measure the source of the sound's to 30.           15         point.         2         2         And it ha sery light source on sound to trois we as a steed?           14         point.         COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the chart's you were         2         2         2         2         2	5			COMMISSIONER NELSON: So what is the scale of
7         THE WITNESS: Well, the scale of measurement's COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so a microbarometer of does the same thing.         7         THE WITNESS: Well, the scale of measurement's on the right-hand side. That's in decisely just like we would measure other sounds but without any A-weighting, without any A-weighting of the sounds to z0.           10         THE WITNESS: Except that It measures the little right- the pressure you see when someone says the in right the pressure you see when someone says the in right the pressure you see when someone says the in right the pressure you see when someone says the in right the pressure you see when someone says the in right the pressure outsed is X induses us to take that in stand or measuring the overall pressure level. It's a inter variant on a standard barometer with the exception that in instand of pressure changes as a breeze goes by, if or example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is point.         10         11	6	understand a typical barometer measures pressure.	6	measurement of the infrasound?
<ul> <li>does the same thing.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the little ripple the pressure you use when somene says the pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall pressure.</li> <li>Transform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that</li> <li>The without any G-weighting, Without any G-weighting</li></ul>	7		7	THE WITNESS: Well, the scale of measurement's
10       THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the little       10       without any G-weighting, without any filtering of the         11       ripple the pressure vousie is X inches of mercury is the overall       12       The analysis method called Fast Fourier         13       pressure.       13       Transform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that         14       A microbarometer is designed to measure the       15       and convert it into frequencies as we can see depicted in         16       variant on a standard barometer with the exception that       16       the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the         17       instead of measuring the overall pressure changes at a breeze goes by, for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is       18       to where those traces are in the spectrogram.         19       for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is       19       And it is only by using these kind of tools that         20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible       19       And it is only by cound these ound analysis, allows us to take that         21       that faint because they re up in the SO maybe SO to 60       20         22       It's measurong the pressure changes at a breeze goes by, for any dive set and for on the secure of analysis, allows us to take that the core of the secure of analysis, allows us to take that the core of the secure of analysis, allows us tot set the secore of the cound tanalysis, allows us to ta	8	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so a microbarometer	8	on the right-hand side. That's in decibels just like we
11       ripple the pressure you see when someone says the       11       sound we're just looking at all of the sounds 0 to 20.         12       pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall       13       Transform, narrow hand analysis, allows us to take that         14       A microbarometer is designed to measure the       14       Iong string of pressures it samples 50 times a second,         15       Ittle ripples that occur at that pressure level. It's a       16       the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the         16       the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the       16       the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the         17       instead of measuring the overall pressure changes as a breeze goes by.       18       to where those traces are in the spectrogram.         18       to where those structs as we can see depicted in       17       little graph with the spikes and then the arrows pointing         18       to where those traces are inthe spectrogram.       19       And it is only by using these kind in the course of the pressure changes that rise         20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible sounds.       22       24       that faint because they're up in the 50 - maybe 50 to 60         21       above and below the barometric pressure any given       24       complex with see with the spike and sub the pressure changes the rise       25       COMMIS	9	does the same thing.	9	would measure other sounds but without any A-weighting
12       pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall       12       The analysis method called Fast Fourier         13       pressure.       13       Transform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that         14       A microbarometer is designed to measure the       14       Instact of measuring the versites as a superse pressure ly use for a wanat on a standard barometer with the exception that       15       and convert it into frequencies as we can see depicted in         15       warant on a standard barometer with the exception that       16       the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the         16       the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the       17       little graph with the spikes and then the rows pointing         18       measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by,       18       to where those traces are in the spectrogram.         19       pressure, and this wery little sensitivity to audible       20       you and dect theose pressure, and you were         21       sound, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.       21       that faint because they're up in the 50 maybe 50 to 60         22       It's measuring the pressure changes that rise       30       30       and convert is the spectrogram.       21         24       point.       23       CooMHISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       23       that faint because they're up in the 50 mayb	10	THE WITNESS: Except that it measures the little	10	without any G-weighting, without any filtering of the
13       pressure.       13       Transform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that         14       A microbarometer is designed to measure the       14       Iong string of pressure.       13       Transform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that         14       A microbarometer is designed to measure the       14       Iong string of pressure.       15       and covert it into frequencies as we can see depicted in         16       variant on a standard barometer with the exception that       16       the chart in the upper right-hand comer. We can see the         17       instead of measuring the overall pressure changes as a breeze goes by,       16       the chart in the upper right-hand comer. We can see the         18       measures the rapid pressure changes that rise       20       you can detect those pulses. Not that the pulses are         21       sound, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.       21       that faint because they're up in the 50 maybe 50 to 60         22       Lits measuring the pressure changes that rise       23       above and below the barometric pressures nut sounds.       21         23       LOMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       26         3       intitually submitted they looked Greek to me so 1 didn't       study them.       3       Cot that, but of individuals that you have observed <th>11</th> <th>ripple the pressure you see when someone says the</th> <th>11</th> <th>sound we're just looking at all of the sounds 0 to 20.</th>	11	ripple the pressure you see when someone says the	11	sound we're just looking at all of the sounds 0 to 20.
14A microbarometer is designed to measure the 1514Iong string of pressures it samples 50 times a second, 1615ititle ripples that occur at that pressure level. It's a 1716and convert it into frequencies as we can see depicted in 1616variant on a standard barometer with the exception that 1716the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the 1118measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by, 19for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is 201620picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible 21above and below the barometric pressure at any given 221824point.22It's measuring the pressure changes that rise 232023above and below the barometric pressure at any given 2425COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were25COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were 2526ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE! 1921pointing out to us very early on in your discussion 1 2411New these symptoms that can't be explained 242Will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were 3intially submitted they looked Greek to mes 0 I din't 43intially submitted they looked Greek to mes 0 I din't 4study them.4study them.5COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the 410COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the 41011microbarometer test various frequencies; is 45S13THE WITNESS: That's correct. 1010 <th>12</th> <th>pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall</th> <th>12</th> <th>The analysis method called Fast Fourier</th>	12	pressure outside is X inches of mercury is the overall	12	The analysis method called Fast Fourier
15       little ripples that occur at that pressure level. It's a         16       variant on a standard barometer with the exception that         17       instead of measuring the overall pressure tig just         18       measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by,         19       for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is         20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible sounds.         21       It's measuring the pressure changes that rise         23       above and below the barometric pressure at any given         24       commits of the charts you were         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were         26       they lip ick those up and fiel a pressure pulse or         27       will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were         3       initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't         4       study them.         5       Now that you've explained them I'm going to go         6       back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of         19       THE WITNESS: That's correct.         10       COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the         11       microbarometer text various frequencies is if         8       that correct?         9       THE WITNESS: That's correct.	13	pressure.	13	Transform, narrow band analysis, allows us to take that
16       variant on a standard barometer with the exception that       16         17       instead of measuring the overall pressure it just       18         18       measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by,       16         19       for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is       10         20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible       20         21       stoud, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.       20         22       11's measuring the pressure changes that riske       21         23       above and below the barometric pressure at any given       25         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       26         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       25         26       booke and below they looked Greek to me so I didn't       4         4       study them.       5         5       Now that you've explained them I'm going togo       5         6       back and I I remember correct?, one of       6         7       the axis on three taked about different frequencies; is       5         8       that correct?       7       above and ta 20 hertz.         10       COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the       10       Frequency range?	14	A microbarometer is designed to measure the	14	long string of pressures it samples 50 times a second,
17       instead of measuring the overall pressure it just       17         18       measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by,       18         19       for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is       19         20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible sounds.       19         21       sound, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.       10         22       It's measuring the pressure changes that rise       23         23       above and below the barometric pressure at any given       24         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       25         26       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       25         3       initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't       3         4       study them.       1         5       Now that you've explained them I'm going to go       6         6       back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of       1         11       microbarometer test various frequencies; is       8         8       that correct?       11         11       microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what       1         12       requency range?       11         13       THE WITNESS: That's correct.       10	15	little ripples that occur at that pressure level. It's a	15	and convert it into frequencies as we can see depicted in
18       measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by, for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is picked up. And it is only by using these kind of tools that         19       for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is picked up. And it is only by using these kind of tools that         20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible sounds.         21       sound, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.         22       It's measuring the pressure changes that rise asove and below the barometric pressure at any given point.         23       above and below the barometric pressure at any given point.         24       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were         26       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were         27       now that you've explained them I'm going to go         3       back and study them and if 1 member correctly, one of         4       that correct?         3       the WITNESS: That's correct.         10       COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the         11       THE WITNESS: That's correct.         13       THE WITNESS: The microbarometer trim using tests         14       between 0 and 20 hertz.         15       COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the         16       specific sources of the infrasoun	16	variant on a standard barometer with the exception that	16	the chart in the upper right-hand corner. We can see the
19       for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is       19       And it is only by using these kind of tools that         20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible       20       you can detect those pulses. Not that the pulses are         21       sound, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.       21       that faint because they're up in the 50 - maybe 50 to 60         22       It's measuring the pressure changes that rise       23       dbrange. But those are sufficient asa s Steve         23       above and below the barometric pressure at any given       24       people will pick those up and feel a pressure pulse or         24       pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I       14       have these symptoms that can't be explained         2       It bindly submitted they looked Greek to me so I din't       4       effects.         3       initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I din't       3       COMHISSIONER NELSON: And So does the         10       COMMISSIONEN NELSON: And so does the       5       COMMISSIONEN NELSON: And so does the         11       microbarometer List       10       Reuency range?         13       THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests       14       have madu these type or SO dB then we see people         14       between 0 and 20 hertz.       15       COMMISSIONEN NELSON:	17	instead of measuring the overall pressure it just	17	little graph with the spikes and then the arrows pointing
20       picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible         21       sound, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.         22       It's measuring the pressure changes that rise         23       above and below the barometric pressure at any given point.         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were         26       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were         27       they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizzy. They will         26       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were         27       they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizzy. They will         28       were yearly on in your discussion I         29       pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I         20       you can detect those pulses. Not that the pulses are         29       now that you've explained them I'm going to go         3       6         4       effects.         5       Now that you've explained therent frequencies; is         4       the axis on there taiked about different frequencies; is         5       the torneet test various frequencies on if so what         21       the WITNESS: The's correct.         20       DAMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the         3       microbarometer test various frequencies in frasound that you're testing: <th>18</th> <th>measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by,</th> <th>18</th> <th>to where those traces are in the spectrogram.</th>	18	measures the rapid pressure changes as a breeze goes by,	18	to where those traces are in the spectrogram.
21sound, Iterally no sensitivity to audible sounds.21that faint because they're up in the 50 maybe 50 to 6022It's measuring the pressure changes that riseabove and below the barometric pressure at any given22dB range. But those are sufficient as as Steve23COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were23Cooper's study presented, those are inaudible but some24point.24migraine or they'll get a migraine or they'll get a migrai	19	for example, or a pressure pulse from a wind turbine is	19	And it is only by using these kind of tools that
22It's measuring the pressure changes that rise above and below the barometric pressure at any given point.22dB range. But those are sufficient as as Steve Cooper's study presented, those are inaudible but some people will pick those up and feel a pressure pulse or they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizy. They will24point.25COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizy. They will25COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were26They ligt at any anion or they'll get dizy. They will25COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were26They ligt at any anion or they'll get dizy. They will26I pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them.190ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE! I have these symptoms that can't be explained 2 Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound 4 effects.3initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them.3COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed4that correct?8that ave measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.11microbarometer text various frequencies; is the twens get and if so what frequency range?114restource of the infrasound that you're testing; correct?115COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the fs specific	20	picked up. And it has very little sensitivity to audible	20	you can detect those pulses. Not that the pulses are
23       above and below the barometric pressure at any given point.       23       Cooper's study presented, those are inaudible but some people will pick those up and feel a pressure pulse or they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizzy. They will         24       people will pick those up and feel a pressure pulse or they'll get dizzy. They will         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       25         26       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       26         27       they only our discussion I       20         28       Will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were       10         3       initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't       3         4       study them.       5       Now that you've explained them I'm going to go       6         5       Now that you've explained them I'm going to go       6       6       medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified         7       the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is       8       that correct?       8       that have made these type of complaints and where you         9       THE WITNESS: That's correct.       10       COMMISSIONER NELSON: And is o does the       11       THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests         14       requery range?       11       THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests         15	21	sound, literally no sensitivity to audible sounds.	21	that faint because they're up in the 50 maybe 50 to 60
24       point.       24       people will pick those up and feel a pressure pulse or         25       COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were       25       they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizzy. They will         1       pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I       10       ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!       192         1       pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I       10       ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!       192         1       pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I       11       have these symptoms that can't be explained       12         1       will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were       13       Can't be explained by normal audible sound         4       effects.       5       COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a         6       back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of       5       COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the         10       COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the       10       level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.         11       microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what       11       The WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests       11         14       between 0 and 20 hertz.       12       level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people         13       THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's <th>22</th> <th>It's measuring the pressure changes that rise</th> <th>22</th> <th>dB range. But those are sufficient as as Steve</th>	22	It's measuring the pressure changes that rise	22	dB range. But those are sufficient as as Steve
25COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were25they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizzy. They willROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!190ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!1921pointing out to us very early on in your discussion IROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!1922will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they werea study them.13initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't3Can't be explained by normal audible sound4study them.6CoMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the67the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is5COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the10COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the1THE WITNESS: That's correct.11microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what11THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests14between 0 and 20 hertz.14respont 40 but I'm talking about average.15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;15Remember 1 said it's a pressure pulse so if we16only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which14response.22Usually within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and	23	above and below the barometric pressure at any given	23	Cooper's study presented, those are inaudible but some
ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!190ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!1921pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I1have these symptoms that can't be explained22will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were3initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't34study them.3Can't be explained by normal audible sound5Now that you've explained them I'm going to go6back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of67the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is7to do that, but of individuals that you have observed8that correct?8that have made these type of complaints and where you9THE WITNESS: That's correct.910COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the1011THE WITNESS: That's correct.1012level of infrasound in their home, what13THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests14between 0 and 20 hertz.1115COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct?18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's19only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which2Usually within the wind project they operate at readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24usually within the wind project they operate at readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24usually within the vert opharmeter	24	point.	24	people will pick those up and feel a pressure pulse or
1pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I1have these symptoms that can't be explained2will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were3Can't be explained by normal audible sound3study them.3Can't be explained by normal audible sound4study them.4effects.5Now that you've explained them I'm going to go6back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of56back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of6medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified7the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is8that correct?9THE WITNESS: That's correct.9have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what10COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the10level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.11microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what11THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests14between 0 and 20 hertz.12level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16have a average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which19to 70 and then along period without anything. So the22Usually within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the<	25	COMMISSIONER NELSON: In the charts you were	25	they'll get a migraine or they'll get dizzy. They will
2will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't2Excuse me. Turn those off.3initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't3Can't be explained by normal audible sound4study them.3Can't be explained by normal audible sound5Now that you've explained them I'm going to go6Gent to explained by normal audible sound6back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of6medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified7the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is6medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified9THE WITNESS: That's correct.9have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what10COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the10level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people11microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what11THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests14between 0 and 20 hertz.12level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the13with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16nave a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a19only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the20usally within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the21<				
<ul> <li>3 initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't</li> <li>4 study them.</li> <li>5 Now that you've explained them I'm going to go</li> <li>6 back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of</li> <li>7 the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is</li> <li>8 that correct?</li> <li>9 THE WITNESS: That's correct.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the</li> <li>11 microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what</li> <li>12 frequency range?</li> <li>13 THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests</li> <li>14 between 0 and 20 hertz.</li> <li>15 COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the</li> <li>16 specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;</li> <li>17 correct?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's</li> <li>19 only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which</li> <li>19 only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which</li> <li>10 auguly within the wind project they operate at</li> <li>21 gional.</li> <li>22 Usually within the wind project they operate at</li> <li>23 communication of the tower at the same</li> <li>24 point.</li> <li>23 Can't be explained by normal audible sound</li> <li>3 ConMISSIONER NELSON: And T'm not looking for a</li> <li>6 medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified</li> <li>10 to do that, but of individuals that you have observed</li> <li>11 the WITNESS: When the average sound pressure</li> <li>12 level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people</li> <li>13 with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can</li> <li>14 respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.</li> <li>15 Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we</li> <li>16 have a wind turbine blade moves 10 or the tower at the same</li> <li>20 only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which</li> <li>21 goint.</li> <li>22 Usually within the wind project they operate at</li> <li>23 similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer</li> <li>24 readings and you compress hours worth of this data and</li> <li>2</li></ul>		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 190		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 192
4study them.4effects.5Now that you've explained them I'm going to go6back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of5COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a7the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is6medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified7the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is7to do that, but of individuals that you have observed8that correct?9THE WITNESS: That's correct.910COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the10level of infrasound in their home, what11microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what11THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure12level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.11THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure13THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests14level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people13THE WITNESS: The infrasound that you're testing;15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the24usually within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data a	1	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I	1	
<ul> <li>5 Now that you've explained them I'm going to go</li> <li>6 back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of</li> <li>7 the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is</li> <li>8 that correct?</li> <li>9 THE WITNESS: That's correct.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the</li> <li>11 microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what</li> <li>12 frequency range?</li> <li>13 THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests</li> <li>14 between 0 and 20 hertz.</li> <li>15 COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the</li> <li>16 specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;</li> <li>17 correct?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's</li> <li>19 only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which</li> <li>20 means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same</li> <li>21 point.</li> <li>22 Usually within the wind project they operate at</li> <li>23 similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer</li> <li>24 readings and you compress hours worth of this data and</li> <li>50 COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the</li> <li>24 readings and you compress hours worth of this data and</li> <li>50 COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the</li> <li>24 pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed</li> </ul>		pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I		have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off.
6back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of77the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is88that correct?99THE WITNESS: That's correct.910COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the1011microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what1112frequency range?1213THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests14between 0 and 20 hertz.15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;17correct?18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's19only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which20usually within the wind project they operate at21usually within the wind project they operate at23coMMISSIONER NELSON: And won you take the microbarometer24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and	2	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't	2	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound
7the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is7to do that, but of individuals that you have observed8that correct?8that have made these type of complaints and where you9THE WITNESS: That's correct.910COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the1011microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what1112frequency range?1213THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests1314between 0 and 20 hertz.1415COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the1516specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;1617correct?1718THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's1819only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which1920means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same2021Usually within the wind project they operate at2323Similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer2324readings and you compress hours worth of this data and2424readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24	2 3 4	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them.	2 3 4	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects.
8that correct?8that have made these type of complaints and where you9THE WITNESS: That's correct.9have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what10COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the10level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.11microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what10level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.12frequency range?11THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure13THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests13with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can14between 0 and 20 hertz.13correct?1416specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?17pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which10to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the20Usually within the wind project they operate at23coMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24DUMISSIONER NELSON: And so, bagain, so th	2 3 4 5	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go	2 3 4 5	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a
<ul> <li>9 THE WITNESS: That's correct.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the</li> <li>11 microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what</li> <li>12 frequency range?</li> <li>13 THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests</li> <li>14 between 0 and 20 hertz.</li> <li>15 COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the</li> <li>16 specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;</li> <li>17 correct?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's</li> <li>19 only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which</li> <li>20 means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same</li> <li>21 point.</li> <li>22 Usually within the wind project they operate at</li> <li>23 similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer</li> <li>24 readings and you compress hours worth of this data and</li> <li>9 have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what</li> <li>10 level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.</li> <li>11 THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure</li> <li>12 level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people</li> <li>13 with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can</li> <li>14 respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.</li> <li>15 Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we</li> <li>16 have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a</li> <li>17 pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's</li> <li>18 say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 65</li> <li>19 only because wind turbines turn at the same</li> <li>20 average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the</li> <li>21 crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological</li> <li>22 response.</li> <li>23 COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the</li> <li>24 readings and you compress hours worth of this data and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of	2 3 4 5 6	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified
10COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the10level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.11microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what11THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure12frequency range?12level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people13THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests13with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can14between 0 and 20 hertz.14respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?17pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the20Usually within the wind project they operate at20rest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological22Usually within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the23similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is	2 3 4 5 6 7	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed
11microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what11THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure12frequency range?12level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people13THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests13with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can14between 0 and 20 hertz.14respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?17pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the20Usually within the wind project they operate at21crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological22Usually within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you
12frequency range?12level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people13THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests13with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can14between 0 and 20 hertz.14respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?17pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the20Usually within the wind project they operate at21crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological22Usually within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what
13THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests13with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can14between 0 and 20 hertz.13with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?1618THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's19only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which20means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same21point.22Usually within the wind project they operate at23similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.
14between 0 and 20 hertz.14respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct?16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?17pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.22Usually within the wind project they operate at similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer readings and you compress hours worth of this data and23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure
15COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct?15Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct?16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a17correct?16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.22Usually within the wind project they operate at similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer readings and you compress hours worth of this data and2324readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people
16specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct?16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.16have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a 1720means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.21Usually within the wind project they operate at similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer readings and you compress hours worth of this data and23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can
17correct?17pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the20means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same20average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the21point.21crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological22Usually within the wind project they operate at23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.
18THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6519only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.18say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 6520means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.20average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.22Usually within the wind project they operate at similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer readings and you compress hours worth of this data and23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average. Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we
19only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.22Usually within the wind project they operate at similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer readings and you compress hours worth of this data and19to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.23Similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average. Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a</li> </ul>
20means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.20average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological21Usually within the wind project they operate at similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer readings and you compress hours worth of this data and20average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the 2122Usually within the wind project they operate at readings and you compress hours worth of this data and20average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the 2223COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average. Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's</li> </ul>
21point.21crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological22Usually within the wind project they operate at22response.23similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct? THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average. Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 65
22Usually within the wind project they operate at22response.23similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct? THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average. Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 65 to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the
23similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer23COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the24readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct? THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.</li> <li>Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 65 to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the</li> </ul>
24 readings and you compress hours worth of this data and24 pulse at 50 dB is where you have received or observed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct? THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off. Can't be explained by normal audible sound effects. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints. THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average. Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 65 to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct? THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point. Usually within the wind project they operate at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off.</li> <li>Can't be explained by normal audible sound</li> <li>effects.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.</li> <li>Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 65 to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.</li> </ul>
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	pointing out to us very early on in your discussion I will be honest when I saw those exhibits when they were initially submitted they looked Greek to me so I didn't study them. Now that you've explained them I'm going to go back and study them and if I remember correctly, one of the axis on there talked about different frequencies; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's correct. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so does the microbarometer test various frequencies and if so what frequency range? THE WITNESS: The microbarometer I'm using tests between 0 and 20 hertz. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So you can identify the specific sources of the infrasound that you're testing; correct? THE WITNESS: That's right. Because and it's only because wind turbines turn at the same RPM which means the blade moves in front of the tower at the same point. Usually within the wind project they operate at similar RPMs. And when you take the microbarometer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>have these symptoms that can't be explained Excuse me. Turn those off.</li> <li>Can't be explained by normal audible sound</li> <li>effects.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I'm not looking for a medical conclusion because I don't think you're qualified to do that, but of individuals that you have observed that have made these type of complaints and where you have measured the level of infrasound in their home, what level of infrasound have you associated with complaints.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: When the average sound pressure level of the tones gets over 50 dB then we see people with serious complaints. The most sensitive people can respond at 40 but I'm talking about average.</li> <li>Remember I said it's a pressure pulse so if we have a wind turbine blade coming down and it creates a pulse, there's a high-rise much above 50 in fact let's say the average was 50. The pulse would probably be 65 to 70 and then a long period without anything. So the average doesn't look that high. It's the peak or the crest of the pulse that's triggering the physiological response.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so, again, so the</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 193		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 195
1	THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes. There are some that	1	all be done in one night, not two weeks.
2	are very sensitive who even at 40 average will have	2	COMMISSIONER NELSON: But from what you're
3	complaints, but when it gets to 50 people start	3	explaining to me it's got to be the right night and
4	complaining. And in homes where you get over 60 they	4	nobody really knows when that is going to be; correct?
5	start talking about leaving their home when it's over 60	5	THE WITNESS: That's right. It may mean that we
6	by any significant amount on a regular basis they will	6	set up the instruments and we have to spend some evenings
7	leave their home and it's because they just give up.	7	waiting for the conditions to be right, yes. But that's
8	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. I appreciate	8	still a lot less time than two weeks.
9	going through that discussion.	9	COMMISSIONER NELSON: The condition that you
10	I want to shift now to the dBA measurements that	10	described, windy up above, still down below, so I'm a
11	are being proposed for this wind project. And you	11	South Dakotan for my entire life. Wind in
12	indicated that and you explained why you don't believe	12	South Dakota we've got a windy state. Is the
13	a two week measurement works. You've suggested a	13	phenomenon that you described, is that something that
14	10-minute average. Is it correct that you would only do	14	occurs everywhere? Because I know that wind is not the
15	that 10-minute average when the turbines are at full	15	same everywhere.
16	speed.	16	THE WITNESS: It's a phenomena created by solar
17	THE WITNESS: That would be the point of making	17	heating. Let me explain how that happens.
18	the measurement, yes. That's why the Mr. Hessler was	18	During the day the sun warms the ground. The
19	asked this morning about an on/off test. The proper way	19	warm ground causes air near it to rise and this mixes
20	to take a test of a machine like a wind turbine is to	20	with the upper-level winds creating a smooth gradient.
21	find an ANSI S 12.9 Part 3 compliance test, and on a day	21	The wind speed increases. The more you go from the
22	when the wind turbines are operating at full power and	22	ground up the wind speed goes up.
23	there's no wind at the ground this is a stable	23	At night when the sun goes down the ground
24	atmospheric condition. It's very common in the Midwest,	24	cools. Now we have cool air at the bottom, warm air up
25	the national renewable energy labs has done studies in	25	above and cool air sinks so we have this layer of maybe
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 194		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 196
1	prairie states saying it's roughly two out of every three	1	100 feet deep. Sometimes less than that. Sometimes you
2	nights where this condition occurs with calm winds with	2	can see the top of the trees wiggling but there won't be
3	high upper-level winds. So the wind turbines running but	3	enough breeze at the ground to induce leaf Russell.
4	there's no leaf rustle to mask them.	4	The National Renewable Energy Lab study and I
5	You take that condition. You have the wind	5	think one of the places they did the test was
6	turbines operating. They're turned off. Another reading	6	South Dakota, either that or one of the other plain
7	is taken and as long as there's a 6 decibel or so	7	states showed that that occurs about two out of three
8	difference between the on and the off, you can be fairly	8	nights during the warm season. And it is a
9	sure in saying that the on condition measurement was the	9	characteristic that meteorologists in other cases where
10	wind turbines not background sound. If it's over 10,	10	I've testified have agreed. And in acoustics we use that
11	then it's absolute, if there's a 10.	11	condition as the best test condition.
12	And as long as we have Mr. Hall's data showing	12	For example, the model, the ISO model that Mr.
13	that levels in the community are 22 to 28 at night, if	13	Hall used for his prediction makes the assumption that
14	the wind turbine sound was 40 and it was turned off I	14	the weather conditions are calm wind at the ground and if
15	would expect the sound then to drop to 28 and we would	15	you'll read it, it will say a stable atmospheric
16	know then the contribution of the wind turbine without	16	environment. That is the ideal condition for testing
17	any concern over whether other things had contaminated or	17	noise and that is what I'm saying would be the condition
18	affected the sound.	18	for testing wind turbines knowing from my own experience
19	There's operational data, SCADA data S C ADA,	19	and from what I have learned about meteorology over my 45
20	that I have used in hearings where I can correlate my	20	years that there will be many nights when the wind
21	readings with the exact operating mode, the speed, the	21	turbines will be at full power even though the wind at
22	blade angles, the power output, et cetera, and all of	22	the ground level is moderate.
23	that can be brought to bear for a simple on/off test to	23 24	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I think the last and I
24 25	make sure that the test is fair and assesses only wind turbine noise and not other types of noise. And it can	24	appreciate that discussion. I think the last question.
	undure noise and not other types of noise. And it can	25	You made the statement in relation to infrasound and you

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 197		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 199
1	said, and I think I quote this correctly, "it's unstudied	1	over distance, if it does.
2	but a major concern."	2	THE WITNESS: Infrasound is a I'll call it
3	How can we make sound decisions on something	3	infrasound is not absorbed by air. The energy
4	that is unstudied?	4	infrasonic rate is not absorbed by air as the audible
5	THE WITNESS: You can't. All you can do is	5	sounds are.
6	the precautionary principal says that we err on the side	6	The farther you get away from a high frequency
7	of safety. If we know that we have people complaining	7	noise, even speech, not only is distance a factor but
8	about the distances of a mile and a quarter or two miles,	8	that energy's being absorbed by ear molecules.
9	then we have to take that into consideration until the	9	Infrasound doesn't do that. Infrasound isn't
10	science those us that that isn't a problem.	10	blocked by physical things, for example. It goes through
11	And this is something that's always baffled me.	11	a house as though the house wasn't even there. And I
12	Why are the project why are we permitting projects	12	believe that Mr. Hessler's work at Shirley Wind showed
13	near homes when there's still other areas where we could	13	that the levels outside the house and inside were almost
14	have wind turbines out at greater distances while the	14	roughly the same.
15	research goes on.	15	Infrasound is a particularly long propagating.
16	So my position has been under the precautionary	16	But elephants for example in Africa use infrasound to
17	principal that until we know enough about why these	17	communicate, a deep bellow. And they can communicate
18	problems occur, that we should be more cautious in	18	over hundreds of kilometers. We use infrasound to detect
19	allowing wind turbines near residential homes.	19	distant nuclear bombs, for example. The micro barometer
20	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.	20	that I use is used by the U.S. government with detectors
21	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.	21	to detect when bombs are set off halfway around the
22	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Go ahead. I have one more	22	world.
23	question whenever.	23	An infrasonic pulse if it's sufficiently strong
24	MR. DE HUECK: We'll go down to Commissioner	24	enough can go around the world and have almost as much
25	Fiegen. And I'll just announce for the room Cheri really	25	intensity as afterwards. There's anecdotal evidence when
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 198		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 200
1	needs a break. She's been at it for a long time. So	1	Krakatoa erupted microbarometers all over the world went
2	when we're done with Commission questions we're going to	2	off and they showed the echo of that eruption propagating
3	take a recess.	3	around the earth several times. So infrasound is just
4	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: In your testimony,	4	one of those things that is hard to stop.
5	Mr. James, your written prefiled testimony, you talk	5	And even though wind turbines aren't like a
6	about Michigan and Ohio and a noise trespass.	6	nuclear bomb, the sound is more than sufficient to
7	Have they used that in relation, the noise	7	propagate miles. I have measured infrasound tones at
8	trespass in Michigan and Ohio?	8	distances of 6 miles. I have colleagues who have
9	THE WITNESS: In Michigan, yes. A number of	9	measured in the distances of 50 miles. Where you can
10	communities have passed ordinances that encourage that to	10 11	clearly see the tones that we see in my examples.
11 12	happen. Basically encourage they set restrictive limits, 45 not to exceed, for example. That's an Lmax.	12	And, again, this depends on how many wind turbines. One wind turbine isn't going to be detectable
13	And then they let the developer negotiate with the	13	50 miles away. But a bank of 200 wind turbines will be
14	landowners for easements.	14	clearly distinguishable at much greater distances than
15	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: And they haven't used it in	15	the single one. And when we start talking about these
16	Ohio.	16	projects getting larger and larger we get to the point
17	THE WITNESS: I don't know. Ohio's still	17	like we have up in Ontario where there's no place within
18	arguing over things that actually in a case that	18	southern Ontario where we can't put up a microbarometer
19	Mr. Hessler and I were involved in called Buckeye Wind	19	and detect wind turbine tones.
20	back in the early 2000s. They're still arguing over that	20	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So when you measured
21	case.	21	infrasound at 6 miles what was the level?
22	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.	22	THE WITNESS: It was down around 40. Average
23	COMMISSIONER NELSON: My apology to Cheri. I	23	40.
24	have another couple of questions.	24	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so presumably as you
25	Help me understand how infrasound dissipates	25	would move further out it would ratchet down and at some
23 24	COMMISSIONER NELSON: My apology to Cheri. I have another couple of questions.	23 24	40. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so presumably as y would move further out it would ratchet down and at some

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 201		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 203
1	point hit zero.	1	correct?
2	THE WITNESS: No, it doesn't hit zero. It just	2	THE WITNESS: That's close. You're probably
3	blends into the other infrasound that's there. I mean	3	you're probably right sound trespass but noise means
4	just the fact that the earth is rotating and friction in	4	unwanted sound. If a person didn't bother them, then it
5	the atmosphere produces some infrasound. So you get to	5	wouldn't be a trespass.
6	the point where there's a background infrasound even when	6	What I'm concerned about is uncompensated
7	you don't have wind gusts and other things triggering it.	7	easements. And when we begin to have government bodies
8	But at this point when I'm asking what is the distance we	8	set a standard that goes to a home, not to the property
9	should be concerned of, the board of health in Brown	9	line, it results in uncompensated easements. And that's
10	County, which has debated this for eight years now	10	what concerns me.
11	basically has said that the radius of the human health	11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm a strong believer in
12	hazard is 2 and a half miles around the wind project.	12	property rights as well. But there's and semantics
13	And that seems to encapsulate most of the people who are	13	aside from noise and sound, when you get into something
14	sensitive and it takes people who are really sensitive	14	of that nature, does my air conditioning unit outside my
15	beyond that, one of which I have an example in my	15	house, do I need to compensate my neighbor for the noise
16	exhibit, to sense it. But for practical purposes, any	16	that that creates or the airplane that flies overhead or
17	time you're within a mile is going to be very significant	17	the street construction work or on and on and on that
18	and even at 2 and 2 and a half miles we'll have people	18	take place throughout the world daily in everyone's life.
19	who if they are sensitive will report those sensations.	19	I mean, that just seems so extraordinarily
20	Whether it triggers, you know, an adverse reaction or not	20	unworkable and unrealistic. It's when the noise is is
21	depends on them. I have an acoustician friend Dr. Malcom	21	really in a trespass sense. And I know you're trying to
22	Swinbanks who has published papers about his own	22	get to that point, but I just don't see that you're
23	sensitivity. And he uses his sensitivity to infrasound	23	reaching that.
24	pulsations as an expert for the U.S. Department of	24	THE WITNESS: You know, I I understand the
25	Defense in protecting our military against infrasound.	25	issue of air conditioners but let me use that as an
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 202		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 204
1	Because he can feel it, he doesn't have to look at his	1	example.
2	meter to know whether it's present.	2	The air conditioning industry since I was a
3	I know three other acousticians who also can	3	young kid back in the '50s has done extensive work in
4	sense these pressure pulsations. It's not as rare as	4	making the sound of an outdoor air conditioning condenser
5	Mr. Hessler might like to make it out. If my limited	5	compatible with community noise standards or community
6 7	number of acousticians friends include three that are using it as tools, then it's more prevalent in the	6 7	lifestyle. When I bought my new air conditioner a couple of
8	population than we might expect.	8	years ago it came with all sorts of noise data showing
9	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.	9	the impact on my neighbor and how that impact would be
10	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. James, all of the	10	acceptable. Also in my community there are other sounds
11	positions and thoughts and premises that you're using	11	at night that raise the level up to about 30, 35 dBA. So
12	seem to boil down to a conclusion, and I would like to	12	my expectation here is that the my neighbor if they
13	read what I believe is your conclusion. I've written	13	put in a wind turbine or an air conditioner will also
14	that down, and I it may be a little bit lengthy, but	14	put in one that has been designed to be compatible with
15	I'd just like you to pause and wait until I ask you if	15	the acoustic environment of the community.
16	that is correct or not.	16	Wind turbines haven't been designed for that.
17	You're obviously a strong supporter of property	17	Wind turbines are still in their early years. That
18	rights. And on page 6 line 174 there's a question	18	doesn't mean that some day they won't have one. It just
19	pertaining to that. And all this seems to boil down to	19	means that right now a wind turbine is like an old air
20	your position that sound levels that are generated from	20	conditioner in 1950 with a noisy fan or noisy pump and
21	the wind turbines may not exceed the ambient sound level	21	other mechanical sounds, that until they can design wind
22	existing at the property line of nonparticipants unless	22	turbines that are more compatible with being close to
23	the utility developer operator is willing to provide	23	homes, they should put their hardware out in areas where
24	compensation for the what you call noise trespass or	24	people aren't there. Or if a person willing to accept
25	the what I would call sound as opposed to noise; is that	25	the noise compensate them.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 205		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 207
1	In my career with workers, there are a number of	1	where I went through a Daubert hearing in a court here in
2	jobs where the noise was unbearable, but my employers	2	Michigan. It was McBain, Michigan I can get the specific
3	or my clients who were their employers would pay them	3	reference for the record later I don't have it in my
4	extra and they would take that extra money as	4	hands but in that case I was after the Daubert hearing
5	compensation for the noise.	5	I was qualified as an acoustician.
6	People have a people have a right to privacy,	6	In fact, if everyone would turn to my Exhibit 1, my
7	but if you say are you willing to exchange it for X	7	bio materials, I have the exact quote from that decision
8	number of dollars a year, there willing to do it. And	8	on that page so that people can follow along. It's the
9	that allows each property owner to participate in the	9	page bio materials for Richard R. James, November 8,
10	process to the extent they want. And that's why I kind	10	2017.
11	of lean towards it.	11	At the bottom of that page there is a table showing
12	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.	12	some of the example qualifications and at the very bottom
13	THE WITNESS: Yeah. If wind turbines were air	13	is the Michigan court case where I went through a Daubert
14	conditioners, it may be different.	14	hearing, and the judge concluded that I was an
15	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. James. I	15	acoustician with expertise in measurement of wind turbine
16	understand that we have moved a great deal with, for	16	noise and its effects on people and I was qualified to
17	instance, automobiles or you can hardly even hear them	17	
18		18	opine that the Plaintiff's symptoms were caused by the Defendant's wind turbines after that special Daubert
19	when you're standing right next to them.	19	
20	THE WITNESS: That's right.	20	hearing.
20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: And there's been a great	20	In Alberta, Canada I've also been simply qualified
22	deal of however, you would have to accept that there	22	to speak to not only the noise but also human response to
22	have been significant advances in the wind turbines of	22	noise, and that is the typical qualifications that I have
23 24	today as compared to 20 or 30 years ago. I won't take exception with your premises and argue those premises	23	been granted in other jurisdictions. Q. And what was the name of that Michigan case?
24 25		24	
23	that's up to the other folks here. But I'll give it as	23	, ,
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 206	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 208
1	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel	1	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get
2	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your	2	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it.
2 3	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.	2 3	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission
2 3 4	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.	2 3 4	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to.
2 3 4 5	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock.	2 3 4 5	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later.
2 3 4 5 6	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.)	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it.</li> <li>Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later.</li> <li>Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it.</li> <li>Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later.</li> <li>Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay?</li> <li>A. I will.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it.</li> <li>Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later.</li> <li>Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay?</li> <li>A. I will.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand. Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it.</li> <li>Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later.</li> <li>Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay?</li> <li>A. I will.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel</li> <li>that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your</li> <li>presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> <li>Mr. James is on the witness stand.</li> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished</li> <li>with cross-examination first round. We're going back to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it.</li> <li>Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later.</li> <li>Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay?</li> <li>A. I will.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand. Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay? A. I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand. Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect. <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay? A. I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation. THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you. MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand. Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect. <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay? A. I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.     THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.     MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock.         (A short recess is taken.)     MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand.     Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.     <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALMONDE:     Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been</u></pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay? A. I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.     THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.     MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock.         (A short recess is taken.)     MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand.     Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.     <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALMOND: Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give</u></pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay? A. I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.     THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.     MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock.         (A short recess is taken.)     MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand.     Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.     <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALMOND: Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on</u></pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. Q. Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. Q. We'll just provide it later. Okay? A. I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.     THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.     MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock.         (A short recess is taken.)     MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session. Mr. James is on the witness stand.     Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.     <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALMOND:     Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people?</u></pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> <li>Mr. James is on the witness stand.</li> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.</li> <li><u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No. MR. DE HUECK: And Staff.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. (A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> <li>Mr. James is on the witness stand.</li> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.</li> <li><u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you provide a citation to the Commission of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No. MR. DE HUECK: And Staff. MS. EDWARDS: Briefly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. <ul> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> </ul> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect. <ul> <li><u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND: <ul> <li>Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Q. And can you provide a citation to the Commission of what that case was?</li>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No. MR. DE HUECK: And Staff. MS. EDWARDS: Briefly. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock.     <ul> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. James is on the witness stand.</li> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.</li> <li><u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> BY MR. ALMOND: <ul> <li><b>Q</b>. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people?</li> <li><b>A</b>. Yes.</li> <li><b>Q</b>. And can you provide a citation to the Commission of what that case was?</li> <li><b>A</b>. The case</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No. MR. DE HUECK: And Staff. MS. EDWARDS: Briefly. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. <ul> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. James is on the witness stand.</li> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.</li> <li><u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you provide a citation to the Commission of what that case was?</li> <li>A. The case</li> <li>Q. Maybe not the citation but can you tell us the case</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No. MR. DE HUECK: And Staff. MS. EDWARDS: Briefly. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <b>BY MS. EDWARDS:</b> <b>Q.</b> Can you turn to Staff Exhibit S-5? Do you have all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. <ul> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. James is on the witness stand.</li> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.</li> </ul> <b>BY MR. ALMOND: Q.</b> First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people? <b>A.</b> Yes. <b>Q.</b> And can you provide a citation to the Commission of what that case was? <b>A.</b> The case <b>Q.</b> Maybe not the citation but can you tell us the case name and where it was located at?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No. MR. DE HUECK: And Staff. MS. EDWARDS: Briefly. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <b>BY MS. EDWARDS</b> : <b>Q.</b> Can you turn to Staff Exhibit S-5? Do you have all the exhibits in front of you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>much weight as I can to what you've said where I feel that it's justifiable to do so. So thank you for your presentation.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We will recess until 4 o'clock. <ul> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: We are back in session.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. James is on the witness stand.</li> <li>Mr. James, you're still under oath. We finished with cross-examination first round. We're going back to Mr. Almond for redirect.</li> <li><u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. First question, Mr. James. Have you ever been permitted to testify in the United States Court to give opinions on noise generated by wind turbines' effects on people?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you provide a citation to the Commission of what that case was?</li> <li>A. The case</li> <li>Q. Maybe not the citation but can you tell us the case</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	names. If you want let me pull it up here. I can get it. <b>Q.</b> Well, no. Let's not do that. Unless the Commission would like him to. MR. DE HUECK: Just provide it to us later. <b>Q.</b> We'll just provide it later. Okay? <b>A.</b> I will. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Mr. James. THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, any cross-examination based on Commission questions? MR. FUERNISS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. MS. JENKINS: No. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour. MS. PAZOUR: No. MR. DE HUECK: And Staff. MS. EDWARDS: Briefly. <u>RECROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <b>BY MS. EDWARDS:</b> <b>Q.</b> Can you turn to Staff Exhibit S-5? Do you have all

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 209		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 211
1	Q. Yes. S 5.	1	<b>Q.</b> And earlier you testified that 15 percent of the
2	<ul><li>A. Okay. Opening it up here. I think everyone else is</li></ul>	2	population would be susceptible to infrasound. So would
3	opening it too because it's slow to respond.	3	not then 15 percent of the population of southern Ontario
4	Q. Just let me know when you get there.	4	be ill?
5	<ul> <li>A. I will. It's opening slowly.</li> </ul>	5	A. No. That was 15 percent were subject to the audible
6	Okay. I have the document open.	6	sound. 15 percent found levels of 40 Leq and higher were
7	Q. Okay. And I would like to?	7	susceptible.
8	A. Which page?	8	In my let's look at Shirley Wind. When Shirley
9	<b>Q.</b> Direct your attention to page 8 of 27.	9	Wind when the Brown County Health Department began to
10	<b>A.</b> Okay. Is that 2-8? Or 2-7? Is that the page with	10	explore it the initial complaints were three families.
11	question 2-7?	11	By the end of their investigation they had 70 families
12	Q. Right.	12	that had reported either audible sound or infrasound
13	<b>A.</b> Or 2-8.	13	related symptoms. And this was for a small project with
14	<b>Q.</b> I'm looking at the question before that which would	14	eight wind turbines in a relatively small dairy farming
15	be 2-6 but I'm looking at the answer so	15	community.
16	A. Okay. Okay. Okay. I believe that was the response	16	So what is the percentage that are affected? We
17	by Dr. Alves-Pereira.	17	don't know. <mark>Health Canada, for example, their study</mark>
18	<b>Q.</b> Correct. And do you see at the very end there where	18	found that at one and a quarter mile so we're talking
19	she responded that there are currently no scientifically	19	2 kilometers they asked people within that distance if
20	valid studies providing numerical data on safe distances	20	they had tinnitus, ringing in the ears, migraines,
21	that can effectively protect families against ILFN	21	dizziness, et cetera. Well, we know that the general
22	contaminated homes?	22	population that the percentage of the general
23	A. That is very true because acousticians have ignored	23	population with dizziness and tinnitus, et cetera is
24	low frequency and infrasound since the '70s when I	24	roughly around 1 out of 10 people, and yet at a mile and
25	started out and they concluded that audible A-weighted	25	a quarter from the wind turbines in the Health Canada
			ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 212
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 210		KOUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 212
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 210 sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've	1	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher
1 2		2	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates.
	sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've		Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher
2 3 4	sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum. <b>Q.</b> How could you set a limit if there's no	2 3 4	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was
2 3	sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.	2	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher (prevalence rates.) They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've</li> <li>underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency</li> <li>end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no</li> <li>statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've</li> <li>underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency</li> <li>end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no</li> <li>statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the</li> <li>criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've</li> <li>underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency</li> <li>end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no</li> <li>statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the</li> <li>criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were</li> <li>familiar with different types of problems got together</li> <li>and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians and their</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum. <b>Q.</b> How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data? <b>A.</b> Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians and their experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum. <b>Q.</b> How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data? <b>A.</b> Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty of experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians and their experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty of experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in response to which Commissioner question that there's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've</li> <li>underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency</li> <li>end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no</li> <li>statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the</li> <li>criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were</li> <li>familiar with different types of problems got together</li> <li>and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the</li> <li>EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was</li> <li>based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty</li> <li>of experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty</li> <li>of experience with IFLN but governments don't because</li> <li>they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in</li> <li>response to which Commissioner question that there's</li> <li>nowhere you can go in Ontario and not be subject or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. No further questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians and their experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in response to which Commissioner question that there's nowhere you can go in Ontario and not be subject or not be able to pick up infrasound; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Any Commission follow up?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty of experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in response to which Commissioner question that there's nowhere you can go in Ontario and not be subject or not be able to pick up infrasound; correct?</li> <li>A. I said southern Ontario. Basically if you go from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Any Commission follow up? Okay. Commissioner Nelson has a question for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians and their experiences in the field. And acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in response to which Commissioner question that there's nowhere you can go in Ontario and not be subject or not be able to pick up infrasound; correct?</li> <li>A. I said southern Ontario. Basically if you go from the western edge of southern Ontario on lake Huron over</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. No further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Any Commission follow up? Okay. Commissioner Nelson has a question for you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in response to which Commissioner question that there's nowhere you can go in Ontario and not be subject or not be able to pick up infrasound; correct?</li> <li>A. I said southern Ontario. Basically if you go from the western edge of southern Ontario on lake Huron over to the east of Toronto along Lake Eerie any area along</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. No further questions. MR, DE HUECK: Any Commission follow up? Okay. Commissioner Nelson has a question for you. THE WITNESS: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in response to which Commissioner question that there's nowhere you can go in Ontario and not be subject or not be able to pick up infrasound; correct?</li> <li>A. I said southern Ontario. Basically if you go from the western edge of southern Ontario on lake Huron over to the east of Toronto along Lake Eerie any area along there there is I think 1,700 wind turbines in that area.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints. MR. DE HUECK: Any Commission follow up? Okay. Commissioner Nelson has a question for you. THE WITNESS: Okay. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Earlier I asked you to try
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>sounds would be the focus of regulations. We've underserved the communities by ignoring the low frequency end of the spectrum.</li> <li>Q. How could you set a limit if there's no statistically reliable data?</li> <li>A. Well, to be very honest, the same way we set the criteria back in the 1970s. Acousticians who were familiar with different types of problems got together and pooled their data and came up with, for example, the EPA has an L D N on 55 for urban environments. It was based upon consensus among acousticians have plenty of experience with IFLN but governments don't because they've all focused on dBA criteria.</li> <li>Q. Okay. You testified, and I don't remember in response to which Commissioner question that there's nowhere you can go in Ontario and not be subject or not be able to pick up infrasound; correct?</li> <li>A. I said southern Ontario. Basically if you go from the western edge of southern Ontario on lake Huron over to the east of Toronto along Lake Eerie any area along</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Study they were reporting 20 percent and higher prevalence rates. They couldn't explain what caused it. They tended to ignore it. But I used to say a mile and a quarter was a safe distance. Safe meaning safe. Now I can't say that. The Health Canada data calls it into question because we can't explain why these symptoms of low frequency noise, tinnitus, migraines, pressure pulsations, et cetera, nausea are so prevalent at that distance. Audible sound would have died off by a mile and a quarter. It would only be the low frequency and infrasound that's present in those homes. So the more with learn about the problem the more we begin to see that even what would be considered large setbacks may not prevent some of the complaints. MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. No further questions. MR, DE HUECK: Any Commission follow up? Okay. Commissioner Nelson has a question for you. THE WITNESS: Okay.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 213		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 215
1	infrasound would occur uniformly over distance since	1	infrasound is significant enough to trigger the
2	there appears to be no impediments to it. Is that	2	sensations of the distances of a mile and a quarter to
3	accurate?	3	two miles in those sensitive individuals.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes. It it it propagates	4	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Have you measured
5	with very decrease in sound level over great distances,	5	infrasound the level of infrasound at a turbine?
6	which is an advantage if you're an elephant trying to	6	THE WITNESS: Right at a turbine it wouldn't be
7	communicate to another elephant but it's a disadvantage	7	very high and that's because the sound's occurring up
8	if you're looking at a noise source that produces	8	above and it's radiating out.
9	infrasonic pulses because that problem propagates much	9	I mean, a wind turbine the sound is radiating
10	farther than the audible sounds.	10	off the blades and, therefore, when you're close to it
11	COMMISSIONER NELSON: So how many since it	11	actually one of the quietest places near a wind turbine
12	dissipates at a uniform rate over distance, how many dB	12	is right at the base of the tower.
13	does it decrease per mile?	13	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I understand that. So
14	THE WITNESS: Well, it again, it sound	14	at what distance would the infrasound be maximized?
15	drops off proportional to the distance. If we're talking	15	THE WITNESS: It becomes more repattable (check)
16	about audible sound.	16	when we're out at distances let's say a thousand feet.
17	COMMISSIONER NELSON: No we're not talking about	17	And for a one hertz infrasonic tone it takes a thousand
18	audible sound. We're talking about infrasound.	18	feet for the wavelength to form. So within that you can
19	THE WITNESS: Well audible sound decreases at 6	19	get numbers within that distance the numbers can vary
20	dB per doubling of distance. Infrasound is more like 1	20	all over but as you get a little further away the wave
21	or 2 dB per doubling of distance.	21	form is fully developed and the propagation becomes
22	And in my tests I kind of lean towards the 2	22	somewhat measurable.
23	mile, mile and a quarter as the separating difference	23	But it depends on how it's reflected off the
24	between a lot of people, a significant number, let's say	24	ground, how it's reflected off the ionosphere and other
25	10 percent, having complaints and after that it becomes	25	atmospheric conditions. And it's very variable. Low
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 214		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 216
1	much more spotty.	1	frequency noise problems are hard to trace because of
2	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Let me delve into your	2	these issues.
3	answer 1 or 2 dB per doubling of distance.	3	And wind turbine sounds fit into that category.
4	So between 5 feet and 10 feet it reduces 1 and	4	One day it could be perfectly fine. The next day it
5	2 1 or 2.	5	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're
5 6	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah.	5 6	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric
5 6 7	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense.	5 6 7	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound.
5 6 7 8	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at	5 6 7 8	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have
5 6 7 8 9	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's	5 6 7 8 9	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating
5 6 7 8 9	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will	5 6 7 8 9	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine?
5 6 7 8 9	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>2 1 or 2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yeah.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at</li> <li>100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's</li> <li>smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will</li> <li>be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters</li> <li>it becomes 94.</li> </ul>	5 6 7 8 9	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>2 1 or 2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yeah.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at</li> <li>100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's</li> <li>smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will</li> <li>be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters</li> <li>it becomes 94.</li> </ul>	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more meters.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at that distance.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more meters. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So I understand	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at that distance. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what would cause the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more meters. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So I understand that math. And so then my question is is it 1 or is it 2	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at that distance. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what would cause the distance between it being 60 or it being 85?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more meters. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So I understand that math. And so then my question is is it 1 or is it 2 decibels? That's a big difference.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at that distance. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what would cause the distance between it being 60 or it being 85? THE WITNESS: Well, the 60 is the average, but
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more meters. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So I understand that math. And so then my question is is it 1 or is it 2 decibels? That's a big difference. THE WITNESS: Yes. It depends upon the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at that distance. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what would cause the distance between it being 60 or it being 85? THE WITNESS: Well, the 60 is the average, but remember a pulse and then quiet so what we're doing is
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more meters. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So I understand that math. And so then my question is is it 1 or is it 2 decibels? That's a big difference. THE WITNESS: Yes. It depends upon the atmospheric conditions, and it depends upon the surface	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound. COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine? THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there? THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at that distance. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what would cause the distance between it being 60 or it being 85? THE WITNESS: Well, the 60 is the average, but remember a pulse and then quiet so what we're doing is we're averaging a very large short-term sound with a lot
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2 1 or 2. THE WITNESS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER NELSON: That doesn't make sense. THE WITNESS: Well, let's say it starts out at 100 at 1 meter away. And I'll use meters because it's smooth. 1 meter away it's 100. So at 2 meters it will be let's say 98. At 4 meters it becomes 96. At 8 meters it becomes 94. And so you can see that as we get to a significant distance like 500 meters it now in order to get another decibel of reduction we've got to go 500 more meters. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So I understand that math. And so then my question is is it 1 or is it 2 decibels? That's a big difference. THE WITNESS: Yes. It depends upon the atmospheric conditions, and it depends upon the surface conditions but and that's why I say 1 or 2. Because	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>could be much noisier just due to I'm assuming they're operating the same. Just due to how the atmospheric boundary layers are reflecting the sound.         COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I'm going to ask have you measured infrasound 1,000 feet away from an operating turbine?         THE WITNESS: Yes. Multiple times.         COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what level would you typically find there?         THE WITNESS: Probably in the 60s to 70s average with peaks up around 85. That was my first paper was at that distance.         COMMISSIONER NELSON: And what would cause the distance between it being 60 or it being 85?         THE WITNESS: Well, the 60 is the average, but remember a pulse and then quiet so what we're doing is we're averaging a very large short-term sound with a lot of quiet after it so that average drops down. But it's </pre>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	217	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 219
1	were giving me were just the peak numbers. So 85 would	1	
2	be the peak?	2	
3	THE WITNESS: Yeah. 85. Whereas the average	3	
4	would be 50 to 60.	4	MR. DE HUECK: Can you slow down a little bit
5	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.	5	for the court reporter and identify yourself.
6	MR. DE HUECK: Reiss, any redirect after	e	A. I'm Jerry Punch. I live in open us, Michigan where
7	Commissioner Nelson's question?	7	I'm seated right now. I appreciate the opportunity to
8	No.	8	not to have to make the trip to South Dakota by the way.
9	Mr. James, thank you for your testimony	9	I have been an audiologist since 1967 so I have
10	MS. SMITH: Excuse me, Mr. de Hueck, I got	10	really about 50 years experience as an audiologist. My
11	skipped, and I didn't want to interrupt.	11	educational background is with a master's of science
12	Is it okay? I just have one question.	12	degree in hearing and speech sciences from Vanderbilt
13	MR. DE HUECK: Yep.	13	university and a Ph.D. in audiology from Northwestern
14	RECROSS-EXAMINATION	14	University. I've been a teacher, a clinician, a
15	BY MS. SMITH:	15	researcher, an administrator in a number of settings,
16	<b>Q.</b> Mr. James, you had previously talked about the	16	5
17	Shirley Wind Farm in response to some of the questions	17	The last 20 years 21 years I 've been at Michigan
18	that you were asked; is that correct?	18	
19	A. That's correct.	19	5
20	<b>Q.</b> And you mentioned that the board of health declared	20	
21	the wind farm a human hazard. Is that true?	21	
22	<ul> <li>A. The exact term is human health hazard.</li> <li>A. Uuman health hazard</li> </ul>	22	
23 24	Q. Human health hazard.	23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
24 25	Are you aware that that designation was rescinded in 2015 due to insufficient evidence of a link between wind	25	
			which you look down we can creatly see your tips so it
20	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO OUOTEL	218	
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	218	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 220
1 2	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! farms and people's health issues? <b>A.</b> No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the	218	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       220         you can either back up while you speak or alternatively
1	farms and people's health issues?	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.
1 2	farms and people's health issues? A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       220         you can either back up while you speak or alternatively       if you can adjust your camera down.         (Discussion off the record.)
1 2 3	<ul><li>farms and people's health issues?</li><li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li><li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li></ul>	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?
1 2 3 4	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> </ul>	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       220         you can either back up while you speak or alternatively       if you can adjust your camera down.         (Discussion off the record.)       (Discussion off the record.)         Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?       A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing
1 2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 2 4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearingdisorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has
1 2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of</li> </ul>	1 2 3 2 4 5 6	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       220         you can either back up while you speak or alternatively       if you can adjust your camera down.         (Discussion off the record.)       (Discussion off the record.)         Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?       A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing         disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has       been involved, particularly my research has been involved
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down. (Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has been involved, particularly my research has been involved with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions.</li> </ul>	1 2 2 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearingdisorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work hasbeen involved, particularly my research has been involvedwith hearing aid research with diagnostic testing toquantify the amount of hearing loss in people.As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down. (Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has been involved, particularly my research has been involved with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to quantify the amount of hearing loss in people. As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearingdisorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work hasbeen involved, particularly my research has been involvedwith hearing aid research with diagnostic testing toquantify the amount of hearing loss in people.As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist andstill am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot ofclinical work with patients. As someone already
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. 1'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. 1'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness. (A short recess is taken.)</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down. (Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has been involved, particularly my research has been involved with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to quantify the amount of hearing loss in people. As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of clinical work with patients. As someone already mentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'm
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. 1'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. 1'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearingdisorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work hasbeen involved, particularly my research has been involvedwith hearing aid research with diagnostic testing toquantify the amount of hearing loss in people.As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist andstill am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot ofclinical work with patients. As someone alreadymentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'mlosing my train of thought already. It's not that time
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr. Almond, you may call your next witness.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearingdisorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work hasbeen involved, particularly my research has been involvedwith hearing aid research with diagnostic testing toquantify the amount of hearing loss in people.As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist andstill am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot ofclinical work with patients. As someone alreadymentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'mlosing my train of thought already. It's not that timeof day for me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down. (Discussion off the record.)(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has been involved, particularly my research has been involved with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to quantify the amount of hearing loss in people. As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of clinical work with patients. As someone already mentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'm losing my train of thought already. It's not that time of day for me. Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kind
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. 1'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. 1'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness. (A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch. MR. DE HUECK: Good afternoon, Mr. Punch. My</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearingdisorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work hasbeen involved, particularly my research has been involvedwith hearing aid research with diagnostic testing toquantify the amount of hearing loss in people.As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist andstill am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot ofclinical work with patients. As someone alreadymentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'mlosing my train of thought already. It's not that timeof day for me.Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kindof a new area. I got involved in about excuse me. In
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch. MR. DE HUECK: Good afternoon, Mr. Punch. My</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down. (Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has been involved, particularly my research has been involved with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to quantify the amount of hearing loss in people. As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of clinical work with patients. As someone already mentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'm losing my train of thought already. It's not that time of day for me. Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kind of a new area. I got involved in about excuse me. In 2008 or 2009 when, in fact, Rick James asked me to go to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch. MR. DE HUECK: Good afternoon, Mr. Punch. My</li> <li>name is Adam de Hueck. I am the Hearing Examiner in this matter. I'll be swearing you in today. Are you ready?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down. (Discussion off the record.)(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has been involved, particularly my research has been involved with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to quantify the amount of hearing loss in people. As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of clinical work with patients. As someone already mentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'm losing my train of thought already. It's not that time of day for me. Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kind of a new area. I got involved in about excuse me. In 2008 or 2009 when, in fact, Rick James asked me to go to a wind project in lower Michigan. It was in the thumb
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. 1'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. 1'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch. MR. DE HUECK: Good afternoon, Mr. Punch. My</li> <li>name is Adam de Hueck. I am the Hearing Examiner in this matter. I'll be swearing you in today. Are you ready? THE WITNESS: I'm ready. Thank you.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down. (Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has been involved, particularly my research has been involved with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to quantify the amount of hearing loss in people.As I say, I 've been certified as an audiologist and still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of clinical work with patients. As someone already mentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'm losing my train of thought already. It's not that time of day for me. Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kind of a new area. I got involved in about excuse me. In 2008 or 2009 when, in fact, Rick James asked me to go to a wind project in lower Michigan. It was in the thumb area of Michigan where a family was abandoning their home
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. MS. SMITH: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.) MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch. MR. DE HUECK: Good afternoon, Mr. Punch. My</li> <li>name is Adam de Hueck. I am the Hearing Examiner in this matter. I'll be swearing you in today. Are you ready?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       220         you can either back up while you speak or alternatively       if you can adjust your camera down.         (Discussion off the record.)       (Discussion off the record.)         Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?       A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing         disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has       been involved, particularly my research has been involved         with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to       quantify the amount of hearing loss in people.         As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and       still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of         clinical work with patients. As someone already       mentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'm         losing my train of thought already. It's not that time       of day for me.         Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kind       of a new area. I got involved in about excuse me. In         2008 or 2009 when, in fact, Rick James asked me to go to       a wind project in lower Michigan. It was in the thumb         area of Michigan where a family was abandoning their home       or leaving their home at night to be able to sleep
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. 1'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. 1'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. <ul> <li>MS. SMITH: I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. <ul> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I am the Hearing Examiner in this matter. I'll be swearing you in today. Are you ready?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm ready. Thank you.</li> <li>(The oath is administered by Mr. de Hueck.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       220         you can either back up while you speak or alternatively       if you can adjust your camera down.       (Discussion off the record.)         Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?       A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearing         disorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work has       been involved, particularly my research has been involved         with hearing aid research with diagnostic testing to       quantify the amount of hearing loss in people.         As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist and       still am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot of         clinical work with patients. As someone already       mentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'm         losing my train of thought already. It's not that time       of day for me.         Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kind       of a new area. I got involved in about excuse me. In         2008 or 2009 when, in fact, Rick James asked me to go to       a wind project in lower Michigan. It was in the thumb         area of Michigan where a family was abandoning their home       or leaving their home at night to be able to sleep
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>farms and people's health issues?</li> <li>A. No. I'm not. In fact, 2015 the</li> <li>Q. I just asked if you were aware of that.</li> <li>A. I'm aware that it was not rescinded at that point.</li> <li>Q. Was it ever rescinded?</li> <li>A. No. The board has maintained that in spite of efforts to have it rescinded. <ul> <li>MS. SMITH: I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Thank you for your testimony,</li> </ul> </li> <li>Mr. James. That will conclude it. <ul> <li>MR. DE HUECK: I'm going to turn to Mr. Almond to call his next witness.</li> <li>(A short recess is taken.)</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: EL18-026 is back in session. Mr.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Almond, you may call your next witness. <ul> <li>MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Jerry Punch.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Good afternoon, Mr. Punch. My</li> <li>name is Adam de Hueck. I am the Hearing Examiner in this matter. I'll be swearing you in today. Are you ready?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm ready. Thank you.</li> <li>(The oath is administered by Mr. de Hueck.)</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!220you can either back up while you speak or alternativelyif you can adjust your camera down.(Discussion off the record.)Q. First why don't you just what is an audiologist?A. Well, audiology is the study of hearing and hearingdisorders essentially, hearing loss. Much of my work hasbeen involved, particularly my research has been involvedwith hearing aid research with diagnostic testing toquantify the amount of hearing loss in people.As I say, I've been certified as an audiologist andstill am since the 19 late 1960s. I've done a lot ofclinical work with patients. As someone alreadymentioned in the previous testimony, I basically I'mlosing my train of thought already. It's not that timeof day for me.Basically what I was saying is wind turbines is kindof a new area. I got involved in about excuse me. In2008 or 2009 when, in fact, Rick James asked me to go toa wind project in lower Michigan. It was in the thumbarea of Michigan where a family was abandoning their homeor leaving their home at night to be able to sleepbecause of the turbine noise.By the way, my affiliation with Rick has been over

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 221		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	223
1	instructor to teach a couple of not courses but give a	1	MS. SMITH: I'm sorry. I'm kind of wondering	
2	couple of lectures in a hearing conservation course, a	2	what the question is because I don't think it's quite	
3	graduate seminar in hearing conservation at Michigan	3	I'm sorry. I don't know where this started.	
4	State University.	4	<b>Q.</b> I think we were just kind of rambling a bit about	
5	And so Rick and I had known each other for sometime	5	your background there, Dr. Punch. So let me try to hone	
6	before 2008 or '9. So we basically I went there	6	you in here.	
7	thinking I'm not sure what my role is here. I'm an	7	Did you file or did you prepare prefiled	
8	audiologist. I understand sound. They were complaining	8	testimony in this matter?	
9	of the noise. And I've had a lifelong interest or career	9	A. I did.	
10	long interest in occupational hearing loss and in	10	Q. And is that what has been marked as Exhibit I-2?	
11	community noise so I thought it would be interesting. I	11	A. I'm looking at my list here I'm sorry I didn't	
12	was thinking about retiring in a few years and I thought,	12	become acquainted with this earlier. I-2.	
13	well, this is something of interest to me. I could	13	A. Yes.	
14	possibly become involved if it seems important to do so	14	${\bf Q}.  \mbox{And do you have any changes or corrections you want}$	
15	or interesting.	15	to make to that testimony?	
16	And the family, we just interviewed them, more or	16	A. No, I don't.	
17	less, informally. Two daughters, two teenage daughters,	17	<b>Q.</b> And along with that testimony did you include two	
18	again, they were leaving their home at night to sleep in	18	exhibits which were your CV and then an article written	
19	a hotel or motel. And I came away actually thinking	19	by you and Mr. James?	
20	honestly that what's the problem here? I heard the	20	A. I did, yes.	
21	turbines. They were moving somewhat during the afternoon	21	<b>Q.</b> And you also provided some responses to some	
22	that I was there. I felt a little bit of sensation. It	22	questions asked by PUC Staff; is that correct?	
23	didn't feel that strange at the time. I was only there,	23	A. I did, yes.	
24	as I said, a couple hours or so, three maybe. And I came	24	<b>Q.</b> And I'll represent to you that that those are on	
25	away thinking, well, I need to understand I want to	25	Exhibit I-34, specifically Intervenors Responses to	00.4
4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 222	4	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	224
1	understand what's going on. So I rented rented. I	1	Staff's Second Set of Data Requests to Intervenors. If I were to ask you those same questions that are	
3	checked out a book from the library, Paul Gipe's book on wind energy, Wind Energy Comes Of Age. And it was fairly	3	asked in your prefiled testimony as well as the questions	
4	favorable toward wind energy. It did not it barely	4	asked by PUC Staff and Intervenors Responses to Staff's	
5	mentioned noise, though, as an issue, and the book was	5	Second Set of Data Requests to Intervenors, would you	
6	based a lot on the information that was available from	6	provide the same answers here today?	
7	the wind turbines that had been installed in European and	7	A. I would, yes.	
8	I think Scandinavia countries and so forth and California	8	MR. ALMOND: At this time I would move for the	
9	at that time by the time had become involved with wind	9	admission of Exhibit I 2 as well as Exhibits I 2 A and I	
10	energy.	10	2 B.	
11	So not getting a whole lot from the book in terms of	11	MR. DE HUECK: Do you have an objection?	
12	an explanation of what the family was complaining about,	12	MS. SMITH: Can we revisit this after cross?	
13	I began to search the literature, first the internet and	13	MR. DE HUECK: Certainly.	
14	then some other sources of let's say journal articles and	14	MR. ALMOND: I think the process we used	
15	so on, and I ended up writing an article. Rick was a	15	previously was to admit it and have her move to strike	
16	co-author on the article along with a student we involved	16	it.	
17	in our measurements and writing the report.	17	MS. SMITH: If you would like to do it that way,	
18	The study was published in Audiology Today, which is	18	that's fine by me.	
19	basically a monthly magazine of the American Speech	19	MR. DE HUECK: You're right. Yes. Okay. So,	
20	Language Hearing Association in the summer of 2010, I	20	Staff, do you have anything to add?	
21 22	believe. And so as a result of that, I was asked to	21 22	MS. EDWARDS: I have no objection.	
22 23	chair a group in Michigan, which now the Department of	22	MR. DE HUECK: So we're going to go ahead and admit the exhibits and testimony.	
23 24	Energy essentially in the state to develop My audio died. Are you hearing me?	23 24	(A short recess is taken.)	
25	Q. Yes.	25	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. We're back in session.	
L		1	,	

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 225		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 227
1	The court reporter is all squared away so we can	1	draw inferences. We use what is available.
2	continue.	2	Not that we shouldn't do more research. Some of it
3	<b>Q.</b> (BY MR. ALMOND) Dr. Punch, did you have the	3	might be clinical research design. Some of it might be
4	opportunity to review Dr. Roberts's prefiled testimony in	4	epidemiological. But these studies that will really
5	this matter?	5	address the question definitely about infrasound or just
6	A. Yes, I did.	6	even audible sound and things like dose response, how
7	<b>Q.</b> And do you recall Mr Dr. Roberts's prefiled	7	much sound does it take before people really do come down
8	testimony him stating that he's not aware of any reliable	8	with the various complaints and problems that they
9	evidence providing any link between infrasound and	9	complain about.
10	adverse health effects?	10	That was one of my major takeaways from his his
11	A. I did. Yeah I do.	11	comments there. He also did talk about he basically
12	<b>Q.</b> Do you have any response to that claim?	12	uses government studies to rely on for his inference or
13	<ul> <li>A. Well, I heard him say I'm not aware at least three</li> </ul>	13	conclusion that there is no causative relationship
14	times with respect to that question. Or I read that.	14	between adverse health effects and wind turbines. Yet he
15	There's I think mountains of evidence as we provided	15	uses he talked about peer reviewed studies. But these
16	in our article, the 2016 article, that included as	16	government studies he relies on don't seem to be peer
17	exhibit I 've lost the numbers here but my second	17	reviewed, per se, min the way that he defines per
18	exhibit.	18	reviewed. So I found that rather unacceptable.
19	You've heard testimony and I would agree with it	19	He holds folks like me and Mr. James and others to a
20	that from Rick especially that there's lots of field	20	standard of peer reviewed epidemiological research to
21	evidence. There's lots of anecdotal evidence. There is	21	establish those relationships yet he does not really
22	some evidence in the literature like Dr. Roberts made	22	have he can't point to specific studies other than the
23	the point that only epidemiological evidence is useful in	23	Health Canada study perhaps as others have also done to
24	drawing conclusions about causation between wind turbine	24	support his view that there are no relationships, no
25	noise and adverse health effects.	25	causative relationships here.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 226		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 228
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 226 He also said paradoxically that when asked how	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!228Q.And just I want to jump to kind of your over all
1 2		1 2	
-	He also said paradoxically that when asked how	_	<b>Q.</b> And just I want to jump to kind of your over all
2	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is	2	<b>Q.</b> And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You
23	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the	2 3	Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations;
2 3 4	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I	2 3 4	<b>Q.</b> And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just epidemiological research to answer questions about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just epidemiological research to answer questions about causations causation of disease processes and/or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> <li>They did not study in the 2009 document really wind turbine noise. That needs to be understood. Wind</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just epidemiological research to answer questions about causations causation of disease processes and/or disorders and external patients.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA L A max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> <li>They did not study in the 2009 document really wind turbine noise. That needs to be understood. Wind turbine noise has its own specific characteristics. But</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just epidemiological research to answer questions about causations causation of disease processes and/or disorders and external patients. He went through those criteria, but he didn't he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA LA max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> <li>They did not study in the 2009 document really wind turbine noise. That needs to be understood. Wind turbine noise has its own specific characteristics. But if 40 dB Leq is needed for protection against things like</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just epidemiological research to answer questions about causations causation of disease processes and/or disorders and external patients. He went through those criteria, but he didn't he just named them. He didn't talk about what they are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA LA max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> <li>They did not study in the 2009 document really wind turbine noise. That needs to be understood. Wind turbine noise has its own specific characteristics. But if 40 dB Leq is needed for protection against things like road traffic noise and airport noise or airport noises</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just epidemiological research to answer questions about causations causation of disease processes and/or disorders and external patients. He went through those criteria, but he didn't he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA LA max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> <li>They did not study in the 2009 document really wind turbine noise. That needs to be understood. Wind turbine noise has its own specific characteristics. But if 40 dB Leq is needed for protection against things like</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	He also said paradoxically that when asked how likely is it that and I'm paraphrasing. How likely is it that such epidemiological studies will be done in the future. And he said not very likely. And I think I agree with this in the sense that they're expensive, they require a lot of preparation, government funding and Mr. James has already responded to that issue of there's just not government funding available for that kind of research. So my point is we have to take what we have. Just like the Bradford Hill criteria doctor that is Sir Austin Bradford Hill who addressed the medical society in Britain in 1965 listing nine criteria which include experimentation but there are eight other criteria that he talked about that it becomes sort of the if you will, the Bible of epidemiology, as I understand that. As I understand it. Indicating that we don't need just epidemiological research to answer questions about causations causation of disease processes and/or disorders and external patients. He went through those criteria, but he didn't he just named them. He didn't talk about what they are about. And I think he basically ignored the message that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And just I want to jump to kind of your over all opinions and conclusions in your prefiled testimony. You recommended two separate alternative noise limitations; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I did yes.</li> <li>Q. One was a 40 dBA Leq night outside, the other 40 dBA LA max; is that correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Can you just explain the rationale for those two recommendations?</li> <li>A. Well, the 40 dB Leq comes from mostly emanates really with the 2009 World Health Organization document on night noise guidelines. And that's the point at which it was said it was said it was decided and used by the World Health Organization to be a threshold at which there are substantial and nontrivial numbers of people who are affected by low frequency noise.</li> <li>They did not study in the 2009 document really wind turbine noise. That needs to be understood. Wind turbine noise has its own specific characteristics. But if 40 dB Leq is needed for protection against things like road traffic noise and airport noise or airport noises and other kinds of noises, then because infrasound is a</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 229		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 231
1	45 I know is the design goal for this particular	1	infrasound we're talking about sound that does not
2	project, but 40 is really a very conservative goal. It	2	attenuate very well and certainly not very rapidly, and
3	should be lower. And I know Rick James talks about,	3	as you've heard many times already in this hearing, it
4	recommends, 35 dB Leq but I realize the stress that puts	4	dissipates over very long distances.
5	on wind companies to build the projects and I'm not	5	There's almost no barriers that can stop it. So
6	really trying to stop them from building the projects. I	6	even if you have your windows closed, it could be as bad
7	just want to protect people as much as possible.	7	inside as outside. And because the World Health
8	Let me point out the 40 dB Leq is the level that	8	Organization dealt with low frequency noises that did not
9	I was about to get into this earlier, that the task force	9	include infrasound, I think an even lower number like 40
10	that I chaired in the state of Michigan some years ago	10	instead of 45 dB LAmax would be appropriate to account
11	was about to recommend that task force was shut down.	11	for the peaks and valleys that do cause the annoyance in
12	I won't go into that unless you want me to. But there	12	real time for people.
13	was some lobbying I think about shutting us down	13	And my concern and particularly in the 2009 WHO
14	because	14	document, the concern there is with sleep. Sleep
15	<b>Q.</b> I don't need you to go into that.	<mark>15</mark>	disturbance.
16	A. Okay.	16	<b>Q.</b> In addition to noise limitations, you also
17	<b>Q.</b> But	17	recommended a 1.25 mile setback. Why is it necessary to
18	<b>A.</b> All right. So 40 dB is the level that's certainly	18	have both a noise limitation and a distance setback?
19	recommended by the World Health Organization. It is very	19	<b>A.</b> Well, a distance setback would be ideal if we could
20	close to the levels that the that Dr. Schomer,	20	show a really close correlation with the noise levels
21	Dr. Paul Schomer, has come up with recently based on four	21	that people are exposed to at those distances. But
22	different sources of information, data. They recommend	22	because there are differences in terrain even changes in
23	36 to 38 dB Leq.	23	the weather patterns, differences in noise turbine
24	And he recommends it to be measured over a 24-hour	24	arrays, the way they're arrayed with respect to one
25	period basically. That is a little different from the	25	another, each other, you can't predict exactly what the
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 230		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 232
1	World Health Organization 40 dB level because they	1	noise levels are going to be from knowing the distance.
<b>^</b>		<b>_</b>	
2	recommended that as an annual average, which I think it	2	But I think the 1.25 miles or 2 kilometers that's
3	impractical implying by annual that you actually leave	3	been recommended many times in the literature starting
3 4	impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that,	3 4	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum
3 4 5	impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.	3 4 5	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying
3 4 5 6	impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year. If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an	3 4 5 6	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind
3 4 5 6 7	impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year. If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case	3 4 5 6 7	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative
3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents,</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year. If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year. If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation. MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> <li>A. Okay. Can I go ahead with my</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation. MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any further questions for you at this time and I'll tender
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> <li>A. Okay. Can I go ahead with my</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The 40 dB L A max.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation. MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any further questions for you at this time and I'll tender you for cross.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> <li>A. Okay. Can I go ahead with my</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The 40 dB L A max.</li> <li>A. 40 dB L A max. If you review the even the 1999</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number. But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation. MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any further questions for you at this time and I'll tender you for cross. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Punch, we're now going to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> <li>A. Okay. Can I go ahead with my</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The 40 dB L A max.</li> <li>A. 40 dB L A max. If you review the even the 1999</li> <li>WHO standards I think they talk about the 45 dB L A max</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number.</li> <li>But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any further questions for you at this time and I'll tender you for cross.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Punch, we're now going to subject you to cross-examination starting with the</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> <li>A. Okay. Can I go ahead with my</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The 40 dB L A max.</li> <li>If okay L A max. If you review the even the 1999</li> <li>WHO standards I think they talk about the 45 dB L A max inside. And again the 40 dB L A max, one, is an attempt</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number.</li> <li>But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any further questions for you at this time and I'll tender you for cross.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Punch, we're now going to subject you to cross-examination starting with the Applicant, Prevailing Winds.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> <li>A. Okay. Can I go ahead with my</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The 40 dB L A max.</li> <li>A. 40 dB L A max. If you review the even the 1999</li> <li>WHO standards I think they talk about the 45 dB L A max inside. And again the 40 dB L A max, one, is an attempt to account for all the peaks and valleys that occur in</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number.</li> <li>But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any further questions for you at this time and I'll tender you for cross.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Punch, we're now going to subject you to cross-examination starting with the Applicant, Prevailing Winds.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Dr. Punch I'm just waiting so they</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>impractical implying by annual that you actually leave the sound level meter out for a year. We don't do that, of course. You take samples over a year.</li> <li>If I can get down to the 40 dB L E max is an attempt and I made this attempt in another case earlier in New York to try to look at the WHO documents, both the 1999 and the 2009 documents.</li> <li>Q. Can you back up just a little bit from the camera?</li> <li>A. Sure. I was actually taking a couple notes and trying to read my notes that I just wrote down just a minute ago. Anyway</li> <li>Q. Let's not take any notes okay?</li> <li>A. Okay. All right.</li> <li>A. Okay. Can I go ahead with my</li> <li>Q. Yeah. The 40 dB L A max.</li> <li>A. 40 dB L A max. If you review the even the 1999 WHO standards I think they talk about the 45 dB L A max inside. And again the 40 dB L A max, one, is an attempt to account for all the peaks and valleys that occur in wind turbine noise. Much of it is infrasound. Some of</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>been recommended many times in the literature starting with Pierpont in 2009 would be sort of a minimum distance. 1.5 probably better, obviously. Again, trying to give fairness as much as I can be fair to the wind companies, 1.25 seems a rather respectable conservative number.</li> <li>But because the distance does not correlate very well with the noise levels at those distances, both would be my recommendation. It's not that hard to set the distance as a limiting factor or a minimum distance along with a maximum noise level. But certainly noise level always has to stay in the equation.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: Thank you. I don't have any further questions for you at this time and I'll tender you for cross.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Punch, we're now going to subject you to cross-examination starting with the Applicant, Prevailing Winds.</li> <li>MS. SMITH: Dr. Punch I'm just waiting so they can shift the camera over so that you can see me as</li> </ul>

1       0. And so an audiologist can determine it somebody has         2       0. Dr. Runch, do yun have anyone with you in the room?         4       0. And so an audiologist can determine it somebody has         5       0. And so an audiologist can determine it somebody has         6       0. And so an audiologist can determine it somebody has         7       A. I do'nt.         8       1. Ching the compact of the some standard in this         9       nets: I hading your testmony do you have any other         9       nets: I hading them. I don't have any other         9       these said: Unit of you?         7       A. I had its is no some bandworth on notice. I'm putting is         9       nets: I have: a ingtife cit, hui I have: any other         10       on some bandworth one of the some sy other         11       on some bandworth one of the some sy other         12       0. Okay. Thank you. You method = - you indicated         13       you're an audiologist carrent?         14       A. Correct.         15       ondiyou're not an engineer, not a prifesional         16       engineer. The work is and puffesional         16       on on since is, no         17       A. I do on't perform modeing analyses for wind         13       A. Any ou're not an a		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 233		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 235
2       0. Dr. Punch, do you have anyone with you in the room?       3       A. I don't.         3       A. I don't.       3       Gampase diseases. for instance, from the ear. Is that         4       C. And other than the documents that were filed in this       5       Matter including your testimory do you have any other         6       documents in front of you?       6       May the ear in the ser. I don't have any other         7       A. I had taken some handwritten notes. I'm putting       6       Hasing loss but they cannot necessarily loss really         7       A. I had taken some handwritten notes. I'm putting       6       Hasing loss but they cannot necessarily loss really         7       Hasing loss but they cannot necessarily loss really       I had taken some handwritten notes. I'm putting       Feature loss had loss control         7       Hasing loss but they cannot necessarily loss really       I had you're not an engineer, not a professional       I         10       trought in dispussion in many threes in reports we put in audionatic results       I and you're not an engineer, not a professional       I         17       A. True. True.       III       Many threes in reports we put in audionatic results         18       O. And you're not an exoutidan as Mr. James is;       III       True have additional tests they can perform, including         19       Correct?       IIII	1		1	
3       A. 1 don't.       3       diagnose diseases, for instance, from the ear. Is that         4       0. And other than the documents that were filed in this 5       mater induling your testimony do you have any other 5         5       0. Add other than the documents in front of you?       5         6       documents in front of you?       5         7       A. I dot't think everything is on the 1       exhibit its that we might need.       1         10       those axide. Thin not using them. I don't have any other 10       the stars one hous the sum of the site of the least the site of	_			
<ul> <li>4 Q. And other than the documents that were filed in this</li> <li>5 matter including your testimery do you have any other</li> <li>6 documents in front of you?</li> <li>7 A. 1 hed taken some handwritten notes. 1'm putting</li> <li>7 hose axide. 1'm not using them. 1 don't have any other</li> <li>9 notes. 1 have a laptos to my right with some files 1</li> <li>10 thought 1 might need.</li> <li>11 thought 1 might need.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. Thank you, You mentioned - you indicated</li> <li>you're an audiologist; correct?</li> <li>13 you're not an engineer, not a professional</li> <li>16 engineer. Is that also true?</li> <li>17 A. 1 rue. 1rue.</li> <li>18 Q. And you're not an acoubtion as Mr. James is;</li> <li>19 correct?</li> <li>10 And you're not ancoubtion as Mr. James is;</li> <li>10 and you're not ancoubtion as Mr. James is;</li> <li>10 and you're not ancoubtion as Mr. James is;</li> <li>11 a. 1 don't have might do that; is that</li> <li>22 correct?</li> <li>23 A. 1 ve never done that.</li> <li>24 never done that.</li> <li>25 correct?</li> <li>26 a. 1 don't really know, to be honest, in terms of accoubtions. Both determine sound levels?</li> <li>23 A. 1 ve never done that.</li> <li>24 not the perform to ancoubtion in terms of accoubtions. Fortbably not. 1 have certainty</li> <li>26 correct?</li> <li>27 A. 1 don't really know, to be honest in terms of accoubtions. Fortbably not. 1 have certainty</li> <li>27 A. 1 don't really know, to be honest in terms of accoubtions. Fortbably not. 1 have certaints?</li> <li>28 A. 1 don't really know, to be honest in terms of accoubtion in terms of accoubtion in terms of accoubtion in terms of accoubtion interns of accoubtion internes of accoubtion in</li></ul>	_			
5       matter induding your testimony do you have any other       5       A       Well, I think a medical doctor would say we can't         6       documents in front of you?       6       diagnose in the sense that we can tell where the         7       A       The diston some handwritten notes. I'm putting       6       diagnose in the sense that we can tell where the         10       those a slatop to my right with same like I       10       those a slatop to my right with same like I       10         12       0. Okay. Thank you. You methode "you indicated       10       earphones and so forth but we can't determine what the         13       you're an audiologits correct?       13       Many times in reports wo put in audiometric results         14       A. Correct.       14       are highly consistent with working those and so forth but we can't determine what the         15       o. And you're not an engineer, not a professional       16       holpful to physicians in making thori utadometric results         15       o. And you're not an acoustidan as Mr. James is;       18       the induced hearing loss for warping loss. So that so the sin. no.         12       o. Not as he is, no.       21       in order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine         14       A. I ord order hearing utadimet to tool that;       18       their oremarks fronthon, ond wor         15 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
6       documents in front of you?       6       diagnose in the sense that we can tell where the lesion is watched to shok is in the sense that we can better the sense that we can tell where the lesion is watched to shok is in the sense that we can better the sense that we can better the sense that sense sense that sense that sens	_			
7       A. Libad taken some handwritten notes. I'm putting       7       lesion				
8         those aside. I'm not using them. I don't have any other 9         8         testing battery that we can perform, some of which is 9           9         though I think everything is on the 11         0         Carpones and so forth but we can't determine what the 11           12         0. Gay. Thank you. You mentioned — you indicated 3         0         0         Say. Sonsory nouro hearing loss creatly 12           12         0. Cary. Thank you. You mentioned — you indicated 3         0         Nany times in reports we put in audiometric results 13           14         A. Corroct.         13         Many times in reports we put in audiometric results 13           14         A. Corroct.         14         The reports we put in audiometric results 14           15         a. And you're not an engineer, not a professional 15         16         helpful to physician in making their diagnosis. But 15           16         and you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is; 19         0         5         0         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         11         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10         10			_	-
9       notes. I have a laptop to my right with some files I       9       electrophysiclogic, some of which is audiological through         10       thought I might need.       0       carphones and so forth but we camp to determine what the         11       thought I might need.       11       carphones and so forth but we camp to determine what the         12       Q. Okay, Thank you. You mentioned you indicated       12       is.         13       you're an audiofiest; correct?       13       Many times in reports we put in audiometric results         14       A. Cares.T.       15       Q. And you're not an engineer, not a professional       15       noise-induced hearing loss, for example, and that is         16       engineer. Is that also true?       10       thelpful to physicial skin.       10         17       A. True. True.       10       0. Sor yous I understand your bestimers, if you         18       A. True. True.       10       10       for your -s I understand your bestimers, if you         18       The heaver dome that.       23       A. Twe meaver dome that.       24       A. Yes. We work closely with nointympologists. FNI         24       A. I don't reality know, to be honest, in terms of acoustical standards. Probaby not. I heave ortainly       23       A. True. True.       24         14       A. I don't reality kn	_		_	-
<ul> <li>thought I might need, but I think everything is on the computer of the second determine what the component of the second determine determi</li></ul>	_		_	
11       exhibit list hat we might need.       11       actual cause of, say, sensory neuro hearing loss really         12       0. Okay, Thank you. You mentioned you indicated       11       actual cause of, say, sensory neuro hearing loss really         13       Verter an audiologity; correct?       13       Many times in reports we put in audiometric results         14       A. Correct.       14       are highly consistent with prosbyacoustic hearing loss or         15       0. And you're not an engineer, not a professional       16       holpful to physical is in making their diagnosis. But         17       A. True. True.       17       they have additional tests they can perform, including         18       0. And you're not an engineer, not a professional       16       holpful to physical exam.         19       order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine       20         20       A. Not as he is; no.       21       the actual cause?         21       A. I don't roally know, to be honest, in terms of accoustical standards. Probably not. I have corrianly an audiologist we don't have any expertise       23         21       A. I don't roally know, to be honest, in terms of accoustical standards. Probably not. I have corrianly as an audiologist we don't have any expertise       23         32       Cotay, Are you a licensed audiologist?       3       3         33				
12       Q. Okay, Thank you, You mentioned you indicated       12       is.         13       you're an audiologist; correct?       14       are highly consistent with provesty coustic hearing loss of noise-induced hearing loss, for example, and that is         14       A. Correct.       14       are highly consistent with provesty coustic hearing loss of noise-induced hearing loss, for example, and that is         15       Q. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;       15       helpful to physicians in making their diagnosis. But         16       Q. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;       19       Q. So if you				
13       you're an audiologist; correct?       13       Many times in reports we put in audiometric results         14       A. Correct.       14       are highly consistent with procbysecustic hearing loss or are highly consistent with procbysecustic hearing loss. For Xemple, and that is is height consistent with procbysecustic hearing loss. For Xemple, and that is height consistent with procbysecustic hearing loss. For Xemple, and that is height constraint we additional tests they can perform, including         16       a. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;       19       Q. So if you - as I understand your testimony, if you         17       A. Not as he is, no.       18       their own physical exam.       11         17       A. Not as he is, no.       19       Q. So if you - as I understand your testimony, if you         18       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind       21       11       in order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine         21       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists. ENT         22       Treation the waith mespect to diagnostic and sometimes       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists. ENT         23       A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists. ENT         24       A. I don't reality know, to be honesis measurements part       o diagnose nohearing related				
14       A. Correct.       14       are highly consistent with prebyacoustic hearing loss or         15       Q. And you're not an engineer, not a professional       16       engineer. Is that also true?       17         14       are highly consistent with prebyacoustic hearing loss or       15       noise-induced hearing loss, for example, and that is         16       engineer. Is that also true?       17       they have additional tests they can perform, including         18       Q. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;       19       Q. So if you as I understand your testimony, if you         19       Q. So if you as I understand your testimony, if you       10       10         20       A. I've never done that.       21       11       in order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine         21       A. I've never done that.       23       A. I've never done that.       23         23       A. I've never done that.       24       1       ac and you're not you'				
15       a. And you're not an engineer, not a professional       15       noise-induced hearing loss, for example, and that is         16       engineer. Is that also true?       17       A. True.       18       A. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;         19       correct?       19       A. Not as he is, no.       19       Correct?       19       C. Sol if you as 1 understand your testimony, if you         20       A. Not as he is, no.       21       In order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine         21       A. I'vo nover done that.       23       A. Yes. We work closely with totaryngologists, ENT         23       A. I'vo nover done that.       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otaryngologists, ENT         23       A. I'vo nover done that.       24       specialists, in that we got roferrish from them, and we         25       correct?       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otaryngologists, ENT         24       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       aspecialist.       1         3       done measurements in community noise, an audiologist was how to make noise       1       treatment issues. If medical or surgical treatments seem         3       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       3       specialist.       3       specialist.         4       A. T a				
16       engineer. Is that also true?         17       A. True. True.         18       Q. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;         19       Oreret?         20       A. Not as he Is, no.         21       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind         21       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind         21       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind         22       A. I've never done that.         23       A. I've never done that.         24       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that         25       refer to them with respect to diagnostic and sometimes         26       correct?         21       A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of         2       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly         3       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly         4       acoustical istandencise measurements part         5       f dagnose nonhearing related miadales like heart         6       of my training as an audiologist?         9       A. I am not bocause I am a retired audiologist?         9       A. I am not bocause I am a retired audiologist?         9       A. I have been licensed Provide audiologist?         9       A. I have b				
17       A. True. True.       17       they have additional tests they can perform, including         18       Q. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;       19       Gerrect?         19       Correct?       19       Q. So if you - as I understand your testimony, if you         18       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind       19       Q. So if you - as I understand your testimony, if you         12       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind       21       in order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine         14       A. Two enver done that:       23       A. Two enver done that:       23         24       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that       25       refer to them with respect to diagnosit to determine         25       correct?       23       A. You work closely with otolaryngologists, ENT         25       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       a coustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       a coustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       a coustical standards. Probably not. I have make noise         7       measurements.       a not because I am a retired audiologist?       9       A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist?       9       a na set audiologist was how to make noise?         7       particing clinical work. Licensing only applies to       10       effects posed by no				
<ul> <li>18 Q. And you're not an acoustician as Mr. James is;</li> <li>19 correct?</li> <li>20 A. Not as he is: no.</li> <li>21 A. Not as he is: no.</li> <li>22 the actual cause?</li> <li>23 A. Twe never done that.</li> <li>24 Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that</li> <li>25 correct?</li> <li>23 A. Twe never done that.</li> <li>24 Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that</li> <li>25 correct?</li> <li>26 A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of a coustical standards. Probably not. I have cartainly a specialist.</li> <li>3 acoustical standards. Probably not. I have cartainly a done measurements in communities about community noise.</li> <li>4 race tracks. for example, and public events like concert</li> <li>5 hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise measurements.</li> <li>9 A. 1 am not because I am a retired audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. 1 am not because I am a retired audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. 1 am not because I am a retired audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. 1 am not because I am a retired audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. 1 an not because I am a retired audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. 1 an couple states.</li> <li>19 C. Cartainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>10 direct bracks for medicine work, working with patients who have hearing</li> <li>13 problems.</li> <li>14 Q. Cartainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>14 A. 1 a couple states.</li> <li>19 Q. Are you licensed the whole time with my carcer</li> <li>16 A. 1 an a couple states.</li> <li>19 Q. Are you licensed to readicine?</li> <li>20 A. Passed on your testimony readies medicine?</li> <li>21 A. Cleay.</li> <li>22 A. 1 an so couple states.</li> <li>23 A. 1 and couple states.</li> <li>24 Cortainly. The aring loss treatment. Is</li> <li>24 that true?</li> </ul>		-		
<ul> <li>19 correct?</li> <li>20 A. Not as he is, no.</li> <li>21 Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind projects, for instance, to determine sound levels?</li> <li>23 A. L've never done that.</li> <li>24 Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that</li> <li>25 correct?</li> <li>23 A. L've never done that.</li> <li>24 Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that</li> <li>25 correct?</li> <li>23 A. L've never done that.</li> <li>24 Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that</li> <li>25 correct?</li> <li>26 A. L don't really know, to be honest, in terms of a acoustical standards. Probably not. L have certainly done measurements in communities about community noise, reasc tracks, for example, and public events like concert</li> <li>5 hauls and so forth. L have made noise measurements part 6 of my training as an audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. L am not because 1 am a retired audiologist 1 didn't 10 want to pay the 5350 a year when 1 know 1 wouldn't be 11 practicing clinical work, userking with patients who have hearing 13 problems.</li> <li>4 Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>14 A. L naw is involved in clinical work, working with patients who have hearing 13 problems.</li> <li>4 Q. And sy ou have that in front of you?</li> <li>14 A. L are you licensed to whole time with my career 16 that L was involved in clinical work, working with patients who have hearing 13 your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>14 A. Thay been licensed to whole time with my career 15 A. L have been licensed the whole time with my career 16 that L was involved to clinical work, yes.</li> <li>17 A. Mat exhibit is that?</li> <li>18 A. L are you licensed to practic medicine?</li> <li>20 A. Of course not.</li> <li>21 A. Okay.</li> <li>22 A. Of course not.</li> <li>23 A. Or any uncestimony earlier L understand that an 23 audiologis teals with hearing related diagnoses or 23 A. Of course not.</li> <li>24 D. And if you look at page 3. and 4.</li> <li>25 A. That true?</li> <li>26 A. Of instanc</li></ul>				
20       A. Not as he is, no.       20       identified an issue, that may be referred to a physician         21       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind       21       in order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine         22       the actual cause?       23       A. I've never done that.       24         23       A. I've never done that.       24       A. May ou're not qualified to do that; is that       25         26       correct?       23       A. Yes. We work closely with atolaryngologists, ENT         24       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that       25       refer to them with respect to diagnostic and sometimes         27       A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of       236       1       treatment issues. If medical or surgical treatments seem         2       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       applicable, then certainly we refer to a medical       specialist.         3       applicable, then certainly we refer to a medical       specialist.       applicable, then certainly we refer to a medical         3       applicable, way ou bit problems.       A. That's true. True.       A. That's true. True.         4       C. Advay, Are you a licensed audiologist?       A. I have basen licensed to whole time with my carcer         16       problems.       A. I have basen licensed to work, working with		•		
21       Q. You don't perform modeling analyses for wind       21       in order to make a further testing diagnosis to determine         22       A. I've never done that.       22       the actual cause?         23       A. I've never done that.       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists, ENT         24       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists, ENT         25       correct?       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists, ENT         25       correct?       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists, ENT         26       correct?       23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists, ENT         27       A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of       23       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly         3       done measurements in communities about community noise.       4       C. And as an audiologist you don't have any expertise         5       haulis and so forth. I have made noise measurements part       6       disease or diabetes; is that true?         6       measurements.       a on thoecuse I am a retired audiologist I didn't       9       as an expert witness regarding the potential health         10       want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be       1       effects posed by noise from the proje				
22       projects, for instance, to determine sound levels?         23       A. I've never done that.         24       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that         25       correct?         28       A. I don't not qualified to do that; is that         29       the actual cause?         23       A. Yes. We work closely with otolaryngologists, ENT         24       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that         25       recer to them with respect to diagnostic and sometimes         26       recer tracks, for example, and public events like concert         3       above for my training as an audiologist was how to make noise       3 specialist.         4       Q. Adva, Are you a licensed audiologist?       4         9       A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist?       4         9       A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't       10 effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?         11       practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to       11         12       clinical work, working with patients who have hearing         13       problems.       13         14       Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?       14         15       A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career       16 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>				
<ul> <li>23 A. I've never done that.</li> <li>24 A. I ve never done that.</li> <li>25 correct?</li> <li>26 A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of</li> <li>27 A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of</li> <li>28 acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly</li> <li>3 done measurements in communities about community noise,</li> <li>4 race tracks, for example, and public events like concert</li> <li>5 hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part</li> <li>6 of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise</li> <li>7 measurements.</li> <li>8 Q. Okay, Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't</li> <li>19 A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist 1 didn't</li> <li>10 gracticing clinical work. Licensing only applies to</li> <li>11 A. True.</li> <li>12 Clinical work, working with patients who have hearing</li> <li>13 problems.</li> <li>14 Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>15 A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career</li> <li>16 that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay.</li> <li>18 A. In a couple states:.</li> <li>19 Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>20 A. Of course not.</li> <li>21 Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an audiologit deals with hearing related diagnoses or</li> <li>21 A. Of course not.</li> <li>22 A. Of course not.</li> <li>23 A. That's true?</li> <li>24 that true?</li> </ul>				
24       Q. And you're not qualified to do that; is that       24       spacialists, in that we get referrals from them, and we         25       correct?       25       refer to them with respect to diagnostic and sometimes         2       ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!       234       24       ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!       236         1       A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of       234       ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!       236         1       A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of       234       I treatment issues. If medical or surgical treatments seem         2       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       3       applicable, then certainly we refer to a medical       3         3       done measurements in communities about community noise.       4       Q. And as an audiologist you don't have any expertise       5         5       hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part       6       disease or diabetes; is that tre?       7       A. That's true.       8       O. In your testimony you state that you're testifying         9       A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't       10       effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?       11       A. True.         11       practicing clinical work, working with patients who have hearing       13       your testimony, do you have that in front of you? </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
25       correct?       25       refer to them with respect to diagnostic and sometimes         ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       234       ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!       236         1       A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of       acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly       236         3       done measurements in communities about community noise,       4       0. And as an audiologist vou don't have any expertise         4       race tracks, for example, and public events like concert       4       0. And as an audiologist you don't have any expertise         5       hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part       6       disease or diabetes; is that true?         7       A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't       0       A. That's true. True.         8       Q. Okay, Are you a licensed audiologist I didn't       10       effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?         11       practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to       12       Q. I have been licensed?         13       problems.       12       Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of         13       your testimony, do you have that in front of you?       14         14       A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it       15         15       A. I have been licensed the whole time with my ca				
ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!234ROUGH DRAFT - DO NO QUOTE!2361A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms ofacoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainlyacoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainlyapplicable, then certainly we refer to a medical3acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainlyapplicable, then certainly we refer to a medical4race tracks, for example, and public events like concertapplicable, then certainly we refer to a medical5hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part6disease or diabetes; is that true?7measurements.9A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't99A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't10effects posed by noise from the project; is that true?7A. That's true.120. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of13problems.13your testimony, do you have that in front of you?14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?160. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18A. In a couple states.18Q. I 2.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A. I 2.? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.21A. Okay.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or2223that true?24Q. Tim looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those? <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
1A. I don't really know, to be honest, in terms of acoustical standards. Probably not. I have certainly done measurements in communities about community noise, arace tracks, for example, and public events like concert 5 hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part 6 of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise 7 measurements.1 treatment issues. If medical or surgical treatments seem applicable, then certainly we refer to a medical specialist.3done measurements in communities about community noise, a race tracks, for example, and public events like concert 5 hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part 6 of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise 7 measurements.2 and as an audiologist you don't have any expertise 5 to diagnose nohearing related maladies like heart 6 disease or diabetes; is that true?7A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't 10 want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be 11 practicing clinical work. Ucensing only applies to 12 clinical work, working with patients who have hearing 13 problems.0. In your testimony you state that you're testifying 9 as an expert witness regarding the potential health 10 effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?11A. Take.120. In your testimony do you have that in front of you?12A. I have been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it 15 on the computer.15A. I na couple states.18Q. I 2?19A. I acouple states.19A. I 2?19A. I acouple states.19A. I 2? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.21A. And if y				
2acoustical standards. Probably not. 1 have certainly2applicable, then certainly we refer to a medical3done measurements in communities about community noise,applicable, then certainly we refer to a medical4race tracks, for example, and public events like concert55hauls and so forth. 1 have made noise measurements part66of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise40And as an audiologist you don't have any expertise7measurements.58Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?89A. 1 am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't910want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be1011practicing clinical work, working with patients who have hearing1112clinical work, working with patients who have hearing1313problems.14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it - 1 have it14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it - 1 have it15A. 1 have been licensed the whole time with my career16Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.11A. I 2?18A. I 2?18A. In a couple states.19A. I 2? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.21A. Okay. Chay. Chay. I have it.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an22A. And if you look at page 3. and 4.23treatment.	1		1	
3       done measurements in communities about community noise, 4       race tracks, for example, and public events like concert 5       specialist.         4       race tracks, for example, and public events like concert 5       hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part 6 of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise 7       Measan audiologist you don't have any expertise 5         7       Measurements.       4       Q. And as an audiologist you don't have any expertise 5         8       Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?       A. That's true.       True.         9       A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't 10       want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be 11       9 as an expert witness regarding the potential health 10       effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct? 11       A. True.         12       clinical work, working with patients who have hearing 13       problems.       12       Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of 13       your testimony, do you have that in front of you? 14       A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it 15       on the computer.         16       A. I have been licensed to work, yes.       18       Q. I 2.       19         17       A. Okay.       17       A. I 2?       18       Q. I 2.         18       A. In acouple states.       19       A. I 2. A? I 'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?       Q. Aret you licensed to practi	_			5
<ul> <li>4 race tracks, for example, and public events like concert</li> <li>5 hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part</li> <li>6 of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise</li> <li>7 measurements.</li> <li>8 Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't</li> <li>10 want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be</li> <li>11 practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to</li> <li>12 clinical work, working with patients who have hearing</li> <li>13 problems.</li> <li>14 Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>15 A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career</li> <li>16 that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay.</li> <li>18 A. I na couple states.</li> <li>19 Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>20 A. Of course not.</li> <li>21 Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an</li> <li>22 audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or</li> <li>23 treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is</li> <li>4 Q. And as an audiologist you don't have any expertise</li> <li>5 to diagnose nonhearing related maladies like heart</li> <li>6 disease or diabetes; is that true?</li> <li>4 A. That's true. True.</li> <li>8 Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying</li> <li>9 as an expert witness regarding the potential health</li> <li>10 effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>11 A. True.</li> <li>12 Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of</li> <li>13 your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>14 A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it</li> <li>15 on the computer.</li> <li>16 Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>17 A. 1 2?</li> <li>18 Q. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?</li> <li>20 Q. Yes.</li> <li>21 A. Okay.</li> <li>23 treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is</li> <li>24 that true?</li> </ul>	_		_	
<ul> <li>5 hauls and so forth. I have made noise measurements part</li> <li>6 of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise</li> <li>7 measurements.</li> <li>8 Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>9 A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't</li> <li>10 want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be</li> <li>11 practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to</li> <li>12 clinical work, working with patients who have hearing</li> <li>13 problems.</li> <li>14 Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>14 A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career</li> <li>16 that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay.</li> <li>18 A. I na couple states.</li> <li>19 Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>10 A. I 2?</li> <li>11 A. I 2?</li> <li>12 Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>13 treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is</li> <li>24 that true?</li> </ul>				•
6of my training as an audiologist was how to make noise measurements.6disease or diabetes; is that true?7measurements.7A. That's true.True.8Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?9A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't usan to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be tracticing clinical work. Licensing only applies to 128Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?11practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to 1211A. True.12clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.12Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of 13 your testimony, do you have that in front of you?14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career 1616Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18Q. I 2.18A. In a couple states.18Q. I 2.1919Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an 2221A. Okay. U have it.22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24Q. Tim looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	_		_	
7measurements.7A. That's true. True.8Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?9A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't9A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't9as an expert witness regarding the potential health10want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be10effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?11practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to11A. True.12clinical work, working with patients who have hearing12Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of13problems.13your testimony, do you have that in front of you?14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career16Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18A. In a couple states.18Q. I 2.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.22audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24that true?24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do	-			
8       Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?       8       Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying         9       A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't       9       as an expert witness regarding the potential health         10       want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be       10       effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?         11       practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to       11       A. True.         12       clinical work, working with patients who have hearing       12       Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of         13       problems.       13       your testimony, do you have that in front of you?         14       Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?       14       A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it         15       A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career       16       Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.         17       Q. Okay.       17       A. I a couple states.       18       Q. I 2?         18       A. In a couple states.       19       A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?         20       A. Yes.       20       Q. Yes.         21       Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an       21       A. Okay. Okay. I have it.         22	_			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
9A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't 109as an expert witness regarding the potential health10want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be 1110effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?11practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to 1211A. True.12clinical work, working with patients who have hearing 1312Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of 1313problems.12Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career 1616Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18A. In a couple states.18Q. I 2.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an 22 audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or 22 Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.2323treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24that true?24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	8			A. That's true. True.
10want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be10effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?11practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to11A. True.12clinical work, working with patients who have hearing12Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of13problems.12Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career16Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18A. In a couple states.18Q. I 2.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.22audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24that true?24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?			8	
11practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to12clinical work, working with patients who have hearing13problems.14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career16that I was involved in clinical work, yes.17Q. Okay.18A. In a couple states.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?20A. Of course not.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?		<b>Q.</b> Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?	_	<b>Q.</b> In your testimony you state that you're testifying
12clinical work, working with patients who have hearing13problems.14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career16that I was involved in clinical work, yes.17Q. Okay.18A. In a couple states.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?20A. Of course not.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an22audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is24that true?25Certainly and so have you ever been licensed?26A. Okay.27Manuel States.28A. Okay.29A. Okay.20A. Of course not.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is24Q. Tim looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9	<ul><li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li><li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't</li></ul>	9	<b>Q.</b> In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health
13problems.13your testimony, do you have that in front of you?14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it16that I was involved in clinical work, yes.16Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18A. I n a couple states.18Q. I 2.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24that true?24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be</li> </ul>	9 10	<b>Q.</b> In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?
14Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?14A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career15on the computer.16that I was involved in clinical work, yes.16Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I a couple states.18Q. I 2.18A. In a couple states.19A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?1920A. Of course not.20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to</li> </ul>	9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> </ul>
15A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career15on the computer.16that I was involved in clinical work, yes.16Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18A. In a couple states.18Q. I 2.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24that true?24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of</li> </ul>
16that I was involved in clinical work, yes.16Q.Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.17Q.Okay.17A.I 2?18A.I n a couple states.18Q.I 2.19Q.Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A.I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A.Of course not.20Q.Yes.21Q.Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an21A.Okay. I have it.22audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or22Q.And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A.Okay.24that true?24Q.I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> </ul>
17Q. Okay.17A. I 2?18A. In a couple states.18Q. I 2.19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.22audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24that true?24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it</li> </ul>
19Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?19A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?20A. Of course not.20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A. Okay.24that true?24Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> </ul>
20A. Of course not.20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an 22 audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or 23 treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is20Q. Yes.21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is24that true?25	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> </ul>
20A. Of course not.20Q. Yes.21Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an 22 audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or 23 treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is20Q. Yes.21A. Okay. Okay. I have it.22Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is24that true?25	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>A.   2?</li> </ul>
22audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or22Q.And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A.Okay.24that true?24Q.I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. In a couple states.</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>A. I 2?</li> <li>Q. I 2.</li> </ul>
22audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or22Q.And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.23treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is23A.Okay.24that true?24Q.I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. In a couple states.</li> <li>Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>A. I 2?</li> <li>Q. I 2.</li> <li>A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?</li> </ul>
24 that true?   24 Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. In a couple states.</li> <li>Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>A. Of course not.</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>A. I 2?</li> <li>Q. I 2.</li> <li>A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
24 that true?   24 Q. I'm looking at lines 58 and 59. Do you see those?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. In a couple states.</li> <li>Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>A. Of course not.</li> <li>Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>A. I 2?</li> <li>Q. I 2.</li> <li>A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. I have it.</li> </ul>
<b>25 A.</b> That's true. <b>25 A.</b> 59 ends the guestion and 60 starts an answer.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. In a couple states.</li> <li>Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>A. Of course not.</li> <li>Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>A. I 2?</li> <li>Q. I 2.</li> <li>A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. I have it.</li> <li>Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.</li> </ul>
	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. Are you a licensed audiologist?</li> <li>A. I am not because I am a retired audiologist I didn't want to pay the \$350 a year when I knew I wouldn't be practicing clinical work. Licensing only applies to clinical work, working with patients who have hearing problems.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. And so have you ever been licensed?</li> <li>A. I have been licensed the whole time with my career that I was involved in clinical work, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. In a couple states.</li> <li>Q. Are you licensed to practice medicine?</li> <li>A. Of course not.</li> <li>Q. Based on your testimony earlier I understand that an audiologist deals with hearing related diagnoses or treatment. So, for instance, hearing loss treatment. Is</li> </ul>	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. In your testimony you state that you're testifying as an expert witness regarding the potential health effects posed by noise from the project; is that correct?</li> <li>A. True.</li> <li>Q. I believe if you want to turn to pages 3 and 4 of your testimony, do you have that in front of you?</li> <li>A. What exhibit is that? I do not have it I have it on the computer.</li> <li>Q. Certainly. I believe it is Exhibit 2. I 2. Sorry.</li> <li>A. I 2?</li> <li>Q. I 2.</li> <li>A. I 2 A? I'm sorry. Prefiled testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. I have it.</li> <li>Q. And if you look at page 3. 3 and 4.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 237		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 239
1	<b>Q</b> . Yes.	1	you think can occur due to wind turbines; is that true?
2	A. On my okay.	2	<b>A.</b> Yes. Most of which are documented all of which are
3	<b>Q</b> . That's correct. And, as I understand that portion	3	documented in the literature.
4	of your testimony starting at line 60 through 81 you're	4	<b>Q.</b> And that's your you reference those on page 5 of
5	identifying your qualifications to testify as a health	5	your testimony; correct?
6	expert regarding wind turbine noise. Is that true?	6	<b>A.</b> Are you talking about the symptoms or the complaints
7	<b>A.</b> Well, the question was what experiences do I have to	7	or the health problems?
8	qualify me as a health expert, yes. In that sense it's	8	Q. Yes.
9	true.	9	A. Okay.
10	Q. And as I'm looking at your testimony, you indicate	10	Q. So, for instance, you note sleep disturbance,
11	that you coauthored an article on wind turbine noise in	11	annoyance, headaches, dizziness, vertigo, nausea, those
12	Audiology Today.	12	types of symptoms?
13	Is that the article you were referencing with	13	A. Absolutely, yes.
14	Mr. James that you	14	<b>Q.</b> People that don't live near wind turbines also can
15	A. That was the first article. That's not the same	15	experience those same health effects. Is that true?
16	article as I included as my Exhibit 2.	16	A. Admittedly, yes of course.
17	Q. Certainly. You talk about chairing a technical work	17	Q. And there's multiple reasons why someone might
18	group. Is that true?	18	suffer a headache, for instance. Is that also true?
19	A. Yes.	19	A. Many reasons I understand, yes.
20	<b>Q.</b> Testifying before zoning boards and commissions. Is	20	<b>Q.</b> So if someone is seeking treatment for certain
21	that also correct?	21	symptoms part of the process as we discussed earlier
22	A. I have, yes.	22	would be to diagnose potential causes of that
23	<b>Q.</b> Coauthoring a blog on a website. Is that also true?	23	particularly symptom. Is that true?
24	A. The article, wind turbine well, Exhibit 2 is an	24	A. True.
25	article that is published on a website. I called it a	25	<b>Q.</b> And you would also rule out other potential causes
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 238		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 240
1	blog. I'm not sure it's really a blog. It's really a	1	so that you can identify hopefully the true cause; is
2	it's like a journal of the hearing health technology	2	that correct?
3	and health matters. Okay.	3	A. Yes. And you're talking about individuals. I don't
4	<b>Q.</b> Okay. And then testifying in other matters; is that	4	diagnose individuals. I talk my work is involved with
5	true?	5	what I call causation assessment or risk assessment, not
6	A. Yes.	6	individual diagnosis.
7	Q. And interviewing individuals?	7	<b>Q.</b> No. That would be what a physician would do; is
8	<ul> <li>A. I have interviewed individuals, yes.</li> <li>And then the article that you'ly accurate with</li> </ul>	8	that correct?
9	<b>Q.</b> And then the article that you've coauthored with	9	<ul> <li>A. Individual diagnosis, yes.</li> <li>And an audialogist does not have the training to</li> </ul>
10 11	Mr. James that you do have is Exhibit 2-2; is that correct?	10 11	Q. And an audiologist does not have the training to rule out nonhearing related symptoms as you've stated
12	A. Sure. Yes.	12	earlier; correct?
13	<b>Q.</b> So other than your interviews with people where you	13	A. Nonhearing related symptoms? Rule out?
14	were interviewing them and asking them about their	14	We can take the patient's or client's or
15	complaints as you described earlier in your testimony,	15	patient's word for it, like the physicians have to do,
16	you're relying primarily on other people's information to	16	that they have a headache, for example, but we can't
17	have your opinions; is that true?	17	officially diagnose it.
18	<b>A.</b> Well, to a large extent I have my own experiences	18	<b>Q.</b> On page 5 of your testimony you indicate that
19	visiting and talking with people and doing some more	19	landowners who participate in a wind project or sign
20	formal interviewing than I had mentioned earlier.	20	waiver agreements with a wind company are less likely to
21	<b>Q.</b> Okay. As far as as far as the people that you	21	experience or report negative effects from turbines; is
22	interviewed, did you perform medical examinations of	22	that correct?
23	those people?	23	A. I believe it is.
24	<b>A.</b> No.	24	<b>Q.</b> So a person's perception of a wind project can
25	<b>Q.</b> And you have identified a number of maladies that	25	influence their reaction to the wind project. Is that
I	Page 237 tr		· · ·

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 241		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 243
1	true?	1	the same reasons my testimony was excluded because of the
2	A. Of course.	2	Daubert hearing issue that we discussed.
3	<b>Q.</b> On page 6 of your testimony you state that you	3	<b>Q.</b> Okay. So if you'll look on page 14 of the and so
4	estimate around 15 to 20 percent of exposed residents	4	the as I understand it, the page numbers are on the
5	will experience extreme annoyance and sleep disturbance.	5	lower right-hand side.
6	Is that true?	6	A. Yeah. I'm almost there.
7	A. Right.	7	<b>Q</b> . Okay.
8	<b>Q.</b> You don't site a source for that statement in your	8	A. Okay. I have page 14.
9	testimony, do you?	9	Q. So if we look under A, Qualifications, do you see
10	<b>A.</b> There is no source that says the range is 15 to 25	10	that subsection?
11	percent. I was offering an opinion and also an estimate,	11	A. I do. Yes, I do.
12	and that is my estimate.	12	Q. And I'll just warn you Cheri's looking at me so we
13	<b>Q.</b> In your testimony you indicate that you have been	13	have to be careful not to talk over each other. Cheri is
14	retained as an expert witness in the past. Is that true?	14	our court reporter.
15	A. Yes.	15	I see a line that says, "Punch's qualifications are
16	<b>Q.</b> Are you familiar with the case of Williams versus	16	impressive to be sure." Is Punch you, Dr. Punch?
17	Invenergy, LLC?	17	A. I would assume.
18	A. Yes.	18	<b>Q.</b> And if you look down at the bottom of the page it
19	Q. And do you have in front of you what's been marked	19	says, "However," and then up at the top of 14, "Punch is
20	as I oh, A 36?	20	neither a medical doctor nor an epidemiologist who could
21	A. I have it on the list I'll have to find it. I'm	21	opine on the cause of Williams' symptoms solely on the
22	sorry. I	22	basis of these qualifications. Therefore, for Punch's
23	Q. I apologize. It's A 36. It would have been sent to	23	causation testimony to be admissible he must support his
24	you by e-mail.	24	causation opinion with reference to foundational
25	A. Oh, I think that was sent to Mr. James's e-mail	25	literature which establishes the causal relationship
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 242		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 244
1	address because I'm in his study in his home. I don't	1	through the Application of scientific knowledge."
2	know	2	Have I read that accurately?
3	<b>Q.</b> I apologize. So do we need to send it to your	3	A. You have.
4	e-mail now?	4	<b>Q.</b> So if we turn then to page 15?
5	A. I have my computer available to do that, if you	5	A. Okay.
6	will.	6	<b>Q.</b> And were you before I get there were you present
7	<b>Q.</b> Okay. We will send it to you.	7	for the discussion of the reason I believe you said
8	A. I need to log in.	8	you heard Mr. James's testimony?
9	Q. Okay.	9	A. From another room I was listening on another
10	A. Again.	10	computer, yes, on the website.
11	A. I think I have it now.	11	<b>Q.</b> Did you hear the discussion and us read through the
12	<b>Q.</b> Okay. If you have it up just let us know when	12	reasons why the Cape Bridgewater study was found by the
13	you're ready.	13	Court to not support an opinion of causation?
14	<b>A.</b> It's open. I'll need to be leaning to the right to	14	A. I have to say I only caught part of that. I'm not
15	access it. Okay.	15	fully aware of what was said in total.
16	Q. Okay.	16	<b>Q.</b> If I indicate that Mr. James agreed that I read the
17	A. Okay.	17	portions that were referencing the Cape Bridgewater study
18	<b>Q.</b> Were you retained by the plaintiff in this action to	18	and the Dr. Kelly article and Paul Schomer's articles as
19	provide expert testimony on health effects of wind	19	not being sufficient to form a basis for causation, would
20	turbines?	20	you accept that based on what's in the document?
21	A. Yes, I was.	21	A. I would accept that you
22	<b>Q.</b> And was your testimony excluded by the court?	22	Q. Read it correctly.
23	A. As I recall, it was. I heard I should say I was	23	<b>A.</b> I'm accepting that you read it correctly, yes.
24	present to hear Mr. James's testimony, and I think we	24	<b>Q</b> . I won't repeat those then.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 245		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 247
1	<b>Q.</b> If we look at then on page 15 at the bottom on the	1	variations, factors, can influence the noise levels that
2	left-hand column it says and are you there? I should	2	are picked up or expose people to certain noise levels at
3	ask before I start.	3	that particular distance.
4	A. Am I here? Yes.	4	In other words, different people at 1.25 may not
5	Q. It says here, "Neither the Pierpont nor Schomer	5	experience the same noise levels. I didn't quite make
6	information constitutes an epidemiological study or shows	6	that clear earlier, I think.
7	a significant statistical relationship between turbine	7	Q. Are you aware that as Mr. Howell did in this
8	generated infrasound and adverse health effects. The	8	case, that it's possible to model in advance the
9	third article by Sult and Huller (check) supports its	9	estimated sound levels at specific distances from wind
10	theory of causation by demonstrating some low frequency	10	turbines?
11	sounds stimulate hair cells in the cochleas of guinea	11	A. As I said earlier, I don't do the model but I
12	pigs. However, the Salt and Huller article, like Punch's	12	understand what modeling is about and I understand from
13	other exhibits, fail to demonstrate the statistical	13	other acousticians in addition to Mr. James that modeling
14	relationship between low frequency wind turbine	14	is not always accurate.
15	infrasound and human health effects."	15	MS. SMITH: I have no further questions at this
16	Did I read that accurately?	16	time. I would move to strike all of Dr. Punch's
17	A. I wasn't actually reading with you. I have no	17	testimony. He does not have the qualifications to opine
18	reason to doubt that you read it accurately. Is that	18	regarding health effects, nor does he have the
19	acceptable?	19	qualifications to opine regarding acoustical analyses of
20	Q. That's acceptable.	20	wind project and appropriate wind turbine levels.
21	And the Pierpont study is the book by Neenah	21	MR. DE HUECK: So from my perspective I'm going
22 23	Pierpont called Wind Turbine Syndrome? Is that true that	22 23	to stand by my prior ruling and apply it to Mr. Punch in
23 24	they're referencing? A. True.	23 24	that he may not testify as to health related effects.
24 25	<ul><li>Q. And there's testimony in your in your Direct</li></ul>	24 25	However, I think he is allowed to testify as an expert to infrasonic sounds and inaudible noises from his
25	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 246	23	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 248
1	Testimony you have certain references to Mr. Howell's	1	experience and his training and research.
2	study on the acoustical study that was performed by	2	MR. ALMOND: May I have the opportunity to voir
3	Mr. Howell. Is that accurate?	3	dire the witness specifically related to this court case
4	A. I did make some comments on that, yes.	4	that she was just referring to, as there's a pretty
5	Q. Okay. And you made recommendations of certain	5	significant paragraph in there where the Court says
6	distances and certain sound levels that you believe are	6	"Dr. Punch is provided to give an opinion on causation
7	appropriate; is that true?	7	that wind turbines produce audible noise which may
8	A. I don't recall whether that was in with respect	8	disturb individuals and interfere with sleep," which is
9	to Mr. Howell's testimony or someone else's, but I think	9	on page 16 of this court case we're going over that has
10	that's that makes sense, yes.	10	not been discussed yet.
11	Q. And I should	11	MR. DE HUECK: Can you point me to where
12	A. I'll take it as true.	12	you're
13	<b>Q.</b> I should restate that you did make those opinions	13	MR. ALMOND: Page 16 of of the Williams versus
14	not necessarily in response always to Mr. Howell but of	14	Invenergy.
15	your own determination?	15 16	MR. DE HUECK: Where is it?
16 17	<ul><li>A. That's right.</li><li>Q. And as I understood your testimony earlier, you</li></ul>	17	MR. ALMOND: C, Admissible Subjects of
18	Q. And as I understood your testimony earlier, you indicated that you had offered a distance of a mile	18	Testimony. Just read that section. MR. DE HUECK: Yeah. The first sentence, that's
19	distance in addition to a dBA level because you didn't	19	what I was trying to say. We're not going to talk about
20	know how you would determine sound at a specific level.	20	adverse health effects.
21	Is that true or a specific distance. Is that	21	MR. ALMOND: Of infrasound and not audible or
22	accurate?	22	low frequency sound pulses.
23	A. Yes. I said basically that the two don't correlate	23	That paragraph goes on to say that "Given his
24	always because of differences like terrain and weather	24	expertise as an audiologist, he is qualified to give
25	conditions and times of year. All kinds of things,	25	opinions that wind turbines produce audible noise which

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 249		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 251
1	may disturb individuals and interfere with sleep."	1	did earlier.
2	MS. SMITH: May I respond? Because nothing that	2	He may not talk about adverse health effects as,
3	we've discussed here so far indicates that an audiologist	3	say, a doctor or another medical professional because
4	tests for infrasound. They test for hearing loss.	4	clearly he is not. But he has clearly stated that he has
5	Hearing has to be audible. Therefore, I do not believe	5	been studying audiology for a long long time, and he's
6	that he is qualified to speak regarding infrasound.	6	got a background and a resume to support that.
7	MS. EDWARDS: I'd just like to weigh in that, if	7	On that note I believe infrasound and other
8	permissible, I would like to further voir dire the	8	inaudible noises go hand in hand with his study, and he's
9	witness on the same issue.	9	clearly very fluent in that matter, which is beyond
10	MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead.	10	someone just someone talking about what they've read on
11	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. Mr rather,	11	the internet. So I believe his background will allow him
12	Dr. Punch, are you familiar with the case out of or,	12	to testify in terms of infrasound.
13	rather, docket out of New York involving the Cassadaga	13	Additionally, I see what Reece has pointed out,
14	Wind Farm permit.	14	and if you read the whole paragraph it makes sense to me.
15	THE WITNESS: I am.	15	They're not saying that he can medically go on to expound
16	MS. EDWARDS: Did you offer testimony in that	16	about sleep related health effects but that if he has,
17	case?	17	such as the WHO, literature that talks about health
18	THE WITNESS: I did, yes.	18	effects, he's qualified to tell us about those reports
19	MS. EDWARDS: Was your status as an expert	19	and what they said.
20	challenged?	20	MS. SMITH: And just to be clear, as I
21	THE WITNESS: I don't think my credentials per	21	understand I understand with the reading here that
22	se were challenged. I don't recall that they were.	22	noise can cause sleep disturbance the relationship
23	MS. EDWARDS: Was there a Motion to have your	23	between noise and sleep disturbance was allowed by the
24	testimony excluded?	24	court in this particular case.
25	THE WITNESS: Well, if you have evidence that's	25	So is your ruling that that's allowable? That's
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 250		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 252
1	true, your documentation would be better than my	1	the extent of what's allowable?
2	recollection. I don't recall it. No. I don't recall	2	MR. DE HUECK: That would be the extent.
	it.		
3		3	MS. SMITH: Okay. Just wanted a clarification.
4	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that	4	Thank you.
4 5	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to	4 5	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty
4 5 6	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and	4 5 6	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing
4 5 6 7	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in?	4 5 6 7	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems.
4 5 6 7 8	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I	4 5 6 7 8	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're
4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I	4 5 6 7 8 9	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you	4 5 6 7 8 9	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight. Here we have been applying the rules of	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Moving on for cross-examination to Mr. Fuerniss.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight. Here we have been applying the rules of admissibility. They need to be an expert witness in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Moving on for cross-examination to Mr. Fuerniss.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight. Here we have been applying the rules of admissibility. They need to be an expert witness in order to testify. Otherwise, anyone could come up and	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Moving on for cross-examination to Mr. Fuerniss. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> :
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight. Here we have been applying the rules of admissibility. They need to be an expert witness in order to testify. Otherwise, anyone could come up and give their opinions regarding articles on the internet,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Moving on for cross-examination to Mr. Fuerniss. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> : <b>Q</b> . Hello, Dr. Punch. You have referenced the World
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight. Here we have been applying the rules of admissibility. They need to be an expert witness in order to testify. Otherwise, anyone could come up and give their opinions regarding articles on the internet, and we've been attempting to differentiate between the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Moving on for cross-examination to Mr. Fuerniss. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> : <b>Q</b> . Hello, Dr. Punch. You have referenced the World Health Organization. Is it true that they're currently
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight. Here we have been applying the rules of admissibility. They need to be an expert witness in order to testify. Otherwise, anyone could come up and give their opinions regarding articles on the internet, and we've been attempting to differentiate between the two.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Moving on for cross-examination to Mr. Fuerniss. ECOSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. FUERNISS: Q. Hello, Dr. Punch. You have referenced the World Health Organization. Is it true that they're currently reviewing their noise standards and looking in particular
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. EDWARDS: Would it be accurate to state that the Public Service Commission found that it went to weight and persuasiveness rather than admissibility and allowed your testimony in? THE WITNESS: That sounds consistent with what I recall. But I'm not I'm not a lawyer either, and I don't really fully understand the weight of those you know, the substance of those labels. MS. SMITH: I would say that this we're really just doing legal argument through the witness because that particular case had a standard where they allowed they decided they didn't were not going to apply the traditional standards of admissibility and they allowed the witness in and it went to weight. Here we have been applying the rules of admissibility. They need to be an expert witness in order to testify. Otherwise, anyone could come up and give their opinions regarding articles on the internet, and we've been attempting to differentiate between the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: So I'm considering it pretty limited testimony, avoiding anything that is assessing the risk of health problems. MS. SMITH: All right. As long as we're stopped, I will offer that we'll do the same approach that we did before. We will provide our proposed striking redaction of the testimony that's been submitted, and we'll look at the transcript as well. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. MS. SMITH: Thank you. I have no further questions then. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Moving on for cross-examination to Mr. Fuerniss. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MR. FUERNISS</u> : <b>Q</b> . Hello, Dr. Punch. You have referenced the World Health Organization. Is it true that they're currently

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 253		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 255
1	MR. FUERNISS: Thank you. I have no further	1	some already rendered legal decision so convincingly that
2	questions.	2	some segments of the population suffer damaging effects
3	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.	3	from exposure to wind turbine noise."
4	MS. JENKINS: No questions.	4	Can you cite for me the legal decisions that
5	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.	5	you're referring to there?
6	MS. PAZOUR: No questions.	6	
7	MR. DE HUECK: Staff.	7	THE WITNESS: I don't think they're necessarily
			the legal decisions that were made in cases I've been
8	MS. EDWARDS: No questions.	8	involved with. They're cases that I've discussed with
9	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Dr. Punch or,	9	Rick James, and he's discussed some cases of others who
10	Mr. Punch, now we're going to subject you to Commissioner	10	he knows other acousticians who have been involved in
11	cross-examination. We're going to get you over to	11	these cases.
12	Kristie Fiegen.	12	I cannot cite at this point I was basing that
13	Before she begins I just have one question.	13	on information I had then, but I don't recall what I was
14	That Pierpont lady, she came up with infrasound	14	basing it on at this point.
15	and studied it and published some things. Would it	15	I think probably I was thinking for sure about
16	surprise you to know that she had changed her position	16	the Wisconsin case. We mentioned the Shirley Wind case
17	and determined that wind turbines do not carry	17	in this article, in fact. This was written in 2015 or
18	infrasound? In other words, she backed off of her former	18	'16. And that case was on going since, I don't know,
19	position that you would have relied on in that court	19	2012 at least, if not earlier. So the fact that it had
20	case?	20	been ruled a human health hazard was a legal decision in
21	THE WITNESS: Well, I relied on a number of	21	a court case essentially, in a hearing at least.
22	things. But it would surprise me, yes. It would	22	There are other cases in Europe. There are
23	surprise me.	23	cases now that anyone about then in Canada, particularly
24	MR. DE HUECK: So you have not heard that?	24	Ontario, Australia, I think, Ireland where there are real
25	THE WITNESS: I have not.	25	community pushback there's real community pushback to
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 254		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 256
			ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 250
1	MR. DE HUECK: Okay.	1	install turbine operations.
2	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none.	2	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding
2 3	MR. DE HUECK: Okay.	2 3	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug
2 3 4	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions.	2 3 4	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part
2 3 4 5	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson.	2 3 4 5	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with
2 3 4 5 6	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2,	2 3 4 5 6	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the	2 3 4 5 6 7	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep. I-2 B. And if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the Department of Health. I was not involved in that case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep. I-2 B. And if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep. I-2 B. And if you go to the second page. THE WITNESS: Okay. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Bottom of the second page,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the Department of Health. I was not involved in that case. Let me make that clear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep. I-2 B. And if you go to the second page. THE WITNESS: Okay. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Bottom of the second page, probably second to the last sentence that starts, "In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the Department of Health. I was not involved in that case. Let me make that clear. COMMISSIONER NELSON: But that's the one that you're referring to in this paper; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep. I-2 B. And if you go to the second page. THE WITNESS: Okay. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Bottom of the second page, probably second to the last sentence that starts, "In fact."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the Department of Health. I was not involved in that case. Let me make that clear. COMMISSIONER NELSON: But that's the one that you're referring to in this paper; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep. I-2 B. And if you go to the second page. THE WITNESS: Okay. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Bottom of the second page, probably second to the last sentence that starts, "In fact." THE WITNESS: Just getting to the second page.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the Department of Health. I was not involved in that case. Let me make that clear. COMMISSIONER NELSON: But that's the one that you're referring to in this paper; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have none. MR. DE HUECK: Vice Chairman Hanson. No questions. Commissioner Nelson. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Dr. Punch, your Exhibit 2, which I think has been labeled as Intervenor 2 B, the wind turbine noise and human health paper, on the bottom of page 2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Is that Exhibit 2? COMMISSIONER NELSON: It was Exhibit 2 on your testimony. THE WITNESS: Right. COMMISSIONER NELSON: It's been labeled as 2 B. THE WITNESS: Well, they're numbered by letters and then a number. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep. I-2 B. And if you go to the second page. THE WITNESS: Okay. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Bottom of the second page, probably second to the last sentence that starts, "In fact."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	install turbine operations. And even in Canada I think my understanding is that in the province of Ontario the new premier, Doug Jones excuse me. Doug Ford was elected in large part because of the community's complaints and upset with respect to all the turbines that are going up in that area of the country. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. But that has nothing to do with a convincing legal decision. So I want to go back to your reference to the Shirley Wind Farm issue where that area was declared to be a public health area. THE WITNESS: Human health hazard, yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And that decision was made by a court of law; is that correct? THE WITNESS: Well, it was made by the Public Service Commission, I think, based on evidence from the Department of Health. I was not involved in that case. Let me make that clear. COMMISSIONER NELSON: But that's the one that you're referring to in this paper; correct?

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 257		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 259
1	MR. DE HUECK: With that, Mr. Almond, do you	1	worked as a recreation manager for the city of boys I
2	have any redirect?	2	parks and recreation department. Wife and I worked on a
3	MR. ALMOND: No.	3	business model, plan tried to figure out a way to
4	MR. DE HUECK: Prevailing Winds, do you have any	4	basically get back to South Dakota get back to the farm.
5	recross based solely on Commissioner Nelson's question?	5	So right now since January I moved back. I'm in the
6	MS. SMITH: No.	6	process of building a business on the farm site.
7	MR. DE HUECK: Staff.	7	<b>Q.</b> And what about your wife? What does she do?
8	MS. EDWARDS: No.	8	<ul> <li>A. She's a training manager for a company called D T S.</li> </ul>
9	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Mr. Punch, thank you for	9	She works remotely the company she works for is based out
10	your testimony today. You may be dismissed.	10	5 1 5
11		11	of Orlando Florida she works out of our home remotely.
12	(The witness is excused.)	12	<ul> <li>Q. Do you have any children?</li> <li>Ma da</li></ul>
13	MR. DE HUECK: And moving on, Mr. Almond, you		A. We do. We have four adult children. Our adult
13	may call your next witness.	13	child, Zachary, our third child, moved back to
14	MS. AGRIMONTI: Mr. de Hueck, I'm sorry. I just	14	South Dakota in June.
16	realized the time. We're hitting 5:30, and I know we'll	15	Q. Where does he live?
	go until 7:00. I didn't know if this was the right time	16	<b>A.</b> He lives on the farm with us. He purchased a camper
17 18	to break, or if you had a different time in mind.	17	and moved on to the farm site. We're in the process of
_	(Discussion off the record.)	18	renovating the farmhouse, and so for the last few months
19	MR. DE HUECK: Reece, why don't you go ahead.	19	we've been living in the camper since we don't have a
20	Call your next witness we'll at least get your portion	20	flush toilet. So until I get my rough-in permit, my
21	done and then think about a break before	21	rough-in inspection and get my shower back in place,
22	cross-examination.	22	we're living in the camper on the farmsite.
23	MR. ALMOND: Intervenors call Paul Schoenfelder.	23	Q. The other three children live outside of
24		24	South Dakota?
25		25	A. Yes. All three live in I daho.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 258		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 260
1	Paul Schoenfelder,	1	<b>Q.</b> And do you have any concerns with this project?
2	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above	2	<ul><li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li><li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li></ul>
2 3	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:	23	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this</li> </ul>
2 3 4	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li><li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li><li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND:	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: <b>Q</b> . Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family. We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota. Q. And do you own land in or around the project	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota. Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota. Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint? A. I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota. Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint? A. I do. Q. How long sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota. Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint? A. I do. Q. How long sorry. A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. I in 2000	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Paul Schoenfelder, called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows: <u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. ALMOND: Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission? A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota. Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint? A. I do. Q. How long sorry. A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. I in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MR. ALMOND</u>:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. I in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. I live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. I in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To the southeast we've got multiple wind turbines. So</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> <li>Q. And how long did you say you've lived there?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> <li>Q. And how long did you say you've lived there?</li> <li>A. My wife grew up on the family farm. We moved to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To the southeast we've got multiple wind turbines. So health issues are huge.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> <li>Q. And how long did you say you've lived there?</li> <li>A. My wife grew up on the family farm. We moved to Boise, I daho and then in let's see 2017 my wife</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To the southeast we've got multiple wind turbines. So health issues are huge.</li> <li>You know, from an aesthetics standpoint, this is where where he want to live. This is where we've spent</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> <li>Q. And how long did you say you've lived there?</li> <li>A. My wife grew up on the family farm. We moved to Boise, I daho and then in let's see 2017 my wife returned to the area, to the farm, and then I moved to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To the southeast we've got multiple wind turbines. So health issues are huge.</li> <li>You know, from an aesthetics standpoint, this is where where he want to live. This is where we've spent the last 10 years trying to figure out how to get back</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> <li>Q. And how long did you say you've lived there?</li> <li>A. My wife grew up on the family farm. We moved to Boise, I daho and then in let's see 2017 my wife returned to the area, to the farm, and then I moved to the area in January of 2018.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of ny family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To the southeast we've got multiple wind turbines. So health issues are huge.</li> <li>You know, from an aesthetics standpoint, this is where where he want to live. This is where we've spent the last 10 years trying to figure out how to get back to.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> <li>Q. And how long did you say you've lived there?</li> <li>A. My wife grew up on the family farm. We moved to Boise, I daho and then in let's see 2017 my wife returned to the area, to the farm, and then I moved to the area in January of 2018.</li> <li>Q. And what do you do for a living?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of my family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To the southeast we've got multiple wind turbines. So health issues are huge.</li> <li>You know, from an aesthetics standpoint, this is where where he want to live. This is where we've spent the last 10 years trying to figure out how to get back to.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Paul Schoenfelder,</li> <li>called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above cause, testified under oath as follows:</li> <li><u>DIRECT EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MR. ALMOND:</li> <li>Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the Commission?</li> <li>A. My name is Paul Schoenfelder. 1 live at 40228 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota.</li> <li>Q. And do you own land in or around the project footprint?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. How long sorry.</li> <li>A. Sorry. Own a farm together with my wife. 1 in 2000 received a deed to a portion of what's my wife's family farm.</li> <li>Q. How many acres do you own?</li> <li>A. 160.</li> <li>Q. And how long did you say you've lived there?</li> <li>A. My wife grew up on the family farm. We moved to Boise, I daho and then in let's see 2017 my wife returned to the area, to the farm, and then I moved to the area in January of 2018.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And do you have any concerns with this project?</li> <li>A. I have numerous concerns with the project.</li> <li>Q. I should first clarify are you an Intervener in this proceeding?</li> <li>A. Yes. I am an Intervenor in this case. Several concerns. My primary concern is my health, the health of ny family.</li> <li>We have several wind turbines proposed within a mile of our home. I know several people that live near the Beethoven wind project have had very credible health concerns associated with that. I've visited the Beethoven area. Again it's only a few miles from my home. Sound, shadow flicker, vibration. Those are things that are definitely concern for me. Long-term we're planning to live in this house I have to assume for the rest of our lives. It faces towards the east. To the southeast we've got multiple wind turbines. So health issues are huge.</li> <li>You know, from an aesthetics standpoint, this is where where he want to live. This is where we've spent the last 10 years trying to figure out how to get back to.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 261		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	263
1	environment. So along with my own health concerns, I	1	Q. And let's not talk about what any County	
2	guess I'm afraid for the health of my neighbors. I fear	2	Commissioners said.	
3	for their physical and psychological well-being, having	3	MS. AGRIMONTI: Yeah. I'm going to move to	
4	multiple large wind turbines in the neighborhood.	4	strike the testimony of the witness. He has provided, I	
5	Q. And what county do you live in?	5	believe, speculation about what the County Commissioners	
6	A. Charles Mix County.	6	knew or did not know in his recounting of what was said	
7	<b>Q.</b> And did you participate in the I guess attempted	7	or not said at a variety of meetings.	
8	zoning process and all the County Commission meetings	8	MR. DE HUECK: So it's pretty blended in there	
9	that we talked about with Mr. Mushitz?	9	with what he took away from the meetings. I'm going to	
10	A. Yes. Pretty much throughout the process. I started	10	allow him to continue I'm not going to strike any	
11	attending some meetings in April. Shortly thereafter the	11	testimony up to this point but we need to just focus on	
12	idea of zoning was brought up and again attended multiple	12	what you observed, how you felt, and not speculate as to	
13	meetings in which zoning was discussed by the county.	13	what they said or how they felt or	
14	<b>Q.</b> And from start to finish just give the Commission	14	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
15	kind of your impression of the process that took place.	15	<b>Q.</b> So summarizing you said you attended meetings in the	
16	A. Well, the first meeting I attended was in April. I	16	months of April and May. Did you get a sense or a	
17	believe it was April 19. It was a County Commission	17	feeling of whether or not the County Commissioners were	
18	meeting attended by Mr. Powers who discussed his health	18	attentive to the concerns of the residents?	
19	concerns.	19	A. I got the impression they were very very attentive	;
20	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. I'm going to ask	20	to the input that they were sleeving from the public.	
21	that the witness please not recite what others may have	21	<b>Q</b> . Okay. So then after May did you continue to attend	
22	said at a meeting. He was asked about his impression,	22	meetings?	
23	not what people said.	23	A. I did. I attended.	
24	THE WITNESS: I apologize.	24	<b>Q</b> . Tell us about those.	
25	MS. AGRIMONTI: That's okay. I'm sorry for	25	A. I attended the meeting in June. That was the	
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 262		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!	264
1	interrupting. I want to make sure I have an opportunity	1	meeting that was attended by a representative from	
2	to interject an objection during a narration.	2	District III economic development, Mr. McGinnis. He	
3	<b>A.</b> I attended meetings in April. My primary take away	4	talked about I got to be careful. I honestly want to	
5	from that meeting was that the County Commissioners did	5	be very careful. MR. DE HUECK: Well, here's the easy way to do	
6	not have a great deal of information about the proposed project. My impression was that they were surprised at	6	it. You're doing a lot of what's called narrative, and	
7	what the setbacks potentially were in neighboring Bon	7	you just start which is great and appreciate it, but	
8	Homme County. It was expressed by County Commissioners	8	your attorney can ask a lot more questions and kind of	
9	that they they were surprised that setbacks would be	9	help guide what comes out of your mouth.	
10	that close to occupied residences.	10	So I'm going to allow Reece to ask more	
11	I expressed my concerns that there was a lack of	11	questions and for you to give shorter answers. You can	
12	information about the project available. There was a lot	12	talk just as much. It's just he's going to be there to	
13	of unknowns. I didn't know exactly what the plans were.	13	help you guide it along so we're going to break up your	
14	I've been trying to follow the project earlier, you know,	14	long narratives into smaller sections through your	
15	through 2016, through 2017, but still didn't have a great	15	attorney.	
16	deal of information. I attended several meetings, at	16	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	
17	least two or three meetings during the month of May in	17	<b>Q.</b> So this June meeting in which a District III	
18	which the topic was brought up to the County	18	representative was there, at that meeting did you have a	
19	Commissioners. Several members of the community attended	19	sensor an impression of how the Commissioners were	
20	those meetings. Again, I was struck by the general lack	20	responding to the concerns of the citizens?	
21	of knowledge of wind, large wind facility regulations,	21	A. I believe they put a lot of weight on what	
22	practices. We discussed setbacks with the County	22	Mr. McGinnis brought forward. My take away was that	if
23	Commission. It was expressed several times that two mile	23	the county was going to set about regulations greater	
24	setbacks may be appropriate. County Commissioners	24	than those that existed in Bon Homme County, that the	у
25	expressed that	25	would subject the county to litigation, that there was a	1

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 265		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 267
1	rationale that was used to develop the Bon Homme County	1	of that southern part of the county. I requested a map
2	regulations regarding large wind turbines and that if the	2	that would also represent nonparticipating or withdraw
3	county were going to do anything more restrictive than	3	nonparticipating households. Mr. McGinnis, I believe
4	that they would have to provide peer reviewed research or	4	<b>Q.</b> Did you receive a copy of the map that you
5	they would subject the county to litigation.	5	requested?
6	<b>Q.</b> And did you continue to attend county meetings as	6	A. I did not receive a copy of that map. I also did
7	the process continued on?	7	not see a copy of the map that included nonparticipating
8		8	residences.
9	<ul> <li>A. I did. I attended another meeting later in June.</li> <li>And what was the purpose of that meeting about?</li> </ul>	9	
	<ul> <li>Q. And what was the purpose of that meeting about?</li> <li>That meeting was to take more public input. There</li> </ul>		<b>Q.</b> Okay. After that meeting, did you attend any
10	<b>A.</b> That meeting was to take more public input. There	10	additional meeting?
11	were several members of the community that came in and	11	A. I did. At that meeting in July it was suggested
12	expressed larger setbacks, one mile setbacks and two mile	12	that it was suggested that an agreement
13	setbacks were what they would like to see, what they	13	<b>Q.</b> You said the July meeting this is the one you were
14	would expect, that they felt would be necessary to	14	just talking about?
15	protect them.	15	A. Just talking about, the July meeting. It was
16	<b>Q.</b> And did you have a sensor impression of how that	16	suggested that Prevailing Winds Staff visit with
17	information was or how the Commissioners responded to	17	<b>Q</b> . Let's hold on off on that testimony, okay?
18	those requests?	18	A. Sure.
19	A. Continued to be very well received. Expresses	19	<b>Q</b> . So when you left this meeting in July what was your
20	that at the public we felt as members of the public	20	kind of take away from it?
21	other public people that I heard there that those things	21	A. My take away was that my take away was that the
22	were being heard and that the idea of larger setbacks,	22	Prevailing Winds Staff was having more influence on the
23	one mile setbacks for residences was certainly	23	County Commission than the residents of the county.
24	certainly under consideration.	24	<b>Q.</b> Okay. And then did you continue to attend County
25	<b>Q.</b> And did there come a point in time where you felt	25	Commission meetings there after?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 266		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 268
1	that the County Commissioners were no longer as receptive	1	A. I did.
2	to the requests of their citizens?	2	<b>Q</b> . And did your impression or your sense change at any
3	<b>A.</b> I attended a meeting in July which was also attended	3	point as you attended those additional meetings that the
4	by Mr. McGinnis, members of I guess I refer to them as	4	County Commission was providing was receiving the
5	Prevailing Winds project, Thorstad, their legal counsel,	5	Prevailing Winds' input more favorably than that of its
6	also several people who were investors and/or had	6	residents?
7	easements for the project.	7	<b>A.</b> Yes. That was my impression. It built from that
8	At that time the tenor of the Commission seemed to	8	July meeting and continued in future meetings that I had
9	change.	9	attended.
10	Q. How so?	10	<b>Q</b> . When was the last Commission meeting that you
11	<b>A.</b> When the topic of one mile setbacks was brought up	11	attended with respect to this project?
12	the Commission seemed to be stepping away from that.	12	A. I attended an August meeting of the Commission,
13	Mr. McGinnis brought a map that he had put together. I	13	which zoning was discussed. And then I also attended a
14	assumed it was Mr. McGinnis put together that showed the	14	September early September meeting that was actually
15	southern part of Charles Mix County overlaid with	15	with township representatives and the County Commission
16	residences with multiple rings representing setbacks.	16	to discuss zoning.
17	Overlaid with that were proposed turbine locations and	17	<b>Q.</b> What was that September meeting about?
18	that was reviewed.	18	A. That was about zoning in general. There was a draft
19	Several times you know, it was it was it	19	zoning ordinance being brought forward and there were
20	felt difficult to express something, you know, other than	20	there were, I don't know, approximately there were
21	what would now have been significantly reduced setbacks.	21	several people 40 people from the community, several
22	I requested at that meeting that a map show a map	22	of them representing the townships discussing all aspects
23	of nonparticipating residents. Because as it was looked	23	of zoning.
24	at, people observed that most of the county if you	24	<b>Q.</b> And was the discussion of wind energy zoning or
25	overlaid one mile or two mile setbacks that occupied most	25	was wind energy zoning considered during that meeting?

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 269		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 271
1	A. In that September meeting wind energy zoning was by	1	testimony as well. He's speculating as to how people
2	and large dismissed because at that point what was	2	feel.
3	referred to as an agreement had been signed and the	3	MR. DE HUECK: I agree. However, I'm not going
4	county would not entertain any zoning changes or	4	to strike that testimony. I don't think it's
5	emergency zoning with regards to large wind facilities.	5	incredibly just, Reiss, continue to ask some
6	Q. And you referenced the agreement. Have you come to	6	questions.
7	learn that was the Peter Pawlowski Affidavit that we've	7	MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions
8	been discussing in this hearing?	8	for Mr. Schoenfelder thank you for testifying.
9	A. Yes.	9	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
10	Q. Okay. You've attended this entire hearing process;	10	MR. DE HUECK: As you've seen we're now going to
11	is that right?	11	turn you over for cross-examination. We'll start over
12	A. Yes.	12	here with the Applicant.
13	<b>Q.</b> Earlier a question was asked about the level of	13	MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you.
14	social disruption that has occurred in the area. What is	14	<b>CROSS-EXAMINATION</b>
15	your sense on the social disruption that has occurred and	15	BY MS. AGRIMONTI:
16	that will whether you think it will likely continue	16	<b>Q.</b> Mr. Schoenfelder, just a couple of questions.
17	on?	17	You've reviewed the proposed layout for the project in
18	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Vague.	18	this proceeding; is that right?
19	MR. DE HUECK: You may go ahead and answer that.	19	A. I have. I've seen the map change a couple times,
20	A. I've been I've been aware of this project since	20	but I'm pretty familiar with it.
21	2016, and I've seen that it's generated quite a bit of	21	<b>Q.</b> And do you know how close the nearest turbine is to
22	anxiety. I attended the public meeting in Avon in July	22	your home?
23	of 2018, and I think if you attended that meeting what	23	<b>A.</b> I would say approximately three-quarters of a mile.
24	you saw at that meeting is really indicative of what I've	24	<b>Q.</b> And you stated that you were actively involved in
25	seen in the community, if not even more so. I've seen a	25	Charles Mix County with respect to whether a zoning
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 270		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 272
1	great deal of anxiety.	1	ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?
2	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to	2	ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right? A. Yes.
2 3	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property	2 3	ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right? <b>A.</b> Yes. <b>Q.</b> And you would agree that all interested persons who
2 3 4	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she	2 3 4	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal. <b>A.</b> I've seen people who I fear would who have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal. A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal. A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	great deal of anxiety. My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe. MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal. A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health.</li> <li>The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health.</li> <li>The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's esthetically disturbing.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this Charles Mix process. Would you agree?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health.</li> <li>The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's esthetically disturbing.</li> <li>Q. Have you observed any strains on friendships or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this Charles Mix process. Would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's esthetically disturbing.</li> <li>Q. Have you observed any strains on friendships or relationships in the community?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this Charles Mix process. Would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>M. AGRIMONTI: I have no further questions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's esthetically disturbing.</li> <li>Q. Have you observed any strains on friendships or relationships in the community?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this Charles Mix process. Would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>M. AGRIMONTI: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, do you have any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health.</li> <li>The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's esthetically disturbing.</li> <li>Q. Have you observed any strains on friendships or relationships in the community?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I've seen neighbors who don't look each other in the aye. I see conflicts. I see people brought</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this Charles Mix process. Would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, do you have any questions for Mr. Schoenfelder?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health. The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's esthetically disturbing.</li> <li>Q. Have you observed any strains on friendships or relationships in the community?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I've seen neighbors who don't look each other in the aye. I see conflicts. I see people brought to tiers. I see people who feel ashamed because they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this Charles Mix process. Would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>M. S. AGRIMONTI: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, do you have any questions for Mr. Schoenfelder?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>great deal of anxiety.</li> <li>My my sister-in-law owns property adjacent to ours. Her intention she's developing that property with the intention to move to that property. When she learned that there may be turbines</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. He's testifying to what other people think or believe.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Yes. So don't continue down the road of that. Just your own personal.</li> <li>A. I've seen people who I fear would who have been so emotionally bothered that I fear for their health.</li> <li>The idea that wind turbines are going to be placed in the area. I've seen high levels of anxiety. I've felt personally a lack of information, a lack of accurate information. I can't I guess I could speak for others because I've talked to quite a few people, but my feelings have been echoed by others. They feel that it's esthetically disturbing.</li> <li>Q. Have you observed any strains on friendships or relationships in the community?</li> <li>A. Absolutely. I've seen neighbors who don't look each other in the aye. I see conflicts. I see people brought</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>ordinance ought to be put in place; is that right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you would agree that all interested persons who have a stake in whether zoning would be appropriate or not have a right to speak and influence the political process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And in fact that's what happened in Charles Mix County?</li> <li>A. Could you restate that question?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. You would agree that both or all sides, there were townships that weighed in on whether zoning was appropriate. There were people like yourself who had opinions about setbacks. There were participants who believed there should be certain rules in place for their development of their property and there was Prevailing Wind Park and all of those entities weighed in to this Charles Mix process. Would you agree?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I have no further questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, do you have any questions for Mr. Schoenfelder?</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 273		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 275
1	of a wind farm on your home, your homestead and your	1	lot of information. And it's a very complicated process.
2	business do you feel it would also potentially impact	2	I think for individuals to try and navigate that process,
3	you said that your that was your wife's home she grew	3	it's very difficult and I think there's a lot of people
4	up there. Would there possibly be an impact on the	4	that would be shut out of the process simply due to the
5	cemetery that her family's buried in?	5	lack of understanding of how the process works.
6	A. I believe so. Absolutely.	6	<b>Q.</b> And do you feel that the necessary permits from the
7	MR. FUERNISS: Thank you.	7	different entities that are required
8	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins, do you have any	8	<b>A.</b> Again, having a lack of understanding of how the
9	questions.	9	process works, I was somewhat surprised that certain
10	MS. JENKINS: I have one.	10	things the WAPA study being primary among them. I
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION	11	submitted a letter to WAPA in 2016. It was by
12	BY MS. JENKINS:	12	happenstance I saw the announcement in the Wagner post
13	<b>Q.</b> Do you think that we that the process to get this	13	that that deadline for information to be submitted to
14	Application approved or denied, has it gone according to	14	WAPA was drawn to a close.
15	how you would expect for people like us Intervenors?	15	It seems like it's very important, impactful
16	MS. AGRIMONTI: I'm going to object. I don't	16	project, and a lot of people, myself included, my family,
17	believe that the witness would have any expectation or	17	not aware of what the process was and still look at it to
18	basis on which to make a prediction about how this	18	a certain extent shaking our head wondering how is this
19	process ought to go.	19	happening so quickly.
20	MS. JENKINS: Maybe I have to restate that.	20	<b>Q.</b> Okay. And then one final question, I think.
21	MR. DE HUECK: You do. I think you're trying to	21	Do you feel like the resources that we as
22	ask him his level of satisfaction with the process that	22	Intervenors have are comparable to the resources that
23	he's gone through? Or something along those lines?	23	of the Applicant's?
24	<b>Q.</b> Do you understand?	24	A. Absolutely not.
25	A. I believe I understand the question.	25	<b>Q.</b> Okay. And the question B to that is do you feel
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 274		
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 274		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 276
1	<b>Q.</b> Okay.	1	that if the necessary permits that they needed to
1 2		1 2	
	<b>Q</b> . Okay.	_	that if the necessary permits that they needed to
2	<ul><li>Q. Okay.</li><li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the</li></ul>	2	that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably
2 3	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have</li> </ul>	2 3	that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of</li> </ul>	2 3 4	that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy. MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy. MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that. If you understood the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to</li> <li>finalize this project do you feel like they probably</li> <li>should have been obtained before they filed an</li> <li>Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend</li> <li>money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to</li> <li>finalize this project do you feel like they probably</li> <li>should have been obtained before they filed an</li> <li>Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend</li> <li>money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the</li> <li>Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to</li> <li>finalize this project do you feel like they probably</li> <li>should have been obtained before they filed an</li> <li>Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend</li> <li>money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the</li> <li>Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to</li> <li>finalize this project do you feel like they probably</li> <li>should have been obtained before they filed an</li> <li>Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend</li> <li>money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the</li> <li>Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to</li> <li>finalize this project do you feel like they probably</li> <li>should have been obtained before they filed an</li> <li>Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend</li> <li>money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the</li> <li>Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I</li> <li>still don't understand how they could be addressed or</li> <li>redressed through the process leading up to either</li> <li>approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Okay. A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted. I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved. My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying to start a business in the area. And a business is based</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> <li>I fear that it moved very quickly for the people in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying to start a business in the area. And a business is based on on sort of the uniqueness of the area. I'm trying</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> <li>I fear that it moved very quickly for the people in the area and it moved very quickly for our county</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying to start a business in the area. And a business is based on on sort of the uniqueness of the area. I'm trying to I'm working on opening a brewery. We'd love people</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> <li>I fear that it moved very quickly for the people in the area and it moved very quickly for our county officials.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to</li> <li>finalize this project do you feel like they probably</li> <li>should have been obtained before they filed an</li> <li>Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend</li> <li>money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the</li> <li>Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying to start a business in the area. And a business is based on on sort of the uniqueness of the area. I'm trying to come out and enjoy the area and understand that you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> <li>I fear that it moved very quickly for the people in the area and it moved very quickly for our county officials.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. And can you describe how you feel about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to</li> <li>finalize this project do you feel like they probably</li> <li>should have been obtained before they filed an</li> <li>Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend</li> <li>money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the</li> <li>Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I</li> <li>still don't understand how they could be addressed or</li> <li>redressed through the process leading up to either</li> <li>approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying</li> <li>to start a business in the area. And a business is based</li> <li>on on sort of the uniqueness of the area. I'm trying</li> <li>to come out and enjoy the area and understand that you</li> <li>have products that are that are produced in this area,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> <li>I fear that it moved very quickly for the people in the area and it moved very quickly for our county officials.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. And can you describe how you feel about it since the Application came in and the process for the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying to start a business in the area. And a business is based on on sort of the uniqueness of the area. I'm trying to come out and enjoy the area and understand that you have products that are that are produced in this area, that this is where it comes from. And when I I'm kind</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> <li>I fear that it moved very quickly for the people in the area and it moved very quickly for our county officials.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. And can you describe how you feel about it since the Application came in and the process for the Intervenors to prepare for the case and the burden? Do</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests? <ul> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> </ul> </li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying to start a business in the area. And a business is based on on sort of the uniqueness of the area. I'm trying to come out and enjoy the area and understand that you have products that are that are produced in this area, that this is where it comes from. And when I I'm kind of I'm a history buff so whenever I go up to the hill</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. I have been disappointed in the amount of or the lack of information available about the project. I have been dissatisfied with the with the type of information that I've been able to access. I've never been contacted by Prevailing Winds even though I live in the impacted area. My wife's never been, you know, contacted.</li> <li>I've attempted to contact Prevailing Winds. See very little response. I hear I am surprised and disappointed at the length of time between when the Application is submitted through this process and when it will be approved.</li> <li>My personal opinion is that the County Commission doesn't have the didn't have the time, didn't have the tools in order to adequately and in depth look at this project.</li> <li>I fear that it moved very quickly for the people in the area and it moved very quickly for our county officials.</li> <li>Q. Thank you. And can you describe how you feel about it since the Application came in and the process for the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that if the necessary permits that they needed to finalize this project do you feel like they probably should have been obtained before they filed an Application with the PUC and caused us to have to spend money to protect our interests?</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Relevancy.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: You can go ahead and answer that.</li> <li>If you understood the question.</li> <li>A. I think that there are still unknown factors in the Application that there's still holes in the Application.</li> <li>And I don't know how how those could be addressed. I still don't understand how they could be addressed or redressed through the process leading up to either approval or denial of the Application.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have any other concerns?</li> <li>A. Well, again, I have personal concerns. I'm trying to start a business in the area. And a business is based on on sort of the uniqueness of the area. I'm trying to come out and enjoy the area and understand that you have products that are that are produced in this area, that this is where it comes from. And when I I'm kind</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 277		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 279
1	Lewis & Clark documented Lake Andes because it's a	1	just one or two or
2	natural lake.	2	THE WITNESS: Again I guess trying to avoid
3	Well, then you turn and look farther to the east.	3	hearsay.
4	What you don't see is the rolling plains that was there	4	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Sure. That's a little
5	250 years ago. What's become the dominant feature is a	5	difficult. I understand.
6	band of large wind turbines. And then you envision that	6	THE WITNESS: People say I I don't want to
7	large band of wind turbines stretching for miles farther	7	I don't want to do business with that person. I don't
8	to the south across Highway 46.	8	want to tell them how I feel because I fear that I'll
9	And then you look off towards Nebraska. I drive	9	estrange them and they won't do business with me.
10	down to Elgin, Nebraska, and I'm I'm not stricken by	10	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Is this, I'm assuming
11	the rolling hills. I'm struck by the large wind	11	when you socialize and to whatever extent, church and
12	turbines, and that's not that's not where I grew up.	12	sports events in the high school, things of that nature,
13	I grew up in Mitchell. I didn't grow up in an industrial	13	is this a number one topic of discussion or is Trump's
14	wind farm so that's some concern.	14	latest tweet the
15	MS. JENKINS: Thank you.	15	THE WITNESS: What to me is almost more
16	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.	16	disturbing is that there is a lack of information that
17	MS. PAZOUR: No comment.	17	people don't know that more than anything else I hear is
18	MR. DE HUECK: Staff.	18	that still happening? Or I don't want to talk about it
19	MS. REISS: No thank you.	19	because it's already done. It's already a done deal
20	MR. DE HUECK: And that brings us to Commission	20	is the word you hear so often. It's a done deal. As if
21	questions starting with Commissioner Hanson.	21	this all these proceedings are completely irrelevant.
22	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Good evening,	22	That people when asked if they would attend that meeting
23	Mr. Schoenfelder. It's understandable that there will be	23	in Avon in July said there's no point it's already
24	mixed feelings about a large industrial project of this	24	approved and I don't want to rock the boat. That's
25	nature within an area for a number of different reasons.	25	that's been repeated several times. ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 280
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 278 And that there will be some significant feelings	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 280 COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Thank you.
2	expressed by the inhabitants that are affected by it.	2	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you for being here.
3	We've read a number of things and certainly	3	Just to make sure I've got you placed properly
4	we've witnessed some emotional presentations to us when	4	on the map, I'm seeing a parcel owned by the Vernon sip
5	we were there for the public meeting.	5	life estate. Is that where you're at.
6	Can you tell us just I'm curious and it's not	6	THE WITNESS: That is correct.
7	necessarily going to weigh a tremendous amount on the	7	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Perfect. You referred in
8	decision but I'd like to know, have you witnessed	8	your testimony to the mountains of paper that were
9	let's look at degrees, for instance. Have you personally	9	involved in this process.
10	witnessed altercations from the standpoint of shouting	10	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
11	matches between people?	11	COMMISSIONER NELSON: But you ended by saying
12	THE WITNESS: I've witnessed I would say strong	12	that there are holes in the Application.
13	words. I don't know if I would describe them as shouting	13	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
14	matches.	14	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you believe that
15	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Have you witnessed any	15	those holes have not been filled by the mountains of
16	physical altercations?	16	paper that have been involved here?
17	THE WITNESS: I have not.	17	THE WITNESS: A couple things I guess that come
18	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay. I'm just curious to	18	to my mind immediately. The one is WAPA environmental
19	the fabric of the town and relationships. Have you seen	19	study. It was my understanding that that was a precursor
20 21	people that are no longer willing to do business at	20	for approval for this project. Again, submitted letters
	particular areas or people who have estranged	21	to that process. Still waiting to hear what that says.
			Environmontal cultural accost curvey. Even in
22	relationships of that nature?	22 23	Environmental cultural asset survey. Even in
22 23	relationships of that nature? THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes, I have.	23	the Application I read that that's being worked on. Then
22	relationships of that nature?		

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 281		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 283
1	that there would be opportunities for public input when	1	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Two quick questions. The
2	there is to the best of my knowledge that agreement and	2	closest wind tower number to your property is do you
3	Affidavit that was produced between Prevailing Winds and	3	know what number it is or could Reece
4	the county didn't receive public input. So again still	4	THE WITNESS: I could look at the map in a
5	feeling like there's a lack of information out there and	5	heartbeat.
6	misinformation but definitely still things lacking and	6	Between 23 and 58. I couldn't tell you exactly
7	not understanding how the process works.	7	which one's closer. They're both approximately
8	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Do you understand that	8	three-quarters of a mile from my home.
9	those first two items that you mentioned will in fact	9	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Okay. How many acres there
10	need to be completed before any permit would ever be	10	does your family own?
11	valid from this Commission.	11	THE WITNESS: In total 320.
12	THE WITNESS: I do absolutely.	12	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: 320. And then you talked
13	COMMISSIONER NELSON: And that that information	13	about looking at building a business and
14	at least that which is not confidential information will	14	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
15	ultimately be public.	15	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: It's always neat when people
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.	16	come back come back to South Dakota and raise their
17	COMMISSIONER NELSON: The last question, I want	17	families and retire here, whatever. We love that.
18	to follow up on Commissioner Hanson's question about	18	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
19	relationships.	19	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Tell me a little bit about
20	Have any of your relationships been damaged	20	the business that you're looking at developing and will
21	through this process?	21	people come to your facility? Will they be outside?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes.	22	Will they be in your home? Are you building a shed?
23	COMMISSIONER NELSON: Are there people that you	23	Help me understand the dynamics of that business and like
24	don't talk to because of this?	24	how many acres. Where will it be? Right next to your
25	THE WITNESS: There are people I feel less	25	home?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 282		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 284
			ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 204
1	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that	1	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to
1 2	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes.	1 2	
	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will		THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're
2 3 4	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project?	2	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started.
2 3	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early	2 3	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue
2 3 4 5 6	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that
2 3 4 5 6 7	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking products, hand crafted products, and then distribute it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking products, hand crafted products, and then distribute it from the farm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking products, hand crafted products, and then distribute it from the farm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking products, hand crafted products, and then distribute it from the farm. And then the primary business that we're working on is a brewery. From the legislative side I would say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you for being here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products, and then distribute it from the farm. And then the primary business that we're working on is a brewery. From the legislative side I would say the legislature did a good job this spring because they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you for being here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products, and then distribute it from the farm. And then the primary business that we're working on is a brewery. From the legislative side I would say the legislature did a good job this spring because they changed some of the brewery laws so now we're able to do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you for being here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking products, hand crafted products, and then distribute it from the farm. And then the primary business that we're working on is a brewery. From the legislative side I would say the legislature did a good job this spring because they changed some of the brewery laws so now we're able to do what's called self distribution. In the past you if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you for being here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking products, hand crafted products, and then distribute it from the farm. And then the primary business that we're working on is a brewery. From the legislative side I would say the legislature did a good job this spring because they changed some of the brewery laws so now we're able to do what's called self distribution. In the past you if you didn't sell beer on the sight you had to work through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	comfortable talking to. There are relationships that have been strained personally for me. Neighbors. Yes. COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you feel ill will towards those who support the project? THE WITNESS: I am I made a commitment early in this process that I would want to be treated the way other people want to be treated. I hope that other people feel the same way. These are my neighbors. A lot of those neighbors are taking the stands for a lot of different reasons. They're not evil people. I just I I refuse to I refuse to hate anyone through this process. COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your sharing that. And that was a tough question for me to ask, and I appreciate your answer. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. DE HUECK: Chair Fiegen. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you for being here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: And I apologize. You're going to get me started. The first thing is the family farm. So we're working on the family farmhouse. We sharecrop that land. So we're involved in the process. We received revenue from that farm. We would never want to do anything that would significantly diminish that. Farms are important both economically and culturally. So we want to make sure that that family farm can continue working with a couple of families who do the real work and they've done it for 10, 15, 20 years plus and we want to maintain that relationship. We also want to build a farm based business. Basically producing products on the farm, woodworking products, hand crafted products, and then distribute it from the farm. And then the primary business that we're working on is a brewery. From the legislative side I would say the legislature did a good job this spring because they changed some of the brewery laws so now we're able to do what's called self distribution. In the past you if

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 285		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 287
1	barrels. So we started the process we have a building	1	MR. ALMOND: None.
2	permit we're clearing the ground for a brewery building.	2	MR. DE HUECK: And we had Commissioner questions
3	It will be a pole barn.	3	so Prevailing Winds, do you have any cross based on those
4	We know that the margins you make a lot more	4	questions?
5	money if you can sell it on site so we are hoping to get	5	MS. AGRIMONTI: No. Thank you,
6	people on site to come out and buy our beer.	6	Mr. Schoenfelder.
7	We also know that brand loyalty is huge in the	7	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss, no. Ms. Jenkins.
8	small brewery market so we want to create an environment	8	MS. JENKINS: Of course I have one.
9	where people can come out, sit on the porch patio that	9	CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	would be incorporated into this building. We are trying	10	BY MS. JENKINS:
11	to situate the patio of that building so it's got a	11	<b>Q.</b> Did you give the business plan to the county or have
12	prairie view, emphasizing the farmhouse origin and nature	12	you presented that to them?
13	of our products is a big part of that marketing strategy.	13	<b>A.</b> We went to the County Commission I want to say in
14	And knowing that also then we can self distribute that	14	2014, presented a model of what we had in mind and they
15	and push that out of the area, that we can push the	15	said that from their perspective my understanding
16	lion's share of our products out. But if we get people	16	their perspective was that we would be able to move
17	to identify with us, they'll become loyal to our brand.	17	forward with our plan.
18	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you. I certainly	18	MS. JENKINS: Okay. Thank you, Paul.
19	appreciate understanding how you're using the land that	19	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
20	you came back to. Thank you.	20	MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Pazour.
21	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Schoenfelder, in following up	21	MS. PAZOUR: None.
22	with both Commissioner Hanson and Commissioner Nelson	22	MR. DE HUECK: Staff.
23	regarding the social climate of your community, you	23	MS. EDWARDS: No.
24	talked a lot about strained relationships, high anxiety	24	MR. DE HUECK: Go ahead.
25	among community members, annoyance between the two sides.	25	MR. ALMOND: Do you intend to brew brown ale?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 286		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 288
1	Have you ever felt a threat to your personal	1	A. I will say my wife's family's Belgian. We'll brew a
2	safety?	2	lot of Belgian styles.
3	THE WITNESS: Up to this point concerns but	3	MR. DE HUECK: We'll take a short break, come
4	not a threat. I mean, that's kind of a subtlety but it's	4	back at 6:25. That's about a 10-minute break.
5	something I've thought about but it's not	5	(The witness is excused.)
6	MR. DE HUECK: It's not there on the streets.	6	(A short recess is taken.)
7	THE WITNESS: Personally threatened.	7	MR. DE HUECK: The hearing has resumed.
8	MR. DE HUECK: Like a riot isn't looming.	8	Mr. Almond, you may call your next witness.
9	THE WITNESS: Yeah.	9	MR. ALMOND: Call Gregg Hubner.
10	MR. DE HUECK: You can still gather under one	10	Gregg Hubner,
11	roof, yes. Feel that hostility and whatnot.	11	called as a witness, being first duly sworn in the above
12	THE WITNESS: Yeah. There's a high level of	12	cause, testified under oath as follows:
13	sensitivity, anxiety.	13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	MR. DE HUECK: The community's been able to keep	14	BY MR. ALMOND:
15	civility amongst each other because you're good people.	15	<b>Q.</b> Gregg, why don't you introduce yourself for the
16	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the most part I mean,	16	Commissioners.
17	I've been to these County Commission meetings where, I	17	<b>A.</b> Gregg Hubner, spelled H-U-B-N-E-R. My address is
18	mean, some of the Intervenors are personally attacked and	18	29976 406th Avenue, Avon, South Dakota.
19	insulted. Not physically attacked.	19	<b>Q.</b> How long have you lived at that address?
20	MR. DE HUECK: Yeah.	20	<b>A.</b> Since 2012.
21	THE WITNESS: But demeaned. That's yeah.	21	<b>Q.</b> And what do you do for a living?
22	That's disturbing.	22	A. I'm a licensed real estate broker and a certified
23	MR. DE HUECK: Yep. Thank you.	23	general appraiser and I farmed up until last year. I
24	With that, we'll go back to your attorney for	24	have rented my land out now.
25	redirect.	25	<b>Q.</b> Do you own any land in or around the footprint of

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 289		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 291
1	the project?	1	12 times whatever they were going to pay per turbine for
2	<b>A.</b> Yes.	2	\$25 years would total about 2.886 million dollars and
3	<b>Q.</b> Using the map behind you over your shoulder can you	3	that was their projection or estimate.
4	point out to the Commissioners where your residence is?	4	<b>Q.</b> So did you take it to mean that if you signed up,
5	A. Right here this long yellow line it's right at the	5	there was a possibility you were going to get 2.896
6	bottom (indicating). I see it's under my wife's name,	6	million dollars?
7	Marsha.	7	A. Well, there might have been a possibility but I
8	<b>Q.</b> And in addition to your residence, do you own other	8	thought it was a pretty slim possibility. Since my
9	land in the project footprint area?	9	brother and I were actually small farmers. We're small
10	A. Yes.	10	landowners compared to nowadays. And 12 percent at that
11	Q. And using Exhibit I 29 back there, can you see the	11	time when they were projecting 100 turbines was 12
12	Hubner name on various parcels of land?	12	percent of the project. So that wasn't the reason I
13	<b>A.</b> Yes. From the house I own 240 acres where the house	13	didn't sign but I mean it was pretty unlikely to me that
14	are is, excuse me, and my brother owns the next four	14	we were going to get 12 turbines on this small piece of
15	quarters north and then I own some land to the west of it	15	land.
16	and then some more to the east of it. And then my	16	<b>Q.</b> Was it ever expressed to you why 12 was used?
17	brother and I own a couple quarters up north but I think	17	<b>A.</b> No.
18	it's just out of the project. Because it's right near	18	Q. Okay. I'm going to do some quick math but 1,985
19	Beethoven so I think it's right up in that white there.	19	acres divided by 12 does that come out to about 165 acres
20	<b>Q.</b> And how many total acres do you own do you and	20	per turbine?
21	your brother own and if you can split up who owns what	21	A. I think that's the math, yes.
22	approximately?	22	<b>Q.</b> Was this did you have any other interactions with
23	A. Well, I have yeah. I think I have about 1120	23	Mr. Jurgens or Hornstra regarding this exhibit?
24	acres and my brother has about 840 acres, I think.	24	<b>A.</b> No.
25	There's about 1,900. And we own that one piece together.	25	<b>Q.</b> And this meeting took place at your house?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 290		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 292
1	So roughly the two of us but we each own our own land	1	A. Yes.
2	but together we own about 1,985 acres.	2	Q. In March of 2015?
3	<b>Q.</b> Okay. And at some point were you asked to sign up	3	A. It was either February or March but it was in the
4	to participate in the project?	4	early spring of '15.
5	A. Yes. I was asked to sign up for the Prevailing	5	Q. And during that meeting did you sign up for the
6 7		C	nun in sta
1	Winds project in the spring of 2015.	6	project?
o	<b>Q.</b> And how were you asked to sign up?	7	<b>A.</b> No.
8 9	<ul><li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li><li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to</li></ul>	7 8	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged</li></ul>
9	<ul><li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li><li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and</li></ul>	7 8 9	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it</li></ul>
9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> </ul>
9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day they were at my house, and this was their shall you call</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process after they came to our place. To be honest I had never</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day they were at my house, and this was their shall you call it addendum or estimator projection of what my payment</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process after they came to our place. To be honest I had never been to a County Commissioners meeting in my life before</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day they were at my house, and this was their shall you call it addendum or estimator projection of what my payment would be and how it would work out. And for some reason</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process after they came to our place. To be honest I had never been to a County Commissioners meeting in my life before this started. Probably a zoning meeting either so shame</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day they were at my house, and this was their shall you call it addendum or estimator projection of what my payment would be and how it would work out. And for some reason they put my brother's land and my land together because I</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process after they came to our place. To be honest I had never been to a County Commissioners meeting in my life before this started. Probably a zoning meeting either so shame on me, we'll say.</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day they were at my house, and this was their shall you call it addendum or estimator projection of what my payment would be and how it would work out. And for some reason they put my brother's land and my land together because I think someplace on here it says 1,985 acres.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process after they came to our place. To be honest I had never been to a County Commissioners meeting in my life before this started. Probably a zoning meeting either so shame on me, we'll say.</li> <li>But give you just a little bit of history it won't</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day they were at my house, and this was their shall you call it addendum or estimator projection of what my payment would be and how it would work out. And for some reason they put my brother's land and my land together because I think someplace on here it says 1,985 acres.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process after they came to our place. To be honest I had never been to a County Commissioners meeting in my life before this started. Probably a zoning meeting either so shame on me, we'll say.</li> <li>But give you just a little bit of history it won't take over 30, 40 seconds. When they built the Beethoven</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And how were you asked to sign up?</li> <li>A. Well, I was called by Ron Hornstra and he wanted to make an appointment, which they did. And so him and Roland Jurgens came to our house. I think it was in I think it was in March of '15.</li> <li>Q. And if you'd take a look at Exhibit I-16 for me.</li> <li>A. Okay. Yes. I've got that.</li> <li>Q. And tell me what Exhibit I-16 is.</li> <li>A. Well, they brought this document with them the day they were at my house, and this was their shall you call it addendum or estimator projection of what my payment would be and how it would work out. And for some reason they put my brother's land and my land together because I think someplace on here it says 1,985 acres.</li> <li>But anyway yeah right here on the bottom, long table on top. It says 1,985 acres. And they did all the</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. So after that meeting did you then become engaged with the county process and follow this project, how it went through the county process?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And can you give a brief broad brush strokes summary of your involvement in the county process from the spring of 2015 to I guess today?</li> <li>A. Well, we got pretty involved in the county process after they came to our place. To be honest I had never been to a County Commissioners meeting in my life before this started. Probably a zoning meeting either so shame on me, we'll say.</li> <li>But give you just a little bit of history it won't take over 30, 40 seconds. When they built the Beethoven project we were also approached to sign up for that. And</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 293		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 295
1	But we had built this house in 2012, and before we	1	<b>A.</b> Yeah. It was at all of our meetings we were
2	built the house we knew the Beethoven you know, they	2	talking a two mile setback. And I've, you know, written
3	had been around since 2009 actually. In 2010 I was first	3	some stuff in my prefiled stuff that would explain why we
4	approached by my name, not by Roland or Ronnie but by my	4	thought we wanted two miles. And, you know, it's very
5	neighbor in 2010. And I said no, I'm not interested and	5	similar to what Paul testified to just a little while
6	so before we built our house then in the fall of 2011 I	6	ago. You know, the first meeting it sounded like they
7	called the same neighbor and I said we're going to build	7	were listening. But the second meeting not so much. And
8	my house we're going to move from town we're going to	8	by the third meeting it's like they didn't even hear what
9	build this home where I want to retire just a mile grew	9	we said. I mean we took them volumes and volumes of
10	up	10	stuff to read and I mean it just they were being
11	MS. AGRIMONTI: I'm going to object to the	11	highly persuaded, highly influenced by in my opinion
12	extent the witness is stating what other people said.	12	Prevailing Winds, District III, and they had their mind
13	MR. ALMOND: He hasn't done it yet but I think	13	set up on this state standard, 1.1 times, 1,000 feet from
14	he's about to get there so if you can avoid that, Gregg.	14	the house, and there was nothing you could say, nothing
15	THE WITNESS: I was trying not to.	15	you could do, nothing you could show them to make any
16	MR. DE HUECK: You were saying that your	16	difference.
17	neighbor said there was nothing going on so that's	17	And going through the process, the hearing process
18	<b>A.</b> Okay. I got information to find out from a B&H	18	at the zoning and also the public hearing meeting for the
19	representative that won't work either.	19	County Commissioners, the vast majority of people that
20	Q. Did you have an understanding of whether or not	20	spoke against the Article 17 were people that were living
21	there was going to be	21	in the project, and the vast majority of people that
22	<b>A.</b> I was assured, don't worry about wind turbines.	22	spoke for Article 17 were people that were adjacent or
23	There's nothing happening.	23	not adjacent what's the word I'm looking for
24	MS. AGRIMONTI: Same objection.	24	Landowners.
25	MR. DE HUECK: Okay. We won't strike it. Let's	25	Q. Absentee?
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 294		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 296
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 294 just move on.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!296A.Absentee. It's later today I would have been better
1 2		1 2	
_	just move on.	_	A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better
2	just move on. Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us	2	<b>A.</b> Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people
2 3	just move on. <b>Q.</b> Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the	2 3	<b>A.</b> Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people
2 3 4	just move on. <b>Q.</b> Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.	2 3 4	<b>A.</b> Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it. So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it. So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it. So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it. So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it. So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it. So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house.</li> <li>Ma so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles.</li> <li>And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house.</li> <li>And so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County? First I should say you live in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house.</li> <li>Mathematical attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several neighbors and people that were interested eight</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County; right?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>just move on.</li> <li>Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015.</li> <li>A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house.</li> <li>Mad so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several neighbors and people that were interested eight meetings in 2015 and at the fall of 2015 is when they did</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County? First I should say you live in Bon Homme County; right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Bon Homme County. Western edge.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	just move on. Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015. A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house. And so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several neighbors and people that were interested eight meetings in 2015 and at the fall of 2015 is when they did the draft or excuse me. The Article 17. And so this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County? First I should say you live in Bon Homme County; right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Bon Homme County. Western edge.</li> <li>Q. How many County Commissioners are there?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	just move on. Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015. A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house. Mnd so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several neighbors and people that were interested eight meetings in 2015 and at the fall of 2015 is when they did the draft or excuse me. The Article 17. And so this was kind of leading up to that and advocating for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County? First I should say you live in Bon Homme County right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Bon Homme County. Western edge.</li> <li>Q. How many County Commissioners are there?</li> <li>A. We have five one one for every town.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	just move on. Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015. A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house. And so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several neighbors and people that were interested eight meetings in 2015 and at the fall of 2015 is when they did the draft or excuse me. The Article 17. And so this was kind of leading up to that and advocating for setbacks through that Article 17 process. That's what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County; right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Bon Homme County. Western edge.</li> <li>Q. How many County Commissioners are there?</li> <li>A. We have five one one for every town.</li> <li>Q. What town?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just move on. Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015. A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house. And so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several neighbors and people that were interested eight meetings in 2015 and at the fall of 2015 is when they did the draft or excuse me. The Article 17. And so this was kind of leading up to that and advocating for setbacks through that Article 17 process. That's what happened in 2015.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County; right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Bon Homme County. Western edge.</li> <li>Q. How many County Commissioners are there?</li> <li>A. We have five one one for every town.</li> <li>Q. What town?</li> <li>A. Avon, Springfield, Tabor, Tyndall, and Scotland</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	just move on. Q. Let's go back to the original question. Walk us through the county process and your involvement in the process after that spring of 2015. A. Okay. Okay. So we built the house. We moved into the house. And Beethoven came along and we can see it from our house it's about 9 miles away. And we thought well that's okay. Well then in 2015 when they came around with the second project the house was already built. So we thought, well, you know, these things come and they're, you know, very seldom don't they build them so we thought the only thing we can do to protect ourselves the second best thing we can do is get safe long setbacks so that we can stay in our house. And so we started attending zoning and Commissioners meetings in the spring summer of 2015. I looked up in my records. We attended my wife and I and several neighbors and people that were interested eight meetings in 2015 and at the fall of 2015 is when they did the draft or excuse me. The Article 17. And so this was kind of leading up to that and advocating for setbacks through that Article 17 process. That's what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Absentee. It's later today I would have been better this morning. But anyway absentee landowners or people that live in Sioux Falls, investors these type of people were for it.</li> <li>So in my opinion we never had much of a chance because they always got what they wanted and there was never talk of compromise. As a matter of fact they painted it like at the public hearing at the Commissioners they painted it. If you go through some of the recorded stuff that I have sent in, two miles is way too long we're against the two mile setback. Two miles doesn't work anywhere and they never talked about a mile or half-mile or anything but 1,000 feet or two miles. And so we just got totally wiped out by the people that persuaded them more than we did.</li> <li>Q. And how many County Commissioners are there in Bon Homme County; right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Bon Homme County. Western edge.</li> <li>Q. How many County Commissioners are there?</li> <li>A. We have five one one for every town.</li> <li>Q. What town?</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 297	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 299
1	the only district that is going to have any Prevailing	1	tell me who owns that land?
2	Winds towers is the Avon district.	2	<b>A.</b> Well, I had a neighbor, went to one of the meetings
3	<b>Q.</b> Who's the Commissioner for the Avon district?	3	in trip and brought this map back home and showed it to
4	<ul><li>A. Our Commissioner is Bruce Voigt.</li></ul>	4	me. And I looked at it and it hit me, struck me kind of
5	<b>Q.</b> And was Bruce Voigt participating in any of the	5	funny because it doesn't take me very long to figure out
6	processes?	6	that all of this land at the bottom belongs to my
7	A. Well, Bruce Voigt is on the managers board of	7	brother, myself, and one piece to my neighbor Greg Wyly.
8	Prevailing Winds. And it's only been that way since the	8	And then all the land, the next little piece up to the
9	last election so I assume he took auction January 1 of	9	left, is Indian land. And then we go up to Sherman
10	'17.	10	Fuerniss's land on the very north part. And there was I
11	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. The witness is	11	think another piece of Indian land and there was maybe
12	assuming.	12	one we didn't identify.
13	THE WITNESS: Okay.	13	Basically this map was showing about three or four
14	<b>A.</b> He got elected in the last general election.	14	people I contend that it was to make it look like we're
15	Q. Okay.	15	the only ones who didn't sign up. I don't know what else
16	<ul><li>A. Whenever he would have taken office that's how long</li></ul>	16	it would have meant.
17	he's been there.	17	MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. Speculation.
18	<b>Q.</b> And has he voted on any matters that related to this	18	MR. DE HUECK: I agree.
19	project?	19	MS. AGRIMONTI: So I'd move to strike.
20	<b>A.</b> No. He he can't vote. And that's another	20	MR. DE HUECK: We can strike that very last
21	problem I have with this process is that if you're for	21	part. But you can continue to take him down that line of
22	this project or against this project it doesn't make any	22	questioning.
23	difference. If you're in the Avon district where all the	23	A. I guess before the hearing's up I would like to see
24	turbines are you have no representation.	24	sPower tell me what this map is since my land is front
25	<b>Q.</b> We talked a little bit about the state standard.	25	and center.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 298		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 300
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 298 Was your understanding of the use of the state	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 300 Q. We might get a chance to do that?
1			
-	Was your understanding of the use of the state	1	<b>Q.</b> We might get a chance to do that?
2	Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state	1 2	<ul><li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li><li>A. Okay.</li></ul>
23	Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?	1 2 3	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination.</li> </ul>
2 3 4	Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance? A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those	1 2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance? A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which	1 2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance? <b>A.</b> Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was never law or you know, it was just more of a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance? <b>A.</b> Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was never law or you know, it was just more of a suggestion. And I think counties used that back when	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance? <b>A.</b> Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was never law or you know, it was just more of a suggestion. And I think counties used that back when wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state standard or was it your understanding the state standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was never law or you know, it was just more of a suggestion. And I think counties used that back when wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> <li>that ordinance.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on the top right corner?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> <li>that ordinance.</li> <li>Q. Changing topics here, can you flip to Exhibit I 18</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on the top right corner?</li> <li>A. Of this?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> <li>that ordinance.</li> <li>Q. Changing topics here, can you flip to Exhibit I 18</li> <li>for me, please.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on the top right corner?</li> <li>A. Of this?</li> <li>Q. Of that board.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> <li>that ordinance.</li> <li>Q. Changing topics here, can you flip to Exhibit I 18</li> <li>for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay. I have it.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on the top right corner?</li> <li>A. Of this?</li> <li>Q. Of that board.</li> <li>A. 4-2. Attachment 4-2.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> <li>that ordinance.</li> <li>Q. Changing topics here, can you flip to Exhibit I 18</li> <li>for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay. I have it.</li> <li>Q. And what is Exhibit I 18?</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on the top right corner?</li> <li>A. Of this?</li> <li>Q. Of that board.</li> <li>A. 4-2. Attachment 4-2.</li> <li>Q. And since receiving that have you had the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> <li>that ordinance.</li> <li>Q. Changing topics here, can you flip to Exhibit I 18</li> <li>for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay. I have it.</li> <li>Q. And what is Exhibit I 18?</li> <li>A. This is a an sPower production front and back. I</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on the top right corner?</li> <li>A. Of this?</li> <li>Q. Of that board.</li> <li>A. 4-2. Attachment 4-2.</li> <li>Q. And since receiving that have you had the opportunity to go through and count all the landowners</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Was your understanding of the use of the state</li> <li>standard or was it your understanding the state</li> <li>standard came from the PUC draft model ordinance?</li> <li>A. Yes. I've done extensive research on all of those</li> <li>things, and the draft model ordinances ordinance which</li> <li>was made in 2008 and implemented in 2009, and it was</li> <li>never law or you know, it was just more of a</li> <li>suggestion. And I think counties used that back when</li> <li>wind came in to our state back in 2008, 2009.</li> <li>Q. Did you observe the Bon Homme County Commission</li> <li>utilize those state standards?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. I'll call them?</li> <li>A. Because as they were doing the process I would look</li> <li>through and read and compare and, yes, it was based on</li> <li>that ordinance.</li> <li>Q. Changing topics here, can you flip to Exhibit I 18</li> <li>for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay. I have it.</li> <li>Q. And what is Exhibit I 18?</li> <li>A. This is a an sPower production front and back. I</li> <li>think it's actually two pages but it's an sPower</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. We might get a chance to do that?</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. But let's continue with your examination. Can you flip to Exhibit I 29 for me, please.</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q. Do you see a data response 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. The data request asks the Applicant to provide the names of the 35 landowners who will have a turbine on their property and in doing so identify the county in which the landowner owns the land in which the turbine will be placed and you see the answer is see Attachment 4-2?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Turn over your right shoulder. What does it say on the top right corner?</li> <li>A. Of this?</li> <li>Q. Of that board.</li> <li>A. 4-2. Attachment 4-2.</li> <li>Q. And since receiving that have you had the opportunity to go through and count all the landowners that have turbines placed on their land?</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 301		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 303
1	A. Yes. As best I could. Yep.	1	No. We'll go elsewhere.
2	(Exhibit 38 is marked for identification.)	2	<b>Q</b> . So I'll ask again what were you trying to illustrate
3	<b>Q.</b> I'm handing you what's been marked as Exhibit I 38.	3	with this analysis?
4	Is this the table that you've prepared after reviewing	4	A. I heard somewhere
5	Attachment 4-2?	5	<b>Q</b> . Well, hold on, Gregg.
6	A. Yes.	6	A. I'm sorry. I heard this week it's in the Docket
7	<b>Q.</b> And is this table showing the different turbine	7	it's somewhere.
8	numbers and the landowners associated with each turbine	8	Q. Hold on, Gregg. No. No.
9	number?	9	A. Can I assume anything?
10	A. Yes. There's a couple turbines that were like right	10	<b>Q.</b> No.
11	on the border. Could possibly be mistaken here but it's	11	MR. DE HUECK: Reiss, you can pry a little bit
12	as best I could do.	12	on what he's heard while we've been in trial, if that's
13	<b>Q.</b> And if you flip to the second page, did you then add	13	helpful.
14	up the different number of turbines that each particular	14	<b>Q.</b> While you've been attending this trial what have you
15	landowner would get?	15	heard?
16	A. Yes.	16	A. The number of turbines the number of leases that
17	MR. ALMOND: At this time I'd like to move for	17	sPower Prevailing Winds has. I heard the number this
18	the admission of Exhibit I 38.	18	week. Or it's probably on the Docket.
19	MS. AGRIMONTI: I will not object to the extent	19	<b>Q.</b> Well, you can actually refer to Exhibit I 29. You
20	it is the witness's interpretation of what he believes is	20	should be open to it. No. 4-3 gives you that
21	shown on the map.	21	information.
22	MS. REISS: No objection.	22	<b>A.</b> 1-29? 4-3?
23	MR. DE HUECK: So admitted for as Ms. Agrimonti	23	Yeah. That's what I'm trying to say if I just turn
24	stated.	24	the page over. There's 136 full rights agreements.
25	Q. And what was the purpose of performing this	25	Those would be agreements where they could put turbines
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 302		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 304
1	analysis?	1	on And so in relationship to the 126 that coughed
1	analysis?	1	on. And so in relationship to the 136 that coughed
2	<b>A.</b> Well, what's come up in our rural community in the	2	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got
-	<b>A.</b> Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people	-	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper.
2 3	<ul> <li>Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So</li> </ul>	2 3	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29.
2 3 4	<b>A.</b> Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people	2 3 4	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper.
2 3 4 5	<b>A.</b> Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the	2 3 4 5	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of
2 3 4 5 6	<b>A.</b> Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from	2 3 4 5 6	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection.	2 3 4 5 6 7	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from         MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection.         MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.         THE WITNESS: At this hearing?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard fromMS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard. THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an objection. To the extend he wants to use this exhibit to talk about people who thought they were going to get turbines but who aren't, hearsay, speculation. So if</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper.</li> <li>So 136. And I think it was 29.</li> <li>MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Okay.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to.</li> <li>Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity.</li> <li>A. Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an objection. To the extend he wants to use this exhibit to talk about people who thought they were going to get turbines but who aren't, hearsay, speculation. So if that's where he goes, that's my objection.</li> <li>Q. Go ahead.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity. A. Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the work that we did in the county we were there eight times
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an objection. To the extend he wants to use this exhibit to talk about people who thought they were going to get turbines but who aren't, hearsay, speculation. So if that's where he goes, that's my objection.</li> <li>Q. Go ahead. MR. DE HUECK: Try to help him down a road he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity. A. Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the work that we did in the county we were there eight times in 2015, six times in 2017. In 2016 we didn't go at all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity. <b>A.</b> Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the work that we did in the county we were there eight times in 2015, six times in 2017. In 2016 we didn't go at all because we felt after they did the Article 17 and did it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an objection. To the extend he wants to use this exhibit to talk about people who thought they were going to get turbines but who aren't, hearsay, speculation. So if that's where he goes, that's my objection.</li> <li>Q. Go ahead. MR. DE HUECK: Try to help him down a road he can go.</li> <li>Q. What have you heard during this hearing?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity. <b>A.</b> Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the work that we did in the county we were there eight times in 2015, six times in 2017. In 2016 we didn't go at all because we felt after they did the Article 17 and did it with basically no consideration for the residents at all,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an objection. To the extend he wants to use this exhibit to talk about people who thought they were going to get turbines but who aren't, hearsay, speculation. So if that's where he goes, that's my objection.</li> <li>Q. Go ahead. MR. DE HUECK: Try to help him down a road he can go.</li> <li>Q. What have you heard during this hearing? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity. <b>A.</b> Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the work that we did in the county we were there eight times in 2015, six times in 2017. In 2016 we didn't go at all because we felt after they did the Article 17 and did it with basically no consideration for the residents at all, we basically gave up. We did nothing in 2016. Never
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an objection. To the extend he wants to use this exhibit to talk about people who thought they were going to get turbines but who aren't, hearsay, speculation. So if that's where he goes, that's my objection.</li> <li>Q. Go ahead. MR. DE HUECK: Try to help him down a road he can go.</li> <li>Q. What have you heard during this hearing? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity. A. Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the work that we did in the county we were there eight times in 2015, six times in 2017. In 2016 we didn't go at all because we felt after they did the Article 17 and did it with basically no consideration for the residents at all, we basically gave up. We did nothing in 2016. Never went to one meeting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Well, what's come up in our rural community in the last, say, month was the talk about all of the people that aren't getting turbines that thought they were. So that's why I wanted to know who was actually getting the turbines. And I think, according to what I heard from MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection. MR. ALMOND: You can't talk about what you heard.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: At this hearing? MR. ALMOND: Oh, you want to talk about what someone said at this hearing? MS. AGRIMONI: Let me just interpose an objection. To the extend he wants to use this exhibit to talk about people who thought they were going to get turbines but who aren't, hearsay, speculation. So if that's where he goes, that's my objection.</li> <li>Q. Go ahead. MR. DE HUECK: Try to help him down a road he can go.</li> <li>Q. What have you heard during this hearing? MS. AGRIMONTI: Objection.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	turbines, I was interested in how many actually got turbines and that's why I made this paper. So 136. And I think it was 29. MS. AGRIMONTI: I object to this line of questioning. I don't understand the relevance to the factors that are before the Commission in terms of who got turbines and who didn't. MR. ALMOND: We were done with the line of questioning so I'll end there. MR. DE HUECK: Okay. MR. ALMOND: I don't have any other questions for you, Gregg. You are an Intervenor so I don't want to not allow you to say anything that you want to. Is there anything you want to tell the Commission at this point, given this opportunity. <b>A.</b> Well, basically I wrapped in this because all the work that we did in the county we were there eight times in 2015, six times in 2017. In 2016 we didn't go at all because we felt after they did the Article 17 and did it with basically no consideration for the residents at all, we basically gave up. We did nothing in 2016. Never

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 305		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 307
1	their permit, and it's also in the exhibits here where	1	Until he starts putting flicker on my land or into
2	Mr. Pawlowski testifies that the reason they pulled it	2	my bedroom window or making noise where I can't sleep.
3	they didn't have their land signed up. And it's always	3	That point has been crossed.
4	bothered me that they would bring the PUC clear to Avon	4	And I used the analogy I thought of this a few
5	and put on this big show as if this was going to happen	5	weeks ago. The to be owe industry it took 40 years of
6	and they never had the land signed up. And I knew that	6	people dying from lung cancer before they finally did
7	was the fact but they never it took them two years to	7	something. Now I can't legally light up a cigarette and
8	actually admit that.	8	start puffing smoke in this room. Why is that?
9	And so it's always been about second best which is	9	If I lit a cigarette and then burned another one and
10	protection of our home our neighbor's home, creation,	10	another one, I'd have smoke in this room and it's illegal
11	safety, shadow flicker, red lights. It's always been	11	and everybody's going to go home and probably nobody's
12	we're trying to get some protection. We got no	12	going to get lung cancer. Probably not. But why is that
13	protection from the county.	13	law in existence? Because we protect people. We protect
14	The county is not capable the county doesn't do	14	them.
15	enough work the county doesn't have enough time and	15	And so when you talk about protecting people you
16	this was probably evidenced here this morning to do	16	need to protect all the people. Not the big corporations
17	the due diligence that they need, you know, to do	17	or the big money but the people. Because that's what
18	setbacks and do shadow flicker and study sound and all	18	we're supposed to do, and that's the way a lot of our
19	this stuff we've been going through for, you know, three	19	laws are written.
20	days already. They don't have I don't mean to be	20	That's why I can't smoke a cigarette. I don't
21	disparaging but they don't have a clue as to what all	21	smoke, but that's why I can't light up a cigarette in
22	this is.	22	here because we're to protect. And that's why we're at
23	And we would take them information after information	23	the PUC because we don't get protection, and we will
24	after information, and we'd talk to them and we'd give	24	never get protection at our county level.
25	them stuff and it made absolutely no difference. And	25	I don't think I have anything else to say.
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 306		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 308
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 306 then not having a County Commissioner to represent us.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 308 MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg.
1		1 2	
_	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us.		MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg.
2	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they	2	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep.
2 3	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has	2 3	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd
2 3 4	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do.	2 3 4	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed,
2 3 4 5	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get	2 3 4 5	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for
2 3 4 5 6	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the	2 3 4 5 6	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners.
2 3 4 5 6 7	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. AGRIMONTI:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by the wind industry. And you can go to any county in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. AGRIMONTI: <b>Q</b> . Mr. Hubner, are you aware of the predicted shadow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by the wind industry. And you can go to any county in the state and they're going to tell you the exact same thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. AGRIMONTIE <b>Q</b> . Mr. Hubner, are you aware of the predicted shadow flicker and sound level predictions for your residence?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by the wind industry. And you can go to any county in the state and they're going to tell you the exact same thing. So that's why we're here, and we're trying to you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. AGRIMONTIE <b>Q</b> . Mr. Hubner, are you aware of the predicted shadow flicker and sound level predictions for your residence? <b>A</b> . I've read them, but I can't tell you right now what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by the wind industry. And you can go to any county in the state and they're going to tell you the exact same thing. So that's why we're here, and we're trying to you know, everybody wants to paint us as aunt I wind aunt I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. AGRIMONTI: <b>Q</b> . Mr. Hubner, are you aware of the predicted shadow flicker and sound level predictions for your residence? <b>A</b> . I've read them, but I can't tell you right now what they are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by the wind industry. And you can go to any county in the state and they're going to tell you the exact same thing. So that's why we're here, and we're trying to you know, everybody wants to paint us as aunt I wind aunt I wind aunt I wind that's not it. We're for safe and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> EY MS. AGRIMONTI: <b>Q</b> . Mr. Hubner, are you aware of the predicted shadow flicker and sound level predictions for your residence? <b>A</b> . I've read them, but I can't tell you right now what they are. <b>Q</b> . All right. Please turn to Exhibit A22-1. Page 2.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by the wind industry. And you can go to any county in the state and they're going to tell you the exact same thing. So that's why we're here, and we're trying to you know, everybody wants to paint us as aunt I wind aunt I wind aunt I wind that's not it. We're for safe and responsible wind energy if they want it. I mean I'd	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> <u>BY MS. AGRIMONTI</u> <b>Q</b> . Mr. Hubner, are you aware of the predicted shadow flicker and sound level predictions for your residence? <b>A</b> . I've read them, but I can't tell you right now what they are. <b>Q</b> . All right. Please turn to Exhibit A22-1. Page 2. <b>A</b> . I've got the wrong book here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	then not having a County Commissioner to represent us. We have just totally given up on our county because they have done everything that the wind energy system has wanted them to do. Every time we went to a meeting if we would get if we would just show up and they wouldn't know it the next time you'd show up at a meeting they'd have a wall stacked with investors, attorneys, and Prevailing Winds people. And it was totally intimidating, totally. I could go on and on about each individual meeting. I won't have to. But that's the way it's always been. As soon as you opposed or brought in a witness we brought in Geronimo ohm powers one day we brought in Vickie may one day and at the very next meeting they showed up and basically refuted and tried to dismiss the whole thing. So we got no protection from our county. They're not capable and they've been highly influenced by the wind industry. And you can go to any county in the state and they're going to tell you the exact same thing. So that's why we're here, and we're trying to you know, everybody wants to paint us as aunt I wind aunt I wind aunt I wind that's not it. We're for safe and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ALMOND: Thank you, Gregg. THE WITNESS: Yep. MR. DE HUECK: So it's 7 o'clock so what I'd like to do is break for the evening, come back refreshed, and be at our best tomorrow morning. If that works for my three Commissioners. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So can we start earlier tomorrow? MR. DE HUECK: 8:15. (Discussion off the record.) MR. DE HUECK: I guess we'll move into cross-examination. So if we were recessed we're back in session now. Go ahead, Prevailing Winds. MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> EY MS. AGRIMONTI: <b>Q</b> . Mr. Hubner, are you aware of the predicted shadow flicker and sound level predictions for your residence? <b>A</b> . I've read them, but I can't tell you right now what they are. <b>Q</b> . All right. Please turn to Exhibit A22-1. Page 2.

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 309		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 311
1	the fourth paragraph down. Do you see that?	1	<b>Q.</b> I note in there a variety of meetings both with
2	<ul> <li>A. Where it says identify.</li> </ul>	2	Commission and zoning do these all relate to Bon Homme
3	<b>Q.</b> Where it starts, "Another concern relates to	3	County?
4	compliance with setbacks."	4	A. Yes. These are all Bon Homme County.
5	Do you see that?	5	<b>Q.</b> And I note that in 2017 there are two meetings
6	<b>A.</b> I'm on page 1.	6	listed, one for zoning and one Commission where it says,
7	<b>Q.</b> I'd like you to be on page 2, please.	7	"Gregg proposes one mile with waivers."
8	A. Oh, okay. Another concern.	8	Can you please explain what that is.
9	<b>Q.</b> Yeah. And in that paragraph you talk about a	9	<b>A.</b> Yes. I would like to. What happened there was the
10	belief	10	draft model ordinance that, you know, Article 17 was
11	And let me ask you first, did you participate in	11	based on was taken down by the PUC.
12	drafting these responses, Mr. Hubner?	12	<b>Q.</b> Mr. Hubner I'm just asking maybe I've asked a
13	<b>A.</b> I did.	13	poor question. What was your proposal with respect to
14	<b>Q.</b> All right. And it states that there is another	14	one mile with waivers? What kind of setback was it?
15	concern relating to the Campbell County wind farm and	15	A. Okay. It was a mile from a residence with waivers
16	that it relates to seven instances where the turbines	16	and we know what they are; right?
17	were built in violation of setbacks; is that right?	17	Q. Yeah. Thank you.
18	A. Yes.	18	A. All right.
19	<b>Q.</b> So that's the concern for the Campbell County wind	19	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Please turn to page 28.
20	farm is they were not built in conformance with required	20	A. Okay.
21	setbacks?	21	<b>Q</b> . What is this letter?
22	A. Well, that's a concern I would have too is if they	22	A. It looks like a oh, that's a letter I sent to the
23	don't follow the law here, you know, how do I know	23	Real Estate Commission and without reading the whole
24	they're going to follow the law here.	24	letter because it was September '15, I was I had been
25	<b>Q.</b> I'm trying to understand a couple of other lay	25	trying for years to get the South Dakota Real Estate
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 310		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 312
1	witnesses who are identified as potential witnesses for	1	Commission to add in their property disclosures statement
2	the Intervenors including yourself and they're going to	2	on the house just a little paragraph that says does the
3	talk about the Campbell County wind farm and I want to	3	seller of the property is there a wind farm in the
4	make sure I understand what the concern is. And I read	4	area or a proposed wind farm or do you know of a wind
5	this response to say it's about violation of setbacks.	5	farm in the area so that if somebody bought your house
6	Is that an accurate summary?	6	they would know even if it wasn't built yet they would
7	A. Yes.	7	know if a turbine was turbines were coming in.
8	Q. Thank you.	8	<b>Q.</b> All right. And that effort hasn't been successful,
9	All right. Please go to page 13 of the exhibit.	9	has it?
10	You're actually ahead of me. Give me just a second.	10	A. No. Not at all.
11	Can you please tell me what this document is? The	11	<b>Q</b> . Please turn to page 15 of the exhibit. I'm going to
12	top of it says timetable?	12	back up a little bit.
13	<b>A.</b> These are the meetings that we attended at our	13	A. Okay.
14	county level.	14	<b>Q.</b> One second. All right. On the paragraph that
15	<b>Q.</b> For what purpose was this table put together?	15	begins "today"?
16	A. I just do a lot of I just do a lot of	16	A. Yep. Right in the middle?
17	documentation of all this stuff.	17	Q. Yeah.
18	<b>Q.</b> All right. Did you create it for the purposes of	18	A. Yep.
19	responding to this discovery request or was it already	19	<b>Q.</b> I'm going to read a portion of the last paragraph.
20	something in your files?	20	It says and you're responding to your concerns about the
21	A. No. I had done this about maybe a year ago or less	21	Bon Homme zoning ordinance is that right Article 17 in
22	than a year ago.	22	this letter?
		23	A. There's no date on this letter, is there?
23	Q. All right.		
23 24 25	<ul> <li>All right.</li> <li>A. Would have been after February. So it would have been sometime this spring probably.</li> </ul>	24 25	<ul> <li>Q. I didn't see one.</li> <li>A. Well, this would have been if it starts out it</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 313		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 315
1	starts out talking about in the spring of '15 so I'm	1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	assuming this is a spring or summer 2015 letter.	2	BY MS. REISS:
3	Q. Okay.	3	Q. Mr. Hubner, you mentioned that one of your concerns
4	A. Okay.	4	was the setback distance; correct?
5	<b>Q.</b> All right. At the end of that paragraph you state	5	A. Correct.
6	that, "there should be concerns about reduced property	6	<b>Q.</b> And did you have concerns about sound or shadow
7	values and then "not only would I want my property taxes	7	flicker at all?
8	and valuation reduced I plan to sue B.H. Wind or Ronnie	8	A. Yeah. Shadow flicker definitely. Sound definitely,
9	Hornstra personally for the loss I'll have to take on my	9	yes. All three.
10	property."	10	Q. Okay. You mentioned the one mile setback as your
11	Did I read that right?	11	or as a recommendation. Would you have any
12	A. Yes.	12	recommendation for sound or shadow flicker?
13	<b>Q.</b> And have you otherwise made threats to commence	13	MR. ALMOND: I'm going to object. Misstates his
14	legal action against any of the wind developers in the	14	testimony.
15	area?	15	MS. REISS: Can I rephrase.
16	A. Not that I know of. I'm not sure B&H wind is in	16	MR. DE HUECK: Yeah.
17	existence anymore.	17	Q. What was the setback you requested in your
18	<b>Q.</b> I'm sorry what did you say sir?	18	testimony?
19	<b>A.</b> I'm not sure B&H wind is even in existence anymore.	19	A. The setback I requested in my testimony?
20	<b>Q.</b> And do you know what the closest turbine is to your	20	Today? Here? Now?
21	residence?	21	Q. In response to a question Ms. Ago or Ms. Ago had
22	A. Yeah. According to a map that was provided to me	22	pointed you to a document. Let me pull it up.
23	during this hearing, it was in the 4,500 foot range, I	23	A. You're referring to the one mile with waivers or
24	think.	24	Q. Yes.
25	MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you. I have no other	25	A or you talking about? Okay. So that's one mile
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 314		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 316
1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 314 questions.	1	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE!316with waivers from a residence.
1 2	questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.	1 2	
	questions.	_	with waivers from a residence. Q. Yes. A. Yes.
2 3 4	questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. JENKINS:	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	questions. MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss. MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions. MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins. <u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u> BY MS. JENKINS: <b>Q</b> . Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> BY MS. JENKINS: <ul> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li><u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u></li> <li><u>BY MS. JENKINS</u>:</li> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> BY MS. JENKINS: Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday? A. Yep. Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County? A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> BY MS. JENKINS: <ul> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake as they were doing this. How they did it was really not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> BY MS. JENKINS: <ul> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake as they were doing this. How they did it was really not an issue for me. It's what they did and who they</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> BY MS. JENKINS: <ul> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake as they were doing this. How they did it was really not an issue for me. It's what they did and who they listened to.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake as they were doing this. How they did it was really not an issue for me. It's what they did and who they listened to.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have anything else that you want</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> BY MS. JENKINS: <ul> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake as they were doing this. How they did it was really not an issue for me. It's what they did and who they listened to.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have anything else that you want to talk about?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> BY MS. JENKINS: <ul> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake as they were doing this. How they did it was really not an issue for me. It's what they did and who they listened to.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have anything else that you want to talk about?</li> <li>A. Oh, not really.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> <li>A. Some of them.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Fuerniss.</li> <li>MR. FUERNISS: I don't have any questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: Ms. Jenkins.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>BY MS. JENKINS:</li> <li>Q. Gregg, you heard my testimony yesterday?</li> <li>A. Yep.</li> <li>Q. And did you also have the concerns of the the county not following proper procedure, Bon Homme County?</li> <li>A. Well, I never contended their procedure. I mean, I whether they made a mistake or didn't make a mistake as they were doing this. How they did it was really not an issue for me. It's what they did and who they listened to.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And do you have anything else that you want to talk about?</li> <li>A. Oh, not really.</li> <li>MR. ALMOND: I don't think we've got time.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> <li>A. Some of them.</li> <li>MS. REISS: No further questions.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>questions.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>with walvers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> <li>A. Some of them.     MS. REISS: No further questions.     MR. DE HUECK: That brings us over here to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>questions.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>with walvers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I 've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I 've been duck hunting already and I 've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I 'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> <li>A. Some of them.     MS. REISS: No further questions.     MR. DE HUECK: That brings us over here to Commission questions. And I'll call I'm starting with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>questions.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> <li>A. Some of them.</li> <li>MS. REISS: No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: That brings us over here to Commission questions. And I'll call I'm starting with Commissioner Nelson.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>questions.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> <li>A. Some of them.</li> <li>MS. REISS: No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: That brings us over here to Commission questions. And I'll call I'm starting with Commissioner Nelson.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>questions.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>with waivers from a residence.</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Would you have any recommendations to alleviate your concerns with sound?</li> <li>A. Well, from what I've heard today, 35 decibel top limit would be would be very good. I've been duck hunting already and I've heard turbines for 3 miles. And I'm assuming at one mile I'm going to hear turbines. So 35 decibel one mile from a residence 1,500 feet from a property line would be a minimum for me.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Would you have any recommendation in regard to shadow flicker?</li> <li>A. Zero. On the property or on the house.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And if the Applicant could commit to those sound and shadow flicker levels related to your property would it alleviate some of your concerns?</li> <li>A. Some of them.</li> <li>MS. REISS: No further questions.</li> <li>MR. DE HUECK: That brings us over here to Commission questions. And I'll call I'm starting with Commissioner Nelson.</li> </ul>

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 317		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 319
1		1	
2	that you or your wife have a sensitivity to infrasound? THE WITNESS: I have no evidence, but if I could	2	Commission meeting, I believe, and what you said it was two miles or 1,000 feet and you wish they would have
3	just say another sentence, from reading a lot of this, we	3	negotiated.
4	do have a health condition in the family that could be	4	THE WITNESS: I wish they would have tried to
5	sensitive to infrasound.	5	compromise in some way.
6	COMMISSIONER NELSON: I promised myself I wasn't	6	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Compromise. Okay.
7	going to ask any questions about the zoning process	7	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
8	because I don't believe that's properly before us, but	8	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So when you answered the
9	I'm going to ask one.	9	Staff questions was that property lines or was that your
10	Was there ever an attempt to refer the 2015 Bon	10	resident that you built?
11	Homme zoning changes to a vote of the people?	11	THE WITNESS: What I have I started out for
12	THE WITNESS: No.	12	two miles. And after we fought that for two years and
13	COMMISSIONER NELSON: No other questions. Thank	13	got nowhere, and it looked like this next project was
14	you.	14	going to come in, that's when I made an effort to go back
15	MR. DE HUECK: Chairman Fiegen.	15	one more time and say here I'd like you to do a mile from
16	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you. I did not know	16	a residence. And I don't think at the county at that
17	your background. And so were you here you were here	17	time I mentioned 1,500 feet from the property line. But
18	yesterday when I or maybe two days ago. I can't	18	since being involved in a couple PUC hearings and
19	remember now. When I asked about housing eligibilities?	19	learning about, you know, ice throw and owners manuals of
20	THE WITNESS: Yeah.	20	turbines and all of that stuff it occurred to me that the
21	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So I couldn't remember how	21	property line and the right of way line to a highway
22	much land do you own all by yourself with Marsha, your	22	would be a minimum of 1,500 feet.
23	wife?	23	If you have a bunch of bear land, you know, a
24	THE WITNESS: The 1,120 acres or whatever.	24	1,500 foot property is going to allow some of your
25	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Okay. And then do you have	25	neighbors to put turbines on their land. If your bear
	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 318		ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 320
1	another 1,900.	1	land is next to they're bare land, you know, 1,500 foot
2	THE WITNESS: No.	2	would work. It's a minimum but it to summarize, a
3	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: It's all okay. So out of	3	mile from a residence, 1,500 feet from a property line,
4	that 1,100 how many housing eligibilities would there	4	35 decibels.
5	possibly be? And because of your background yeah.	5	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: From a residence? 35?
6	That's my question.	6	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
7	THE WITNESS: Well, I think the word housing	7	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
8	the term housing eligibility is more for the more	8	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.
9	metropolitan if you want to use that term, Sioux Falls,	9	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Good evening.
10	Brookings, Watertown. They go in their counties and they	10	THE WITNESS: Hi.
11	establish housing eligibilities so that you can put so	11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Over the years I have read
12	many houses on a quarter of land. And each county's got	12	a lot of literature.
13 14	a different set.	13 14	THE WITNESS: So have I.
14	Okay. In Bon Homme County we don't call them housing eligibilities but there are zoning laws that you	14	COMMISSIONER HANSON: From a gentleman by the same name as you who lives in your vicinity. Would that
16	have to have so many minimum acres to build a house. And	16	be you?
17	I think that it's five acres if I'm not mistaken.	17	THE WITNESS: It's possible.
18	So you can't plat off anything less than 5 acres	18	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm surprised when you
19	and build a house unless of course you can get a waiver.	19	gave your resume you didn't say author on it as well.
20	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I'm going to go back to the	20	I don't have any questions for you. You've been
21	Staff's questions. When they asked you questions about	21	very patient sitting there going through the process.
22	what you would be comfortable with on a when you	22	Appreciate it.
23	proposed that one mile setback, I guess, and then the	23	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
24	Staff kind of asked you a little bit of questions you did	24	COMMISSIONER HANSON: And that's all I have to
25	talk about your goal was to negotiate at the County	25	say other than good evening.
		220	

	ROUGH DRAFT DO NO QUOTE! 321
1	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Almond, do you have any
2	redirect? No.
3	Mr. Hubner, thank you for your testimony.
4	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
5	(The witness is excused.)
6	MR. DE HUECK: That's concludes our hearing
7	today. We will reconvene
8	MS. AGRIMONTI: Just one housekeeping matter,
9	Mr. de Hueck.
10	Ms. Smith cross-examined two witnesses with an
11	Exhibit No. 36. It's a court case. We would move
12	admission.
13	MR. DE HUECK: Oh. We had this discussion
14	earlier, and I could have swore you guys already got it
15	in.
16	Yes. The court case will be admitted. Thank
17	you for catching that.
18	MS. AGRIMONTI: Thank you.
19	MR. ALMOND: Can I say no objection.
20	MR. DE HUECK: Yeah.
21	So reconvene at the same time? Is that okay?
22	CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Well, I'd love to start at
23	8:00 but
24	MR. DE HUECK: 8:30. We'll show up at 8:30 and
25	be ready to go.

	1			
¢	85:12, 101:13,	12:1, 12:2, 12:24,	<b>2-6</b> [1] - 209:15	269:23 1
\$	106:1, 108:2,	14:25, 18:22, 22:1,	<b>2-7</b> [2] - 209:10,	<b>21</b> [5] - 32:17, 32:18,
<b>\$25</b> [1] - 291 :2	132:19, 145:16,	25:3, 25:4, 25:8,	209:11	147:4, 147:8, 219:17
<b>\$350</b> [1] - 234 :10	145:21, 146:10,	27:21, 27:25, 32:16,	<b>2-8</b> [2] - 209:10,	<b>213</b> [1] - 1:25
<b>4</b> [.]	147:13, 148:4,	294:20, 294:22,	209:13	<b>213</b> [1] = 1.23 <b>22</b> [6] - 38:24, 38:25,
1	151:12, 155:23,	294:24, 295:20,	<b>2.886</b> [1] - 291:2	42:21, 147:15,
	169:2, 176:1,	295:22, 304:20,	<b>2.896</b> [1] - 291 :2	194:13
<b>'15</b> [5] - 4:3, 290:11,	181:18, 194:10,	311:10, 312:21	<b>20</b> [12] - 7:25, 30:1,	<b>220</b> [1] - 114:22
292:4, 311:24, 313:1	194:11, 211:24,	<b>1701</b> [2] - 11:1, 11:5	<b>20</b> [12] - 7.25, 30.1, 65:5, 93:19, 93:24,	<b>23</b> [6] - 10:20, 10:22,
<b>'16</b> [2] - 4:3, 255:18	213:25, 214:4,	<b>1703</b> [2] - 11:10, 11:13		10:25, 12:1, 18:16,
<b>'17</b> [2] - 4:2, 297:10	260:21, 284:11,	<b>1723</b> [6] - 11:24, 12:2,	190:14, 191:11, 205:23, 212:1,	283:6
<b>'18</b> [1] - 4:2	304:25	12:4, 12:6, 12:11,	, ,	<b>24</b> [7] - 18:15, 18:17,
<b>'46</b> [1] - 59:17	10-minute [3] -	12:12	219:17, 241:4, 284:11	24:2, 125:23, 127:5,
<b>'50 s</b> [1] - 204:3	193:14, 193:15,	<b>174</b> [2] - 158:21,	<b>200</b> [1] - 200:13	133:24, 258:25
<b>'60 s</b> [1] - 131:6	288:4	202:18		
<b>'70s</b> [1] - 209:24	<b>100</b> [6] - 28:23, 55:5,	<b>1741</b> [3] - 25:16, 26:2,	<b>2000</b> [1] - 258:13 <b>2000 s</b> [3] - 132:7,	<b>24-hour</b> [1] - 229:24 <b>240</b> [1] - 289:13
<b>'9</b> [1] - 221 :6	196:1, 214:9,	26:18		
<b>'99</b> [1] - 6:20	214:10, 291:11	<b>175</b> [1] - 158:22	150:3, 198:20	<b>25</b> [5] - 18:16, 59:6,
	<b>10:30</b> [1] - 63:11		<b>2006</b> [1] - 131:25	65:9, 241:10, 290:23
0	<b>11</b> [5] - 1:7, 60:20,	<b>177</b> [1] - 158:23	<b>2008</b> [7] - 99:15,	<b>250</b> [1] - 277 :5
V	112:7, 167:2, 168:7	<b>18</b> [4] - 44:19, 71:15,	177:24, 182:6,	<b>26-page</b> [1] - 92:25
<b>0</b> [2] - 190:14, 191:11	<b>1120</b> [1] - 289:23	298:17, 298:20	220:18, 221:6,	<b>27</b> [4] - 76:3, 153:17,
	<b>1120</b> [1] - 2:3 <b>11 th</b> [1] - 2:4	<b>19</b> [2] - 220:11, 261:17	298:6, 298:9	155:8, 209:9
1		<b>1950</b> [1] - 204 :20	<b>2009</b> [10] - 133:5,	<b>28</b> [4] - 147:15,
	<b>12</b> [10] - 5:15, 137:18,	<b>1960 s</b> [1] - 220:11	220:18, 228:12,	194:13, 194:15,
<b>1</b> [24] - 6:17, 55:12,	290:24,290:25, 291:1,291:10,	<b>1965</b> [1] - 226:13	228:18, 230:9,	311:19
69:24, 95:10, 96:5,	291:11, 291:10, 291:14,	<b>1967</b> [1] - 219:9	231:13, 232:4,	<b>29</b> [5] - 147:16,
104:19, 106:2,	291:11, 291:14, 291:16, 291:19	<b>1970 s</b> [1] - 210:7	293:3, 298:6, 298:9	289:11, 300:4,
106:7, 107:24,	<b>12-hour</b> [1] - 138:3	<b>1972</b> [2] - 131:6, 131:9	<b>2010</b> [6] - 95:1, 127:5,	303:19, 304:4
133:24, 161:25,	<b>12-1100</b> [1] - 138:3 <b>12.9</b> [3] - 144:21,	<b>1980 s</b> [2] - 141:6,	141:25, 222:20,	<b>296 th</b> [1] - 258:7
207:6, 211:24,		142:13	293:3, 293:5	<b>29976</b> [1] - 288:18
<b>A</b> ( <b>A A A A A A A A A A</b>	1/5 / 102 / 21			
213:20, 214:3,	145:4, 193:21	<b>1997</b> [1] - 6:24	<b>2011</b> [4] - 95:2,	
214:4, 214:5, 214:9,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1	178:23, 219:19,	3
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6	
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 <b>1,000</b> [7] - 40:19,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23,	<b>3</b> <sub>[20]</sub> - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 <b>1,000</b> [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20,	<b>3</b> <sub>[20]</sub> - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 <b>1,000</b> [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 <b>1,000</b> [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b>	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{12.93} \ \textbf{[1]} - \textbf{177:12} \\ \textbf{12:07} \ \textbf{[1]} - \textbf{120:1} \\ \textbf{13} \ \textbf{[5]} - \textbf{3:21}, \ \textbf{5:15}, \\ \textbf{163:18}, \ \textbf{167:8}, \ \textbf{310:9} \\ \textbf{136} \ \textbf{[3]} - \textbf{303:24}, \\ \textbf{304:1}, \ \textbf{304:4} \\ \textbf{14} \ \textbf{[12]} - \textbf{6:1}, \ \textbf{6:2}, \ \textbf{6:5}, \\ \textbf{6:8}, \ \textbf{6:11}, \ \textbf{6:14}, \ \textbf{7:5}, \\ \textbf{10:25}, \ \textbf{176:2}, \ \textbf{243:3}, \\ \textbf{243:8}, \ \textbf{243:19} \end{array}$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19 <b>15</b> [17] - 58:17, 59:20,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19 <b>15</b> [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24,	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19 <b>15</b> [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19 <b>15</b> [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22	12.93 [1] - 177:12 $12:07 [1] - 120:1$ $13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9$ $136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4$ $14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19$ $15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 304$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25,	12.93 [1] - 177:12 $12:07 [1] - 120:1$ $13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9$ $136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4$ $14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19$ $15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 241:10, 244:4, 3000000000000000000000000000000000000$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1	12.93 [1] - 177:12 $12:07 [1] - 120:1$ $13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9$ $136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4$ $14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19$ $15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 241:10, 244:4, 245:1, 284:11, 10, 244:1, 245:1, 2$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2,	12.93 [1] - 177:12 $12:07 [1] - 120:1$ $13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9$ $136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4$ $14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19$ $15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22,	12.93 [1] - 177:12         12:07 [1] - 120:1         13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15,         163:18, 167:8, 310:9         136 [3] - 303:24,         304:1, 304:4         14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, $6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5,$ 10:25, 176:2, 243:3,         243:8, 243:19         15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20,         71:2, 93:19, 123:3,         146:10, 175:20,         211:1, 211:3, 211:5,         211:6, 241:4,         245:1, 284:11,         312:11         153 [1] - 183:4	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18	12.93 [1] - 177:12         12:07 [1] - 120:1         13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15,         163:18, 167:8, 310:9         136 [3] - 303:24,         304:1, 304:4         14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, $6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5,$ 10:25, 176:2, 243:3,         243:8, 243:19         15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20,         71:2, 93:19, 123:3,         146:10, 175:20,         211:1, 211:3, 211:5,         211:6, 241:4,         241:10, 244:4,         245:1, 284:11,         312:11         153 [1] - 183:4         16 [2] - 248:9, 248:13	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15	12.93 [1] - 177:12         12:07 [1] - 120:1         13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9         136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4         14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19         15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 241:10, 244:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11         153 [1] - 183:4         16 [2] - 248:9, 248:13         160 [1] - 258:17	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10, 232:2, 236:16,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15 1-2 [1] - 308:24	12.93 [1] - 177:1212:07 [1] - 120:113 [5] - 3:21, 5:15,163:18, 167:8, 310:9136 [3] - 303:24,304:1, 304:414 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, $6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5,$ 10:25, 176:2, 243:3,243:8, 243:1915 [17] - 58:17, 59:20,71:2, 93:19, 123:3,146:10, 175:20,211:1, 211:3, 211:5,211:6, 241:4,241:10, 244:4,245:1, 284:11,312:11153 [1] - 183:416 [2] - 248:9, 248:13160 [1] - 258:17165 [1] - 291:19	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10, 232:2, 236:16, 236:17, 236:18,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15, 269:21, 275:11,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11, 153:15, 153:16
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15 1-2 [1] - 308:24 1-22 [5] - 38:22, 39:1,	12.93 [1] - 177:12 $12:07 [1] - 120:1$ $13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9$ $136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4$ $14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19$ $15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 241:10, 244:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11$ $153 [1] - 183:4$ $16 [2] - 248:9, 248:13$ $160 [1] - 258:17$ $165 [1] - 291:19$ $17 [41] - 7:1, 7:3, 7:5, 102$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10, 232:2, 236:16, 236:17, 236:18, 236:19, 237:16,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15, 269:21, 275:11, 304:19, 304:22,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11, 153:15, 153:16 <b>35</b> [21] - 20:4, 23:18,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15 1-2 [1] - 308:24 1-22 [5] - 38:22, 39:1, 40:25, 41:6, 47:9	12.93 [1] - 177:12 $12:07 [1] - 120:1$ $13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9$ $136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4$ $14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19$ $15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11$ $153 [1] - 183:4$ $16 [2] - 248:9, 248:13$ $160 [1] - 258:17$ $165 [1] - 291:19$ $17 [41] - 7:1, 7:3, 7:5, 7:13, 7:17, 7:21, 312:11$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10, 232:2, 236:16, 236:17, 236:18, 236:19, 237:16, 237:24, 254:6,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15, 269:21, 275:11, 304:19, 304:22, 304:24	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11, 153:15, 153:16 <b>35</b> [21] - 20:4, 23:18, 23:23, 24:5, 61:4,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15 1-2 [1] - 308:24 1-22 [5] - 38:22, 39:1, 40:25, 41:6, 47:9 1.1 [1] - 295:13	12.93 [1] - 177:12 $12:07 [1] - 120:1$ $13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9$ $136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4$ $14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19$ $15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11$ $153 [1] - 183:4$ $16 [2] - 248:9, 248:13$ $160 [1] - 258:17$ $165 [1] - 291:19$ $17 [41] - 7:1, 7:3, 7:5, 7:13, 7:17, 7:21, 7:23, 8:16, 8:22, 3$	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10, 232:2, 236:16, 236:17, 236:18, 236:19, 237:16, 237:24, 254:6, 254:7, 254:9,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15, 269:21, 275:11, 304:19, 304:22, 304:24 <b>2017</b> [5] - 207:10,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11, 153:15, 153:16 <b>35</b> [21] - 20:4, 23:18, 23:23, 24:5, 61:4, 61:9, 62:4, 93:22,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15 1-2 [1] - 308:24 1-22 [5] - 38:22, 39:1, 40:25, 41:6, 47:9 1.1 [1] - 295:13 1.25 [4] - 231:17,	12.93 [1] - 177:12         12:07 [1] - 120:1         13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9         136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4         14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19         15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 241:10, 244:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11         153 [1] - 183:4         16 [2] - 248:9, 248:13         160 [1] - 258:17         165 [1] - 291:19         17 [41] - 7:1, 7:3, 7:5, 7:13, 7:17, 7:21, 7:23, 8:16, 8:22, 9:11, 9:13, 9:23,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{1998} \ \textbf{[1]} - 4:1 \\ \textbf{1999} \ \textbf{[2]} - 230:9, \\ 230:18 \\ \textbf{1:30} \ \textbf{[1]} - 120:1 \\ \textbf{1:45} \ \textbf{[1]} - 130:4 \\ \end{array}$	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15, 269:21, 275:11, 304:19, 304:22, 304:24 <b>2017</b> [5] - 207:10, 258:20, 262:15,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11, 153:15, 153:16 <b>35</b> [21] - 20:4, 23:18, 23:23, 24:5, 61:4, 61:9, 62:4, 93:22, 154:10, 155:18,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15 1-2 [1] - 308:24 1-22 [5] - 38:22, 39:1, 40:25, 41:6, 47:9 1.1 [1] - 295:13 1.25 [4] - 231:17, 232:2, 232:7, 247:4	<b>12.93</b> [1] - 177:12 <b>12:07</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>13</b> [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9 <b>136</b> [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4 <b>14</b> [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19 <b>15</b> [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 241:10, 244:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11 <b>153</b> [1] - 183:4 <b>16</b> [2] - 248:9, 248:13 <b>160</b> [1] - 258:17 <b>165</b> [1] - 291:19 <b>17</b> [41] - 7:1, 7:3, 7:5, 7:13, 7:17, 7:21, 7:23, 8:16, 8:22, 9:11, 9:13, 9:23, 9:25, 10:10, 10:24,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10, 232:2, 236:16, 236:17, 236:18, 236:19, 237:16, 237:24, 254:6, 254:7, 254:9, 254:10, 254:11, 254:14, 308:22,	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15, 269:21, 275:11, 304:24 <b>2017</b> [5] - 207:10, 258:20, 262:15, 304:19, 311:5	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11, 153:15, 153:16 <b>35</b> [21] - 20:4, 23:18, 23:23, 24:5, 61:4, 61:9, 62:4, 93:22, 154:10, 155:18, 175:24, 175:25,
214:4, 214:5, 214:9, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 297:9, 309:6 1,000 [7] - 40:19, 80:12, 116:1, 216:9, 295:13, 296:13, 319:2 1,100 [1] - 318:4 1,120 [1] - 317:24 1,364 [1] - 164:17 1,500 [7] - 284:25, 316:10, 319:17, 319:22, 319:24, 320:1, 320:3 1,700 [1] - 210:22 1,900 [2] - 289:25, 318:1 1,985 [4] - 290:2, 290:20, 290:22, 291:18 1-1 [1] - 134:15 1-2 [1] - 308:24 1-22 [5] - 38:22, 39:1, 40:25, 41:6, 47:9 1.1 [1] - 295:13 1,25 [4] - 231:17,	12.93 [1] - 177:12         12:07 [1] - 120:1         13 [5] - 3:21, 5:15, 163:18, 167:8, 310:9         136 [3] - 303:24, 304:1, 304:4         14 [12] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:5, 10:25, 176:2, 243:3, 243:8, 243:19         15 [17] - 58:17, 59:20, 71:2, 93:19, 123:3, 146:10, 175:20, 211:1, 211:3, 211:5, 211:6, 241:4, 241:10, 244:4, 245:1, 284:11, 312:11         153 [1] - 183:4         16 [2] - 248:9, 248:13         160 [1] - 258:17         165 [1] - 291:19         17 [41] - 7:1, 7:3, 7:5, 7:13, 7:17, 7:21, 7:23, 8:16, 8:22, 9:11, 9:13, 9:23,	<b>1998</b> [1] - 4:1 <b>1999</b> [2] - 230:9, 230:18 <b>1:30</b> [1] - 120:1 <b>1:45</b> [1] - 130:4 <b>2</b> <b>2</b> [43] - 11:11, 11:14, 40:18, 40:25, 41:2, 45:23, 82:8, 82:9, 92:3, 151:16, 163:15, 175:24, 201:12, 201:18, 211:19, 213:21, 213:22, 214:3, 214:5, 214:10, 214:18, 214:22, 224:9, 224:10, 232:2, 236:16, 236:17, 236:18, 236:19, 237:16, 237:24, 254:6, 254:7, 254:9, 254:10, 254:11, 254:14, 308:22, 309:7	178:23, 219:19, 293:6 <b>2012</b> [6] - 127:5, 144:7, 178:23, 255:19, 288:20, 293:1 <b>2013</b> [1] - 99:16 <b>2014</b> [3] - 100:2, 103:12, 287:14 <b>2015</b> [22] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:5, 13:13, 16:19, 18:21, 19:2, 217:25, 218:2, 255:17, 290:6, 292:2, 292:14, 294:4, 294:8, 294:16, 294:19, 294:23, 304:19, 313:2, 317:10 <b>2016</b> [8] - 166:19, 225:16, 262:15, 269:21, 275:11, 304:19, 304:22, 304:24 <b>2017</b> [5] - 207:10, 258:20, 262:15,	<b>3</b> [20] - 19:2, 39:1, 40:18, 44:20, 97:25, 98:1, 111:13, 111:14, 113:9, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 162:22, 184:8, 185:6, 193:21, 236:12, 236:22, 316:8 <b>3-D</b> [1] - 183:7 <b>3.4.4</b> [1] - 145:11 <b>30</b> [6] - 51:15, 65:9, 149:6, 204:11, 205:23, 292:21 <b>320</b> [3] - 283:11, 283:12, 292:23 <b>33</b> [6] - 62:14, 67:5, 75:25, 153:11, 153:15, 153:16 <b>35</b> [21] - 20:4, 23:18, 23:23, 24:5, 61:4, 61:9, 62:4, 93:22, 154:10, 155:18, 175:24, 175:25, 177:25, 204:11,

<b>I</b>				
316:10, 320:4, 320:5	<b>42</b> [3] - 122:9, 122:10,	<b>57</b> [4] - 7:9, 7:11, 25:7,	<b>94</b> [1] - 214:12	245:20 2
<b>35's</b> [1] - 61:11	154:20	25:8	<b>95</b> [2] - 74:8, 74:10	accepted [1] - 38:21
<b>36</b> [7] - 88:14, 89:1,	<b>43</b> [5] - 41:10, 41:13,	<b>58</b> [2] - 236:24, 283:6	<b>96</b> [1] - 214:11	accepting [1] - 244 :23
166:11, 229:23,	41:22, 184:9, 184:12	<b>59</b> [2] - 236:24, 236:25	<b>97</b> [1] - 95:9	access [5] - 153:11,
241:20, 241:23,	<b>45</b> [52] - 23:23, 24:5,	<b>5:30</b> [1] - 257 :15	<b>98</b> [1] - 214 :11	179:9, 179:10,
321:11	26:3, 26:5, 26:9,			242:15, 274:5
<b>37</b> [5] - 94:19, 94:21,	41:14, 54:8, 56:14,	6	Α	accomplish [1] -
94:22, 95:4, 95:8	58:3, 60:3, 60:8,	_		186:9
<b>38</b> [4] - 229:23, 301:2,	60:9, 62:21, 63:4,	<b>6</b> [12] - 12:7, 136:25,	<b>A-weighted</b> [7] - 26:3,	according [7] - 7:24,
301:3, 301:18	64:7,66:1,66:16,	158:21, 161:23,	26:5, 26:9, 26:13,	18:25, 25:24, 26:25,
<b>39</b> [1] - 88:7	67:13, 67:21, 67:25,	162:1, 164:18,	86:2, 86:6, 209:25	273:14, 302:6,
	68:3, 76:22, 94:13,	194:7, 200:8,	<b>a.m</b> [2] - 1:7, 2:5	313:22
4	104:4, 113:14,	200:21, 202:18,	A22-1 [1] - 308:22	account [4] - 64:9,
7	122:14, 125:2,	213:19, 241:3	A5-1 [1] - 107:24	155:9, 230:21,
<b>4</b> [14] - 40:25, 41:2,	145:20, 146:8,	<b>60</b> [8] - 191:21, 193:4,	abandon [1] - 150:8	231:10
137:19, 138:22,	147:5, 147:9,	193:5, 216:18,	abandoned [1] -	
138:25, 145:4,		216:19, 217:4,	150:10	accuracy [1] - 55:5
145:10, 155:11,	147:10, 148:22,	236:25, 237:4		accurate [20] - 64:10,
164:12, 206:5,	149:8, 149:11,		abandoning [1] -	66:3, 67:3, 67:11,
	152:14, 154:18,	<b>60 s</b> [1] - 216:14	220:20	111:20, 136:15,
208:25, 214:11,	155:5, 155:19,	<b>65</b> [1] - 192:18	ability [1] - 125:15	164:4, 164:5, 164:7,
236:12, 236:22	155:20, 159:25,	<b>69</b> [1] - 145:3	<b>able</b> [24] - 25:14,	164:25, 168:23,
<b>4,500</b> [1] - 313:23	176:1, 183:17,	<b>6:25</b> [1] - 288:4	80:14, 81:2, 85:3,	169:14, 169:16,
<b>4-13</b> [1] - 6:20	183:23, 184:11,		90:14,99:8,104:16,	213:3, 246:3,
<b>4-2</b> [5] - 300:6, 300:13,	184:25, 186:8,	7	109:23, 111:21,	246:22, 247:14,
300:19, 301:5	196:19, 198:12,		126:18, 135:20,	250:4, 270:14, 310:6
<b>4-3</b> [2] - 303:20,	229:1, 230:19,	<b>7</b> [8] - 3:20, 104:19,	148:16, 162:3,	accurately [7] - 107:7,
303:22	231 10	119:17, 128:17,	166:25, 170:11,	169:16, 169:20,
<b>40</b> [64] - 44:17, 55:18,	<b>46</b> [2] - 44:22, 277:8	178:3, 191:3, 308:3	173:14, 173:17,	169:22, 244:2,
56:14, 57:9, 57:10,	<b>47</b> [1] - 59:18	<b>70</b> [4] - 64:17, 132:17,	210:18, 220:21,	
60:15, 60:18, 60:20,	<b>49-41 B-22.1</b> [1] - 92:3	192:19, 211:11	274:5, 284:20,	245:16, 245:18
60:24, 62:4, 62:10,	<b>49-41 B-22.1</b> [1] - 92.3	<b>700</b> [5] - 108:7,		achieve [2] - 60:20,
65:1, 66:8, 66:16,		108:17, 109:19,	284:25, 286:14,	61:13
	5	110:4, 140:7	287:16	acoustic [4] - 157 :2,
67:25, 76:22, 88:8,	<b>E</b> 1041 126:22 145:14	<b>70s</b> [1] - 216:14	abnormal [1] - 32:21	183:8, 184:13,
94:15, 96:8, 112:1,	<b>5</b> [21] - 136:23, 145:14,		above -entitled [1] -	204 :15
115:4, 122:13,	145:21, 147:13,	<b>75</b> [1] - 191 :3	2:2	Acoustical [1] -
122:14, 125:2,	155:15, 161:23,	<b>7:00</b> [1] - 257:16	absent [1] - 14:3	169:24
146:8, 150:10,	162:1, 162:6, 183:4,		absentee [3] - 295:25,	acoustical [12] -
154:7, 155:18,	183:18, 185:7,	8	296:1, 296:2	52:24, 53:20, 54:20,
175:25, 183:13,	185:10, 185:16,	9 1101 20117 9710	absolute [1] - 194:11	86:25, 133:6, 134:4,
183:14, 183:17,	185:21, 186:9,	<b>8</b> [10] - 32:17, 87:19,	absolutely [12] -	134:6, 145:2, 188:4,
183:23, 184:6,	208:25, 209:1,	105:14, 169:6,	17:12, 20:5, 23:24,	234:2, 246:2, 247:19
184:25, 186:9,	214:4, 239:4,	169:9, 169:14,	24:6, 66:23, 104:7,	
186:11, 186:13,	240:18, 318:18	169:21, 207:9,	239:13, 270:21,	acoustician [9] -
187:4, 187:5,	<b>5-1</b> [1] - 108:1	209:9, 214:11		131:4, 131:21,
192:14, 193:2,	<b>50</b> [20] - 56:15, 58:3,	<b>80</b> [1] - 187:16	273:6, 275:24,	142:24, 160:10,
194:14, 200:22,	62:4, 65:1, 65:5,	<b>81</b> [1] - 237 :4	281:12, 305:25	172:14, 201:21,
200:23, 211:6,	96:8, 115:4, 136:9,	<b>840</b> [1] - 289:24	absorbed [3] - 199:3,	207:5, 207:15,
	191:14, 191:21,	<b>85</b> [4] - 216:15,	199:4, 199:8	233:18
228:6, 228:11,		216:18, 217:1, 217:3	absorption [2] -	acousticia n's [1] -
228:21, 228:24,	192:12, 192:17, 102:18, 102:24	<b>8:00</b> [1] - 321 :23	124:20, 124:23	170:21
229:2, 229:8,	192:18, 192:24,	<b>8:15</b> [1] - 308 :9	abstract [1] - 84:1	acousticians [16] -
229:18, 230:1,	193:3, 200:9,		academic [2] - 74:15,	143:7, 144:13,
230:6, 230:17,	200:13, 217:4,	<b>8:30</b> [4] - 1:7, 2:5,	219:16	144:16, 148:15,
230:18, 230:20,	219:10	321:24	accelerated [1] -	159:22, 170:11,
231:9, 268:21,	<b>50,000</b> [2] - 71:25,	-	280:24	178:17, 182:9,
292:21, 307:5	123:23	9	accept [5] - 58:6,	202:3, 202:6,
<b>40,000</b> [3] - 37:1,	<b>500</b> [5] - 2:3, 73:18,	0 (4) 00.40 460.4	204:24, 205:21,	209:23, 210:7,
48:16, 50:23	116:1, 214:14,	<b>9</b> [4] - 88:10, 169:4,		
<b>40228</b> [1] - 258:7	214:15	169:6, 294:7	244:20, 244:21	210:11, 210:12,
406 th [1] - 288:18	50 D/40 N [2] - 96:7	<b>90</b> [2] - 149:9, 149:10	acceptable [7] - 40:5,	247:13, 255:10
<b>41.9</b> [2] - 60:5, 122:9	<b>55</b> [4] - 93:23, 149:7,	<b>90,000</b> [1] - 71:24	40:8, 145:9, 146:21,	acoustics [2] -
	154:10, 210:10	90th [1] - 147:7	204:10,245:19,	177:12, 196:10
	101.10, 210.10			

		1		r
acquainted [1] -	addressing [2] -	advances [1] - 205:22	229:10, 230:13,	308:17,313:25,
223:12	113:15, 113:16	advantage [2] -	277:5, 295:6, 307:5,	321:8, 321:18
acre [1] - 51:2	adequately [2] -	115:15, 213:6	310:21, 310:22,	ahead [28] - 3:10,
acres [20] - 37:1,	165:11, 274:16	adverse [13] - 73:15,	315:21, 317:18	12:6, 14:4, 14:15,
48:17, 50:23,	ADHD [1] - 116:12	74:15, 116:6,	agree [30] - 11:17,	14:19, 39:8, 51:18,
258:16, 283:9,	adjacent [3] - 270:2,	131:19, 167:17,	23:6, 28:8, 42:22,	51:20, 92:20,
283:24, 289:13,	295:22, 295:23	168:20, 201:20,	53:22, 53:23, 56:1,	100:12, 102:12,
289:20, 289:24,	adjunct [1] - 220:25	225:10, 225:25,	56:6, 57:3, 74:2,	120:9, 130:18,
290:2, 290:20,	adjust [2] - 118:24,	227:14,245:8,	75:3, 75:24, 76:21,	130:20, 171:17,
290:22, 291:19,	220:2	248:20, 251:2	93:18,95:15,95:24,	173:1, 180:8,
292:23, 317:24,	adjusted [2] - 146:2,	adversely [1] - 69:10	123:12, 124:4,	197:22, 224:22,
318:16, 318:17,	156:12	advice [9] - 8:15, 9:12,	161:9, 169:6, 169:7,	230:16,249:10,
318:18	Adjustment [3] - 4:10,	10:7, 18:12, 26:23,	169:22, 171:25,	257:19,269:19,
acted [3] - 10:7, 27:14,	4:17, 5:8	27:14, 51:16, 53:2,	225:19, 226:5,	276:7, 287:24,
37:7	adjustment [1] - 4:21	121:13	271:3, 272:3,	302:18, 308:14,
acting [1] - 19:1	administered [2] -	advise [1] - 20:21	272:11, 272:18,	310:10
action [2] - 242:18,	130:19, 218:21	advocating [7] -	299:18	aid [2] - 129:8, 220:8
313:14	administrator [7] -	61:13, 82:2, 82:6,	<b>agreed</b> [4] - 64:5,	<b>aids</b> [2] - 126:13,
activates [1] - 167:16	18:5, 18:9, 18:19,	82:9, 186:25, 187:2,	67:20, 196:10,	126:16
active [2] - 15:2, 15:11	21:22, 21:24, 25:24,	294:21	244:16	ain't [1] - 11:25
actively [1] - 271:24	219:15	aesthetics [1] - 260:19	agreement [11] -	<b>air</b> [22] - 37:21,
activities [1] - 17:21	admissibility [4] -	affect [3] - 50:20,	23:11, 39:4, 44:5,	140:13, 140:15,
acts [1] - 5:7	171:20, 250:6,	89:12, 110:17	67:14, 169:23, 171:24, 179:8,	175:2, 175:3, 175:7,
actual [2] - 235:11,	250:16, 250:19	affected [17] - 49:22,	267:12, 269:3,	175:13, 188:1, 195:19, 195:24,
235:22	admissible [3] -	49:24, 54:23, 69:10,	269:6, 281:2	195:25, 199:3,
ADA [1] - 194:19	21:12, 243:23,	71:19, 74:1, 74:5, 74:6, 116:19,	agreements [12] -	199:4, 203:14,
Adam [4] - 1:12, 3:2,	248:16	123:17, 124:14,	5:24, 35:15, 35:23,	203:25, 204:2,
130:16, 218:18 adapt [1] - 118:22	admission [8] - 14:2, 22:24, 88:14, 95:4,	181:3, 194:18,	38:17, 43:22, 83:11,	204:4, 204:7,
add [7] - 61:25, 76:19,	135:11, 224:9,	211:16, 228:17,	84:4, 184:16, 187:7,	204:13, 204:19,
133:3, 133:5,	301:18, 321:12	278:2	240:20, 303:24,	205:13
224:20, 301:13,	admit [7] - 14:4,	affects [1] - 110:17	303 :25	airplane [1] - 203:16
312:1	14:20, 22:22, 25:22,	Affidavit [11] - 39:1,	agrees [2] - 169:10,	airport [2] - 228:22
addendum [1] -	224:15, 224:23,	40:25, 43:21, 47:10,	175:15	Alberta [2] - 96:6,
290:17	305:8	47:12, 47:16, 47:18,	AGRIMONI [1] -	207 :20
adder [1] - 85:11	admits [1] - 168:12	47:22, 48:4, 269:7,	302:13	ale [1] - 287:25
addition [5] - 133:3,	admitted [10] - 23:3,	281:3	<b>Agrimonti</b> [7] - 1:15,	alleviate [2] - 316:4,
231:16, 246:19,	23:4, 23:5, 23:11,	affidavits [1] - 47:24	16:23, 19:10, 42:4,	316:17
247:13,289:8	89:3, 95:8, 114:19,	affiliation [1] - 220:23	166:7, 166:10,	allow [16] - 19:20,
additional [10] -	135:17, 301:23,	affirmations [1] -	301:23 AGRIMONTI [49] -	78:13, 79:15,
41:17, 119:9,	321:16	38:17	10:13, 14:13, 15:3,	109:13, 170:17, 172:9, 172:11,
161:17, 164:18,	admittedly [1] -	afford [1] - 100:16	15:10, 16:15, 17:1,	172.9, 172.11, 179:17, 181:13,
165:16, 165:18,	239:16	afraid [1] - 261:2	19:5, 19:12, 20:7,	184:21, 186:4,
208:25, 235:17,	adopt [5] - 8:16, 12:25, 18:22, 21:20,	Africa [1] - 199:16 afternoon [6] - 113:7,	20:19, 21:7, 22:4,	251:11, 263:10,
267:10, 268:3 additionally [3] -	24:13	147:14, 182:25,	23:5, 28:2, 28:5,	264:10, 304:14,
100:23, 153:8,	adopted [10] - 6:18,	183:1, 218:17,	29:9, 39:6, 42:5,	319:24
251:13	6:20, 6:22, 7:19,	221:21	42:8, 43:3, 50:14,	allowable [2] - 251:25,
address [13] - 126:18,	7:23, 8:12, 8:15,	afterwards [2] - 177:6,	51:5, 257:14,	252:1
162:16, 162:19,	15:5, 28:10, 38:6	199:25	261:20, 261:25,	allowed [9] - 22:24,
162:25, 163:2,	adopting [4] - 14:25,	<b>age</b> [3] - 115:14,	263:3, 269:18,	82:13, 158:18,
163:7, 163:8,	27:15, 37:16, 38:9	115:19, 222:3	270:6, 270:25,	173:11, 247:24,
172:15, 226:25,	adoption [5] - 9:13,	<b>ago</b> [32] - 6:23, 8:18,	271:13, 271:15, 272:20, 273:16	250:7, 250:15,
227:5, 242:1,	9:23, 21:25, 37:23,	13:2, 13:12, 21:3,	272:20, 273:16, 276:6, 287:5,	250:17, 251:23
288:17, 288:19	42:12	23:20, 24:15, 25:15,	276.6, 267.5, 293:11, 293:24,	allowing [3] - 52:14,
addressed [4] -	adult [2] - 259:12	25:24, 28:10, 28:12,	297:11, 299:17,	173:25, 197:19 allows [2] - 191:13,
180:18, 226:12,	adults [1] - 115:9	29:22, 30:1, 30:20, 21:20, 22:7, 25:8	299:19, 301:19,	205:9
276:11, 276:12	advance [2] - 66:10,	31:20, 32:7, 35:8, 62:1, 72:2, 75:6	302:7, 302:22,	alluded [1] - 178:8
addresses [2] - 89:18, 169:4	247:8	62:1, 72:2, 75:6, 204:8, 205:23,	304:5, 308:15,	alluding [1] - 77:9
103.4	advanced [1] - 54:2	207.0, 200.20,		

3

ALMOND [87] - 3:12,	alongside [1] - 184:7	239:11, 241:5,	appendix [1] - 145:11	<b>approve</b> [3] - 40:1, 4
	_			
3:17, 7:11, 14:1,	altercations [2] -	285:25	<b>applicable</b> [2] - 67:13,	40:22, 87:4
14:14, 14:16, 16:23,	278:10, 278:16	annoyed [11] - 75:2,	236:2	approved [7] - 39:10,
19:10, 20:16, 21:14,	alternative [1] - 228:3	75:11, 75:12, 75:13,	Applicant [21] - 3:5,	39:12, 39:19, 42:1,
21:16, 22:15, 22:21,	alternatively [1] -	75:21, 146:11,	14:12, 16:20, 19:15,	273:14, 274:13,
23:3, 23:13, 28:3,	220:1	146:12, 175:22,	23:6, 29:3, 54:14,	279:24
28:20, 34:5, 34:14,	Alves [2] - 56:21,	175:25, 176:1	63:3, 76:2, 92:18,	<b>April</b> [5] - 261:11,
34:19, 42:3, 49:8,	209:17	annual [2] - 230 :2,	112:2, 113:9,	261:16, 261:17,
49:10, 50:9, 50:12,	Alves -Pereira [2] -	230:3	152:13, 153:4,	262:3, 263:16
70:10, 75:17, 80:5,				,
	56:21, 209:17	<b>ANSI</b> [8] - 89:15,	156:7, 186:23,	<b>area</b> [48] - 5:14, 32:4,
83:16, 84:20, 88:13,	Amanda [1] - 1:23	89:18, 144:20,	186:25,232:20,	32:24, 56:24, 56:25,
88:24, 89:2, 90:19,	amazing [1] - 76:19	145:3, 146:17,	271:12, 300:8,	67:23, 71:1, 117:25,
90:22, 91:2, 91:8,	ambient [6] - 64:25,	150:17, 177:12,	316:15	133:1, 144:1,
91:12, 91:18, 92:1,	111:1, 140:21,	193:21	Applicant 's [6] -	146:24, 147:2,
92:14, 95:3, 96:16,	146:23, 147:2,	answer [33] - 9:16,	54:15, 62:24, 67:8,	148:9, 149:24,
97:25, 120:2, 120:8,	202:21	21:2, 25:2, 26:14,	84:9, 90:7, 275:23	149:25, 151:18,
122:21, 122:23,	American [1] - 222:19	27:24, 28:6, 28:8,	Application [17] - 3:4,	157:14, 176:25,
124:6, 130:12,	amount [6] - 68:14,	32:25, 79:15, 85:4,	35:11, 72:4, 88:2,	181:1, 183:25,
130:23, 135:10,		92:20, 121:23,	98:12, 98:13, 99:12,	186:21, 210:21,
156:2, 158:18,	77:2, 193:6, 220:9,			
	274:2, 278:7	123:15, 136:19,	244:1, 273:14,	210:22, 210:23,
169:15, 170:19,	amounts [1] - 74:19	150:1, 152:3,	274:12, 274:22,	220:17, 220:20,
206:13, 208:8,	amplitude [1] - 87:10	158:19, 161:15,	276:4, 276:10,	256:7, 256:11,
218:16, 218:23,	analogy [1] - 307:4	165:6, 165:13,	276:14,280:12,	256:12,258:21,
224:8, 224:14,	analyses [2] - 233:21,	176:7,184:15,	280:23	258:22, 258:25,
225:3, 232:15,	247:19	185:12,209:15,	APPLICATION [1] -	260:12,269:14,
248:2, 248:13,	analysis [15] - 64:1,	212:24, 214:3,	1:2	270:13, 274:7,
248:16, 248:21,	64:13, 87:12, 88:15,	226:18, 236:25,	applies [1] - 234:11	274:19,276:17,
257:3, 257:23,	90:25, 132:8,	269:19, 276:7,	apply [3] - 145:18,	276:18, 276:20,
258:5, 271:7, 287:1,		282:15, 300:12	247:22, 250:16	276:21, 277:25,
287:25,288:9,	139:15, 142:4,	answered [7] - 4:22,	applying [2] - 250:18,	285:15, 289:9,
288:14, 293:13,	157:8, 188:14,	14:10, 57:2, 150:19,	250:24	312:4, 312:5, 313:15
301:17, 302:8,	191:12, 191:13,	155:6, 164:9, 319:8	appointed [2] - 179:1,	areas [6] - 132:9,
302:11, 302:25,	302:1, 303:3	answers [3] - 135:8,	•••	180:20, 186:2,
304:9, 304:12,	analyze [1] - 148:16		179:6	197:13, 204:23,
308:1, 314:19,	analyzed [3] - 75:4,	224:6, 264:11	appointment [1] -	
315:13, 321:19	81:9, 139:16	anticipate [2] - 68:16,	290:9	278:21
	<b>AND</b> [1] - 1:4	73:6	appraiser [1] - 288:23	argue [3] - 142:21,
Almond [26] - 1:16,	Anderson [1] - 132:2	anticipated [1] - 176:6	appreciate [16] - 49:1,	171:19, 205:24
3:10, 10:15, 10:17,	Andes [3] - 276:25,	anticipating [1] -	113:18, 113:21,	arguing [2] - 198:18,
16:21, 17:6, 19:20,	277:1	147 :8	116:4, 119:6, 153:3,	198:20
20:21, 21:11, 34:3,	anecdotal [2] -	anxiety [6] - 168:21,	186:7, 187:9, 193:8,	argument [2] - 10:16,
34:12, 42:22, 52:14,	199:25, 225:21	269:22, 270:1,	196:24, 219:7,	250:13
70:8, 122:20,		270:13, 285:24,	264:7, 282:14,	argumentative [1] -
130:21, 135:17,	anecdotally [1] -	286:13	282:15, 285:19,	28:2
170:17, 171:24,	164:23	<b>anyway</b> [4] - 172:17,	320:22	arguments [1] - 54:2
206:11, 218:11,	angles [1] - 194:22	230:13, 290:21,	apprehension [2] -	arrayed [1] - 231:24
218:15, 257:1,	Anheuser [1] - 131:13	296:2		arrays [1] - 231:24
257:12, 288:8, 321:1	Anheuser -Busch [1] -		120:18, 121:15	
Almond 's [5] - 3:8,	131:13	apologize [10] - 9:21,	approach [3] - 80:19,	arrive [1] - 77:10
19:24, 31:25, 43:10,	annotated [1] - 136:23	24:22, 29:20, 43:15,	89:22, 252:9	arrows [1] - 191:17
47:11	announce [1] - 197:25	156:15, 169:18,	approached [2] -	<b>article</b> [24] - 9:14,
almost [15] - 32:9,	announcement [1] -	241:23, 242:3,	292:22, 293:4	68:20, 69:3, 69:4,
	275:12	261:24, 284:1	appropriate [15] -	94:24, 163:14,
60:17, 113:7,	annoyance [20] -	apology [1] - 198:23	14:8,66:1,95:24,	163:17, 164:8,
113:23, 121:13,	60:16, 73:16, 74:17,	appeal [1] - 82:19	125:19, 153:21,	222:15,222:16,
132:4, 136:13,	75:22, 145:13,	appear [3] - 74:7,	153:23, 157:20,	223:18, 225:16,
136:15, 151:12,	145:22, 146:1,	183:5, 212:25	172:24, 172:25,	237:11, 237:13,
151:22, 199:13,		appeared [1] - 98:7	231:10, 246:7,	237:15,237:16,
199:24, 231:5,	146:7, 146:13,	appearing [6] - 1:15,	247:20, 262:24,	237:24, 237:25,
243:6, 279:15	146:14, 147:8,	1:17, 1:19, 1:20,	272:4, 272:13	238:9, 244:18,
alone [3] - 57:21,	149:19, 152:20,	1:22, 1:23	approval [4] - 88:2,	245:9, 245:12,
117:9, 125:15	154:4, 154:12,	Appendix [1] - 165:21	88:3, 276:14, 280:20	255:17
	154:16,231:11,			

Article [38] - 7:1, 7:5,	assumed [2] - 216:25,	attentive [2] - 263:18,	Australia [4] - 54:20,	275:17, 308:18 5
7:13, 7:16, 7:21,	266:14	263:19	55:1, 143:9, 255:24	<b>awful</b> [1] - 177:5
7:23, 8:16, 8:21,	assuming [9] - 19:21,	attenuate [1] - 231:2	Australian [1] - 140:25	axis [1] - 190:7
9:11, 9:13, 9:23,	44:14, 48:18,	attenuation [1] - 231.2	author [2] - 222:16,	aye [1] - 270:22
9:24, 10:10, 11:6,	171:23, 216:5,	124 :20	320:19	aye [1] - 270.22
11:10, 11:13, 11:18,	279:10, 297:12,	attorney [8] - 31:20,	authority [1] - 48:22	P
11:21, 11:24, 12:1,	313:2, 316:9	43:14, 43:16,	automobiles [1] - 48.22	В
12:2, 12:24, 14:25,	assumption [3] -	43.14, 43.10, 156:10, 178:15,	205:17	<b>B&amp;H</b> [3] - 293:18,
18:22, 21:25, 25:3,	43:15, 118:3, 196:13	264:8, 264:15,	automotive [1] - 145:7	313:16, 313:19
25:4, 25:8, 27:21,	assumptions [2] -	286:24		<b>B.H</b> [1] - 313:8
27:25, 294:20,	63:25, 64:3	attorneys [1] - 306:8	available [10] -	backed [1] - 253:18
294:22, 294:24,	assured [2] - 76:7,	attributable [3] -	180:23, 182:12,	background [37] -
295:20, 295:22,	293:22	66:21, 121:16,	182:20, 188:25,	57:21, 57:22, 58:11,
304:20, 311:10,	atmosphere [3] - 79:2,	170:16	222:6, 226:8, 227:1,	58:20, 62:1, 62:3,
312:21	79:6, 201:5	attributed [2] -	242:5, 262:12, 274:3	62:5, 64:17, 65:3,
articles [4] - 69:5,	atmospheric [12] -	121:16, 123:2	avenue [1] - 288:18	65:4, 65:7, 65:9,
222:14, 244:18,		,	Avenue [1] - 2:3	77:5, 80:19, 80:25,
250:21	57:15, 76:8, 78:3,	auction [1] - 297:9	average [34] - 26:3,	85:7, 85:8, 89:23,
artifact [1] - 140:22	78:8, 78:20, 78:24, 79:8, 193:24,	audibility [4] - 141:4,	26:5, 26:9, 26:13,	125:11, 139:12,
artifacts [1] - 189:2	79:8, 193:24, 196:15, 214:21,	142:23, 143:6,	57:12, 58:22, 94:4,	147:6, 147:11,
ASA [2] - 144:21,	, ,	143:10	125:13, 149:8,	147:24, 149:2,
ASA [2] - 144.21, 145:3	215:25, 216:6 attach [1] - 94:16	audible [32] - 71:5,	152:18, 152:21,	149:13, 149:18,
ashamed [1] - 270:23		73:18, 77:21, 80:18,	153:25, 154:5,	160:2, 171:1,
aside [7] - 13:25,	attached [4] - 107:25,	90:2, 114:16, 116:2,	154:7, 154:11,	194:10, 201:6,
14:21, 40:20, 50:5,	126:13, 134:11,	132:21, 132:25,	154:18, 155:20,	219:11, 223:5,
14.21, 40.20, 50.5, 111:17, 203:13,	140:3	141:3, 144:3, 144:6,	155:22, 155:23,	251:6, 251:11,
233:8	Attachment [3] -	157:20, 167:15,	155:24, 185:18,	317:17, 318:5
aspect [1] - 83:3	300:12, 300:19, 301:5	189:20, 189:21, 192:3, 199:4,	192:11, 192:14,	<b>bad</b> [4] - 72:21, 98:2,
aspects [2] - 113:17,			192:18, 192:20, 193:2, 193:14,	149:3, 231:6
268:22	attachment [1] - 41:2	209:25, 211:5, 211:12, 212:11,	193:15, 200:22,	baffled [1] - 197:11
assertion [1] - 172:17	attacked [2] - 286:18,	213:10, 213:16,	216:14, 216:19,	balance [1] - 144:11
assertions [1] - 171:8	286:19	213:18, 213:19,	216:22, 217:3, 230:2	balancing [2] -
	attacks [1] - 168:21	213.16, 213.19, 227:6, 230:23,	averaged [2] - 26:13,	116:25, 152:6
<b>assess</b> [3] - 53:24, 54:5, 92:23	attempt [6] - 100:14,	248:7, 248:21,	26:16	ballpark [1] - 58:13
assesses [1] - 194:24	100:15, 230:7,	248:25, 249:5	averages [1] - 149:4	<b>balls</b> [3] - 175:5,
	230:20, 317:10	<b>audio</b> [2] - 156:13,	averaging [1] - 216:21	175:7, 175:11
assessing [4] - 113:14, 113:16,	attempted [3] - 107:2,	222:24	avoid [8] - 20:22,	<b>band</b> [4] - 188:14,
149:19, 252:6	261:7, 274:9	audiological [1] -	65:13, 100:22,	191:13, 277:6, 277:7
assessment [6] - 54:1,	attempting [6] - 22:17,	235:9	109:22, 146:18,	bands [3] - 137:24,
92:22, 93:8, 145:4,	22:18, 28:3, 102:5, 110:13, 250:22	audiologist [16] -	175:17, 279:2,	138:4, 138:23
240:5	119:13, 250:22 attend [5] - 263:21,	219:1, 219:9,	293:14	bank [1] - 200:13
assessments [3] -	265:6, 267:9,	219:10, 220:4,	avoiding [1] - 252:6	bare [1] - 320:1
57:24, 64:16, 122:3	267:24, 279:22	220:10, 221:8,	Avon [12] - 15:16,	barely [1] - 222:4
asset [1] - 280:22	attended [24] - 69:5,	233:13, 234:6,	28:23, 34:9, 269:22,	bark [1] - 56:15
associate [1] - 57:8	261:12, 261:16,	234:8, 234:9,	279:23, 288:18,	barked [1] - 177:10
associated [5] -	261:12, 261:10, 261:10,	234:22, 235:1,	296:23, 296:24,	barking [1] - 149:16
164:2, 192:10,	262:16, 262:19,	236:4, 240:10,	297:2, 297:3,	barn [1] - 285:3
260:11, 300:25,	263:15, 263:23,	248:24, 249:3	297:23, 305:4	barns [3] - 24:25,
301:8	263:25, 264:1,	audiology [5] -	aware [29] - 21:10,	25:1, 32:23
Associates [2] -	265:8, 266:3, 268:3,	219:13, 220:5,	26:16, 35:4, 41:18,	barometer [8] -
52:25, 178:17	268:9, 268:11,	222:18, 237:12,	68:13, 71:13, 72:7,	137:11, 139:16,
associates [2] - 88:2,	268:12, 268:13,	251:5	72:25, 83:10, 84:4,	139:22, 187:25,
132:2	269:12, 269:13, 269:22,	audiometric [2] -	96:12, 123:22,	188:18, 189:6,
association [1] -	269:10, 209:22, 269:23, 294:17,	235:7, 235:13	123:25, 142:20,	189:16, 199:19
222:20	310:13	auditory [1] - 149:18	151:6, 170:21,	barometers [3] -
	attending [5] - 42:9,	August [3] - 52:4,	180:14, 181:9,	133:12, 139:19,
<b>assume</b> [10] - 9:23, 42:2, 115:8, 116:25,	46:6, 261:11,	268:12, 304:24	188:20, 217:24,	188:25
42.2, 115.8, 116.25, 117:21, 167:3,	294:15, 303:14	aunt [4] - 66:21,	218:3, 218:4, 225:8,	barometric [1] -
243:17, 260:15,	attention [4] - 32:4,	306:21, 306:22	225:13, 244:15,	189:23
243.17, 200.15, 297:9, 303:9	47:9, 62:13, 209:9	Austin [1] - 226:12	247:7, 269:20,	barrels [1] - 285:1
201.0, 000.0	11.0, 02.10, 200.0		,,	

barriers [1] - 231:5	222:13	251:23, 274:11,	<b>blue</b> [3] - 137:24,	<b>88:11, 124:12</b> , 6
<b>base</b> [3] - 35:13, 80:2,	<b>begin</b> [6] - 67:25,	278:11, 281:3,	187:24, 298:23	137:10, 137:19,
215:12	138:3, 144:11,	283:6, 285:25	<b>Board</b> [12] - 4:9, 4:17,	138:18, 138:19,
			•••	
based [44] - 14:7,	156:6, 203:7, 212:14	betweens [1] - 177:3	4:25, 5:2, 5:7, 5:8,	138:20, 167:11,
19:21, 53:22, 55:15,	<b>beginning</b> [4] - 52:4,	<b>beyond</b> [4] - 139:13,	8:8, 8:10, 21:17,	168:7, 168:8, 168:9,
60:10,66:9,68:16,	63:3, 113:8, 180:24	152:24, 201:15,	21:18, 32:20	169:9, 169:14,
70:3, 71:20, 71:21,	<b>begins</b> [3] - 253:13,	251:9	<b>board</b> [17] - 4:1, 4:3,	169:20, 195:24,
71:22, 75:18, 104:5,	308:25, 312:15	biased [2] - 66:21,	4:8, 4:19, 5:4, 5:7,	207:11,207:12,
110:16, 112:8,	behalf [6] - 1:15, 1:17,	179:25	22:1, 22:2, 24:18,	243:18, 245:1,
117:9, 120:15,	1:23, 15:20, 67:16,	Bible [1] - 226:16	103:9, 139:3,	254:8, 254:20,
122:3, 123:18,	103:11	<b>big</b> [15] - 24:25, 32:24,	151:23, 201:9,	289:6, 290:21, 299:6
123:20, 124:6,	behavior [1] - 122:11	73:9, 85:11, 127:19,	217:20, 218:6,	bought [2] - 204:7,
148:17, 160:16,	behind [1] - 289:3	137:20, 137:21,	297:7, 300:18	312:5
160:18, 172:10,	beings [1] - 35:11	183:23, 184:13,	boards [1] - 237 :20	boundary [1] - 216:7
178:23, 181:10,	Belgian [2] - 288:1,	186:22, 214:19,	<b>boat</b> [4] - 104:23,	bounds [1] - 44:9
208:12, 210:11,	288:2	285:13, 305:5,	182:13, 279:24,	Bowder [1] - 16:1
222:6, 229:21,		307:16, 307:17	302:24	box [1] - 183:3
234:21, 244:20,	<b>belief</b> [2] - 159:6,			boys [1] - 259:1
256:17, 257:5,	309:10	<b>binder</b> [4] - 6:2, 6:5,	bodies [1] - 203:7	
	believer [1] - 203:11	18:15, 38:23	<b>body</b> [6] - 86:11,	Bradford [4] - 226:11,
259:9, 260:24,	<b>believes</b> [2] - 150:24,	binds [1] - 42:23	86:12, 141:14,	226:12, 226:24
276:17, 284:13,	301 :20	<b>bio</b> [2] - 207 :7, 207 :9	141:16, 167:17,	brand [2] - 285:7,
287:3, 290:24,	bellow [1] - 199:17	<b>bit</b> [33] - 13:14, 27:20,	173:18	285:17
298:15, 311:11	bells [1] - 101:23	33:18, 43:9, 45:9,	<b>boil</b> [2] - 202:12,	<b>break</b> [11] - 119:25,
<b>basing</b> [5] - 68:12,	belong [1] - 132:9	68:7, 76:4, 89:5,	202:19	120:5, 120:6, 130:3,
68:14, 69:2, 255:12,	belongs [1] - 299:6	98:6, 100:3, 102:7,	Boise [1] - 258:20	198:1, 257:17,
255:14	<b>below</b> [12] - 55:13,	104:18, 110:25,	<b>bomb</b> [1] - 200:6	257:21, 264:13,
<b>basis</b> [9] - 20:11,	60:18, 62:2, 62:10,	114:15, 132:17,	<b>bombs</b> [2] - 199:19,	288:3, 288:4, 308:4
58:22, 149:19,	66:16, 67:25, 78:23,	141:23, 144:10,	199:21	breaking [1] - 52:14
171:13, 171:15,	107:11, 154:11,	144:19, 155:7,	<b>BON</b> [1] - 1:4	breeze [2] - 189:18,
193:6, 243:22,	175:24, 189:23,	185:14, 189:5,	<b>Bon</b> [23] - 3:23, 6:11,	196:3
244:19, 273:18	195:10	202:14, 219:4,	6:14, 6:20, 6:21,	brew [2] - 287:25,
battery [1] - 235:8	benefit [1] - 5:18	221:22, 223:4,	9:13, 54:8, 63:4,	288:1
Bay [1] - 151:25		230:10, 269:21,	64:6, 67:14, 262:7,	brewery [5] - 276:19,
<b>bear</b> [3] - 194:23,	beside [1] - 114:13	283:19, 292:20,	264:24, 265:1,	284:18, 284:20,
319:23, 319:25	<b>best</b> [12] - 6:16, 20:5,	297:25, 303:11,		
Beaver [1] - 97:23	23:24, 24:6, 27:7,	312:12, 318:24	296:17, 296:18,	285:2, 285:8
	196:11, 281:2,		296:19, 298:10,	Bridgewater [6] -
beaver [1] - 103:11	294:13, 301:1,	black [1] - 109:5	311:2, 311:4,	142:2, 169:1, 169:5,
<b>became</b> [3] - 8:21,	301:12, 305:9, 308:5	<b>blade</b> [8] - 69:23,	312:21, 314:10,	169:6, 244:12,
131:11, 188:20	<b>better</b> [6] - 33:19,	104:17, 104:18,	317:10, 318:14	244 : 17
<b>become</b> [10] - 80:18,	60:15, 76:21, 232:5,	138:1, 142:18,	<b>bone</b> [1] - 126:13	<b>brief</b> [6] - 9:21, 10:16,
132:19, 139:18,	250:1, 296:1	190:20, 192:16,	<b>book</b> [14] - 24:9,	171:21, 218:25,
150:5, 221:14,	between [45] - 10:15,	194 :22	24:14, 24:21, 24:23,	292:12
222:9, 223:12,	34:9, 40:11, 59:5,	blades [5] - 73:19,	29:21, 29:23, 31:23,	briefcase [1] - 24:24
277:5, 285:17, 292:8	62:4, 64:22, 70:12,	104:18, 119:18,	32:10, 222:2, 222:5,	briefed [1] - 17:25
becomes [9] - 74:7,	81:20, 110:4,	144:3, 215:10	222:11,245:21,	briefly [6] - 31:14,
146:22, 186:1,	112:14, 122:14,	blank [1] - 57:6	308:23	49:8, 66:12, 122:21,
213:25, 214:11,	124:18, 124:21,	blended [1] - 263:8	border [1] - 301:11	130:25, 208:19
214:12, 215:15,	129:19, 138:14,	blends [2] - 139:12,	borrowed [1] - 29:21	bring [4] - 33:13,
215:21, 226:15	140:18, 143:25,	201:3	bother [2] - 129:5,	100:5, 103:21, 305:4
bedroom [1] - 307:2	147:15, 152:7,	blind [1] - 54:25	203:4	brings [2] - 277 :20,
beer [2] - 284:22,	163:25, 171:9,	<b>blip</b> [1] - 107:10	<b>bothered</b> [11] - 55:3,	316:20
285:6	175:12, 175:25,	<b>block</b> [1] - 175:6	59:24, 61:12, 118:5,	Britain [2] - 150:3,
Beethoven [12] - 8:24,		blocked [1] - 199:10	118:19, 118:20,	
16:10, 16:12, 43:19,	176:1, 179:8,			226:13
	183:19, 183:23,	<b>blog</b> [3] - 237:23,	118:22, 118:23,	Brittain [1] - 142:25
47:21, 260:10, 260:12, 280:10	190:14, 194:8,	238:1	270:11, 305:4	<b>broad</b> [2] - 155:13,
260:12, 289:19,	213:24, 214:4,	<b>blowing</b> [10] - 62:2,	<b>bothering</b> [2] - 71:6,	292:12
292:21, 293:2,	216:18, 217:25,	62:7, 65:1, 65:6,	77:22	broadband [1] - 105:7
294:6, 296:25	225:9, 225:24,	76:14, 77:14, 79:25,	bothers [1] - 118:11	broader [1] - 168:20
BEFORE [1] - 1:9	227:14,245:7,	94:1, 106:9, 140:23	<b>bottom</b> [28] - 6:6,	broker [1] - 288:22
began [2] - 211:9,	245:14,250:22,	blown [1] - 109:15	26:20, 62:8, 73:23,	Brookings [1] -

318:10	business [18] - 96:24,	19:22, 23:13, 23:19,	206:25, 255:7,	237:17, 265:23,
brother [7] - 289:14,	131:3, 131:21,	26:14, 27:24, 115:4,	255:8, 255:9,	265:24, 278:3,
289:17, 289:21,	132:17, 259:3,	235:2, 255:12	255:11, 255:22,	285:18
289:24, 291:9,	259:6, 273:2,	capability [1] - 55:13	255:23	<b>certified</b> [2] - 220:10,
292:23, 299:7	276:17, 278:20,	capable [5] - 22:2,	Cassadaga [1] -	288:22
brother 's [1] - 290:19	279:7, 279:9,	90:22, 168:20,	249:13	<b>cetera</b> [14] - 83:18,
brought [23] - 8:17,	283:13, 283:20,	305:14, 306:17	catching [1] - 321:17	116:22, 123:1,
27:18, 27:19, 29:20,	283:23, 284:13,		category [1] - 216:3	135:22, 136:6,
	284:17, 287:11	capacity [1] - 76:15		142:17, 170:23,
29:23, 31:23, 38:11,	businesses [1] -	<b>Cape</b> [6] - 142:1,	caught [1] - 244:14	
50:18, 80:1, 92:12, 194:23, 261:12,	258:24	169:1, 169:4, 169:5,	<b>causal</b> [3] - 166:22,	188:1, 188:25,
262:18, 264:22,	<b>buy</b> [1] - 285:6	244:12, 244:17	171:9, 243:25	194:22, 210:25, 211:21, 211:23,
266:11, 266:13,	• • • •	<b>Capitol</b> [3] - 2:3, 33:17	causation [11] - 172:2,	211.21, 211.23, 212.9
268:19, 270:22,	<b>BY</b> [42] - 1:3, 3:17,	captains [1] - 98:18	172:17, 225:24,	<b>chair</b> [4] - 72:21,
290:15, 299:3,	29:14, 31:16, 34:19, 42:8, 43:6, 46:5,	<b>capture</b> [5] - 94:4,	226:19, 240:5,	175:18, 220:24,
306:12, 306:13		106:4, 107:16,	243:23, 243:24,	222:22
Brown [9] - 87:13,	46:16, 47:5, 49:10, 50:17, 51:22, 52:21,	107:18, 165:11	244:13, 244:19,	
88:17, 139:3,	63:20, 70:10, 96:21,	<b>captured</b> [2] - 86:1,	245:10, 248:6	<b>Chair</b> [3] - 49:5, 113:4,
151:16, 151:23,	97:15, 120:13,	107:7	causations [1] -	282:18
		<b>car</b> [2] - 177:10,	226:19	chaired [1] - 229:10
151:25, 178:5, 201:9, 211:9	122:23, 124:10, 127:2, 129:2,	276:24	causative [2] - 227:13,	chairing [1] - 237:17
	127.2, 129.2, 130:23, 156:17,	<b>career</b> [4] - 167:12,	227:25	<b>Chairman</b> [15] - 4:1,
brown [1] - 287:25 Bruce [3] - 297:4,	174:20, 206:13,	205:1, 221:9, 234:15	caused [11] - 74:16,	4:3, 4:6, 8:9, 31:4, 33:0, 33:14, 34:22
	208:21, 217:15,	<b>careful</b> [4] - 58:5,	77:6, 141:15,	33:9, 33:14, 34:22,
297:5, 297:7	218:23, 225:3,	243:13, 264:3, 264:4	142:18, 150:24,	34:24, 48:12, 180:7,
brush [1] - 292:12	233:1, 252:20,	carefully [1] - 163:11	170:22, 177:2,	181:13, 182:23,
<b>buckeye</b> [1] - 198:19	258:5, 271:15,	<b>carried</b> [3] - 24:24,	180:21, 207:17,	254:3, 317:15
<b>buff</b> [1] - 276:23	272:24, 273:12,	104:11, 178:4	212:3, 276:4	CHAIRMAN [1] - 1:10
<b>build</b> [8] - 132:11,	287:10, 288:14,	<b>carry</b> [3] - 104:10,	<b>causes</b> [6] - 110:6,	CHAIRWOMAN [30] -
229:5, 284:13,	308:17, 314:6, 315:2	115:2, 253:17	144:11, 175:3,	1:10, 33:16, 33:21,
293:7, 293:9,	000.17, 014.0, 010.2	cars [1] - 125:6	195:19, 239:22,	49:6, 129:15, 181:15, 182:21,
294:11, 318:16,		<b>case</b> [52] - 3:6, 3:8,	239:25	
219.10	C			
318:19 Building (4) 2:2	С	59:4,65:25,68:2,	causing [5] - 138:2,	197:22, 198:4,
Building [1] - 2:3	C-weighting [2] -	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6,	<b>causing</b> [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7,	_	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11,	<b>causing</b> [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24,	C-weighting [2] -	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16,	<b>causing</b> [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 <b>caution</b> [1] - 145:10	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13,	<b>C-weighting</b> [2] - 106 :1, 106 :3	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] -	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 challenge [2] -
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 177:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 challenge [2] - 118:13, 185:14 challenged [2] -
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:11, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 challenge [2] - 118:13, 185:14 challenged [2] - 249:20, 249:22 challenges [1] - 115:9 chance [4] - 152:9,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 builet [2] - 108:5,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 177:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9 <b>chance</b> [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1
Building [1] - 2:3 building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 177:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 challenge [2] - 118:13, 185:14 challenged [2] - 249:20, 249:22 challenges [1] - 115:9 chance [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 change [17] - 14:22,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 253:20, 255:16,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 177:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9,	$197:22, 198:4, \\198:15, 198:22, \\254:2, 282:19, \\283:1, 283:9, \\283:12, 283:15, \\283:19, 285:18, \\308:7, 317:16, \\317:21, 317:25, \\318:3, 318:20, \\319:6, 319:8, 320:5, \\320:7, 321:22 \\ \textbf{challenge} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:11, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 builet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18, 319:23	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 255:18, 255:21,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9, 275:18	$197:22, 198:4, \\198:15, 198:22, \\254:2, 282:19, \\283:1, 283:9, \\283:12, 283:15, \\283:19, 285:18, \\308:7, 317:16, \\317:21, 317:25, \\318:3, 318:20, \\319:6, 319:8, 320:5, \\320:7, 321:22 \\ \textbf{challenge} \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18, 319:23 burden [3] - 146:6,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 200:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9 <b>chance</b> [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 <b>change</b> [17] - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18, 319:23 burden [3] - 146:6, 274:23, 274:24	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4, 207:20, 211:17,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5, 274:23, 321:11,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8, 168:2, 171:2, 172:6,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 challenge [2] - 118:13, 185:14 challenged [2] - 249:20, 249:22 challenges [1] - 115:9 chance [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 change [17] - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22, 183:7, 183:16,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18, 319:23 burden [3] - 146:6, 274:23, 274:24 buried [1] - 273:5	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4, 207:20, 211:17, 211:25, 212:6,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 255:16, 255:18, 255:16, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5, 274:23, 321:11, 321:16	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8, 168:2, 171:2, 172:6, 173:11, 173:13,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9 <b>chance</b> [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 <b>change</b> [17] - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22, 183:7, 183:16, 183:21, 183:23,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18, 319:23 burden [3] - 146:6, 274:23, 274:24 buried [1] - 273:5 burned [1] - 307:9	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4, 207:20, 211:17, 211:25, 212:6, 227:23, 255:23,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 253:20, 255:16, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5, 274:23, 321:11, 321:16 <b>cases</b> [17] - 58:19,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8, 168:2, 171:2, 172:6, 173:11, 173:13, 181:19, 186:25,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9 <b>chance</b> [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 <b>change</b> [17] - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22, 183:7, 183:16, 183:21, 183:23, 184:2, 184:25,
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:11, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18, 319:23 burden [3] - 146:6, 274:23, 274:24 buried [1] - 273:5 burned [1] - 307:9 burner [1] - 9:18	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4, 207:20, 211:17, 211:25, 212:6, 227:23, 255:23, 256:2	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5, 274:23, 321:11, 321:16 <b>cases</b> [17] - 58:19, 76:15, 123:13,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8, 168:2, 171:2, 172:6, 173:11, 173:13, 181:19, 186:25, 224:13, 229:18,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> $[2]$ - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> $[2]$ - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> $[1]$ - 115:9 <b>chance</b> $[4]$ - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 <b>change</b> $[17]$ - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22, 183:7, 183:16, 183:21, 183:23, 184:2, 184:25, 185:1, 266:9, 268:2,
Building $[1] - 2:3$ building $[10] - 144:7$ , 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings $[2] - 144:9$ built $[18] - 43:19, 58:4$ , 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet $[2] - 108:5$ , 108:7 bunch $[2] - 98:18$ , 319:23 burden $[3] - 146:6$ , 274:23, 274:24 buried $[1] - 273:5$ burned $[1] - 307:9$ burner $[1] - 9:18$ Burns $[2] - 63:25$ ,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4, 207:20, 211:17, 211:25, 212:6, 227:23, 255:23, 256:2 Canadian [1] - 74:22	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 253:20, 255:16, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5, 274:23, 321:11, 321:16 <b>cases</b> [17] - 58:19, 76:15, 123:13, 134:1, 134:6,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8, 168:2, 171:2, 172:6, 173:11, 173:13, 181:19, 186:25, 224:13, 229:18, 231:2, 232:13,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9 <b>chance</b> [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 <b>change</b> [17] - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22, 183:7, 183:16, 183:21, 183:23, 184:2, 184:25, 185:1, 266:9, 268:2, 271:19
Building [1] - 2:3 building [10] - 144:7, 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings [2] - 144:9 built [18] - 43:19, 58:4, 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet [2] - 108:5, 108:7 bunch [2] - 98:18, 319:23 burden [3] - 146:6, 274:23, 274:24 buried [1] - 273:5 burned [1] - 307:9 burner [1] - 9:18 Burns [2] - 63:25, 93:10	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4, 207:20, 211:17, 211:25, 212:6, 227:23, 255:23, 256:2 Cancer [2] - 307:6,	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 253:20, 255:16, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5, 274:23, 321:11, 321:16 Cases [17] - 58:19, 76:15, 123:13, 134:1, 134:6, 137:13, 148:13,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8, 168:2, 171:2, 172:6, 173:11, 173:13, 181:19, 186:25, 224:13, 229:18, 231:2, 232:13, 234:2, 234:14,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9 <b>chance</b> [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 <b>change</b> [17] - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22, 183:7, 183:16, 183:21, 183:23, 184:2, 184:25, 185:1, 266:9, 268:2, 271:19 <b>change</b> [2] - 253:16,
Building $[1] - 2:3$ building $[10] - 144:7$ , 229:6, 258:24, 259:6, 283:13, 283:22, 285:1, 285:2, 285:10, 285:11 buildings $[2] - 144:9$ built $[18] - 43:19, 58:4$ , 99:2, 99:15, 115:15, 121:14, 180:12, 268:7, 292:21, 293:1, 293:2, 293:6, 294:5, 294:10, 309:17, 309:20, 312:6, 319:10 bullet $[2] - 108:5$ , 108:7 bunch $[2] - 98:18$ , 319:23 burden $[3] - 146:6$ , 274:23, 274:24 buried $[1] - 273:5$ burned $[1] - 307:9$ burner $[1] - 9:18$ Burns $[2] - 63:25$ ,	C-weighting [2] - 106:1, 106:3 calculations [2] - 89:16, 290:23 California [1] - 222:8 calm [5] - 65:10, 76:7, 79:9, 194:2, 196:14 camera [6] - 156:10, 156:12, 180:7, 220:2, 230:10, 232:22 campaign [1] - 58:9 Campbell [3] - 309:15, 309:19, 310:3 camper [3] - 259:16, 259:19, 259:22 Canada [13] - 74:22, 96:6, 146:9, 163:6, 175:23, 176:4, 207:20, 211:17, 211:25, 212:6, 227:23, 255:23, 256:2 Canadian [1] - 74:22 cancer [2] - 307:6, 307:12	59:4, 65:25, 68:2, 68:4, 68:11, 75:6, 77:11, 98:11, 102:18, 103:16, 103:17, 117:7, 130:10, 138:5, 156:25, 165:21, 166:3, 166:16, 166:21, 167:2, 191:3, 198:18, 198:21, 206:20, 206:21, 206:22, 206:24, 207:4, 207:13, 207:24, 230:7, 241:16, 242:25, 247:8, 248:3, 248:9, 249:12, 249:17, 250:14, 251:24, 253:20, 255:16, 255:18, 255:21, 256:18, 260:5, 274:23, 321:11, 321:16 <b>cases</b> [17] - 58:19, 76:15, 123:13, 134:1, 134:6,	causing [5] - 138:2, 140:16, 144:17, 172:12, 216:23 caution [1] - 145:10 cautions [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 175:11 cautious [1] - 197:18 cells [1] - 245:11 cemetery [1] - 273:5 center [1] - 299:25 centered [1] - 73:10 certain [24] - 26:15, 54:23, 55:7, 81:3, 82:22, 83:2, 83:7, 101:19, 109:12, 117:8, 121:4, 123:7, 127:21, 141:16, 170:22, 178:24, 239:20, 246:1, 246:5, 246:6, 247:2, 272:15, 275:9, 275:18 certainly [21] - 94:8, 168:2, 171:2, 172:6, 173:11, 173:13, 181:19, 186:25, 224:13, 229:18, 231:2, 232:13,	197:22, 198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2, 282:19, 283:1, 283:9, 283:12, 283:15, 283:19, 285:18, 308:7, 317:16, 317:21, 317:25, 318:3, 318:20, 319:6, 319:8, 320:5, 320:7, 321:22 <b>challenge</b> [2] - 118:13, 185:14 <b>challenged</b> [2] - 249:20, 249:22 <b>challenges</b> [1] - 115:9 <b>chance</b> [4] - 152:9, 182:18, 296:5, 300:1 <b>change</b> [17] - 14:22, 42:12, 122:11, 125:22, 125:24, 133:19, 133:22, 183:7, 183:16, 183:21, 183:23, 184:2, 184:25, 185:1, 266:9, 268:2, 271:19

	Ĩ			
changes [10] - 94:2,	137:20, 137:21,	98:4	commencing [1] - 2:5	110:24, 111:7, 8
134:7, 184:12,	138:5, 138:12,	<b>clock</b> [2] - 118:10,	<b>comment</b> [5] - 37:24,	111:10, 111:16,
184:13, 189:18,	138:16, 138:22	118:14	49:20, 142:10,	111:24, 112:6,
189:22, 223:14,	circumstances [4] -	<b>close</b> [16] - 5:14,	143:13, 277:17	112:15, 112:23,
231:22, 269:4,	66:5, 68:6, 94:14,	42:17, 44:17, 44:18,	commented [1] -	113:6, 114:6,
317:11	109:19	49:23, 80:12,	99:13	114:10, 114:21,
<b>changing</b> [5] - 81:4,	<b>citation</b> [3] - 159:4,	149:14, 186:14,	commenting [1] -	114:25, 115:7,
111:1, 111:25,	206:19, 206:22	203:2, 204:22,	122:2	115:20, 115:24,
138:7, 298:17	citations [1] - 163:8	215:10, 229:20,	<b>comments</b> [6] - 18:10,	116:4, 116:11,
character [1] - 111:4	<b>cite</b> [5] - 158:12,	231:20, 262:10,	38:4, 42:18, 56:2,	116:16, 116:20,
characteristic [3] -	158:13, 158:14,	271:21, 275:14	227:11, 246:4	117:11, 118:1,
154:4, 155:25, 196:9	255:4, 255:12	<b>closed</b> [2] - 132:1,	Commission [79] -	118:3, 118:8,
characteristics [2] -	citizens [2] - 264 :20,	231:6	4:2, 4:5, 4:8, 4:9,	118:21, 119:5,
164:2, 228:20	266:2	closely [1] - 235:23	5:4, 5:6, 5:10, 8:2,	119:9, 119:21,
<b>Charles</b> [23] - 34:23,	<b>city</b> [4] - 117:23,	<b>closer</b> [3] - 17:9,	8:7, 8:8, 8:10, 16:18,	173:7, 174:4,
34:24, 34:25, 35:1,	118:6, 151:25, 259:1	36:12, 283:7	20:13, 21:19, 29:5,	182:25, 183:2,
36:4, 37:1, 38:7,	<b>civility</b> [1] - 286:15	<b>closest</b> [3] - 186:16,	32:1, 33:13, 34:20,	184:1, 184:23,
38:9, 38:14, 39:11,	claim [1] - 225:12	283:2, 313:20	34:24, 34:25, 36:14,	185:13, 186:6,
40:4, 44:9, 44:16,	clarification [1] -	<b>clue</b> [2] - 100:24,	37:3, 37:25, 38:16,	186:15, 186:24,
40:4, 44:9, 44:10, 47:24, 50:19, 50:20,	252:3	305:21	39:19, 41:17, 46:25,	187:8, 187:12,
51:1, 51:3, 261:6,	clarifications [1] -	<b>co</b> [1] - 222:16	47:13, 47:16, 49:12,	187:18, 188:6,
266:15, 271:25,	186 :7	<b>co</b> [1] - 222.16 <b>co-author</b> [1] - 222.16	50:25, 51:24, 53:5,	188:17, 189:4,
272:8, 272:18	clarified [2] - 49:21,	coal [1] - 89:20	68:3, 86:13, 86:23,	189:8, 189:25,
CHARLES [1] - 1:4	50:4 [2] - 49.21,	coauthored [2] -	87:3, 87:22, 103:22,	190:10, 190:15,
chart [5] - 106:3,		237:11, 238:9	130:25, 178:14,	191:5, 192:5,
162:12, 176:4,	<b>clarify</b> [4] - 33:2, 47:17, 153:9, 260:3	coauthoring [1] -	179:7, 180:5,	192:23, 193:8,
181:19, 191:16	<b>Clark</b> [1] - 277 :1	237:23	180:15, 198:2,	195:2, 195:9,
<b>charts</b> [3] - 136:24,	<b>clear</b> [19] - 16:18,	cochleas [1] - 245:11	206:19, 208:3,	196:23, 197:20,
162:8, 189:25	16:24, 22:8, 22:21,	codified [1] - 177:12	208:12, 212:18,	198:23, 200:20,
chat [1] - 117:12	22:22, 23:13, 43:16,	<b>cold</b> [3] - 78:21, 78:23,	218:24, 250:5,	200:24, 202:9,
<b>check</b> [6] - 16:2,	69:9, 70:3, 91:22,	127:23	256:17, 258:6,	202:10,203:11,
154:22, 155:14,	111:24, 121:3,	collaboration [1] -	261:8, 261:14,	205:12,205:15,
191:12, 215:15,	139:17, 188:2,	94:25	261:17, 262:23,	205:20, 212:22,
245:9	188:21, 247:6,	<b>colleagues</b> [4] - 76:9,	266:8, 266:12,	213:11, 213:17,
checked [1] - 222:2	251:20, 256:19,	76:11, 176:15, 200:8	267:23, 267:25,	214:2, 214:7,
<b>Cheri</b> [8] - 1:24, 20:16,	305:4	collection [2] -	268:4, 268:10,	214:17, 215:4,
80:5, 91:12, 172:6,	<b>clearer</b> [2] - 17:2,	164:19, 165:17	268:12,268:15,	215:13, 216:8,
197:25, 198:23,	169:19	<b>college</b> [1] - 10:6	274:14, 277:20,	216:12,216:17,
243:13	clearing [1] - 285:2	<b>color</b> [1] - 136:23	281:11, 286:17,	216:24, 217:5,
Cheri 's [2] - 165:5,	clearly [8] - 21:24,	<b>colored</b> [2] - 162:7,	287:13,298:10,	254:6, 254:11,
243:12	82:17, 139:25,	298:25	304:7, 304:16,	254:14, 254:17,
Chevrolet [1] - 131:8	200:10, 200:14,	<b>colorful</b> [2] - 137:2,	311:2, 311:6,	254:20, 254:25,
chief [3] - 3:6, 3:8,	251:4, 251:9	137:4	311:23, 312:1,	256:8, 256:14,
130:10	<b>client</b> [4] - 43:10,	colors [1] - 187:24	316:21, 319:1	256:20, 256:24,
child [2] - 259:13	143:21, 179:14,	column [2] - 168:8,	COMMISSION [3] -	277:22,278:15,
children [4] - 116:11,	179:15	245:2	1:1, 1:9, 1:12	278:18, 278:24,
259:11, 259:12,	client 's [2] - 178:7,	columns [1] - 147:5	Commission 's [1] -	279:4, 279:10,
259:23	240:14	combatants [1] -	15:6	280:1, 280:2, 280:7,
choose [1] - 127:22	clients [10] - 36:7,	144:4	COMMISSIONER [138]	280:11, 280:14,
chooses [1] - 161:16	36:9, 93:7, 161:8,	comfortable [4] -	- 1:11, 33:24, 34:1,	281:8, 281:13, 281:17, 281:22
chosen [1] - 142:21	178:15, 179:9,	65:20, 107:7, 282:1,	48:9, 48:12, 48:15,	281:17, 281:23,
CHRIS [1] - 1:11	179:17, 179:22,	318:22	48:21, 48:25, 49:3,	282:3, 282:13, 316:23, 317:6
<b>Chris</b> [2] - 53:19,	181:4, 205:3	<b>coming</b> [11] - 17:25,	105:10, 105:13,	316:23, 317:6, 317:13, 320:0
53:20	clients ' [1] - 207 :25	28:21, 29:10, 33:17,	106:17, 107:2,	317:13, 320:9, 320:11, 320:14
church [1] - 279:11	climate [1] - 285:23	56:11, 119:12,	107:5, 107:15,	320:11, 320:14, 320:18, 320:24
churning [1] - 116:1	clinical [5] - 220:12,	144:2, 146:5,	107:21, 108:1,	Commissioner [47] -
<b>cigarette</b> [4] - 307:7,	227:3, 234:11,	172:19, 192:16,	108:4, 108:22,	5:3, 5:4, 8:11, 14:9,
307:9, 307:20,	234:12, 234:16	312:7	109:2, 109:7,	5.3, 5.4, 8.11, 14.9, 18:24, 21:17, 22:1,
307:21	clinician [1] - 219:14	commence [1] -	109:25, 110:2,	31:17, 32:15, 32:17,
circle [7] - 109:5,	<b>Clinton</b> [2] - 97:20,	313:13	110:15, 110:20,	33:23, 33:25, 44:25,
				00.20, 00.20, 44.20,

45:3, 47:1, 48:8,	92:16, 102:4,	66:15, 177:22,	138:3	196:16, 196:17,
43:3, 47:1, 48:8, 48:10, 49:2, 50:18,	121:11, 131:16,	193:4, 197:7, 221:8,	compromise [3] -	317:4
		222:12	•	
103:22, 113:5, 113:19, 117:11,	131:19, 131:24, 145:5, 145:12,		296:7, 319:5, 319:6	conditioner [3] -
121:8, 122:24,		complaint [4] - 71:3,	<b>computer</b> [4] - 9:24,	204:7, 204:13,
121.0, 122.24, 124:11, 173:6,	145:13, 146:1, 147:11, 149:12,	71:4, 132:14, 155:19	236:15, 242:5,	204 :20
173:14, 187:13,	149:22, 194:13,	complaints [73] -	244:10	conditioners [2] -
197:21, 197:24,	204:5, 204:10,	60:11, 60:16, 65:14,	<b>concept</b> [4] - 65:13,	203:25, 205:14
210:16, 212:19,	204:3, 204:10, 204:15, 211:15,	66:9, 66:17, 68:16,	115:16, 143:4,	conditioning [3] -
217:7, 253:10,	204:13, 211:13, 221:13, 221:13,	69:18, 69:19, 70:18,	144:24	203:14, 204:2, 204:4
254:5, 257:5,	255:25, 262:19,	70:19, 70:22, 71:7,	concepts [1] - 27:16	conditions [28] -
234.5, 257.5, 277:21, 281:18,	265:11, 268:21,	71:14, 72:8, 72:14,	<b>concern</b> [17] - 24:25,	57:15, 62:24, 64:21,
285:22, 287:2,	269:25, 270:20,	72:17, 74:11, 77:15,	99:8, 181:2, 194:17,	67:8, 76:8, 78:3,
297:3, 297:4, 306:1,	285:23, 285:25, 285:23, 285:25,	77:17, 77:25, 78:5,	197:2, 231:13,	78:8, 78:20, 78:24,
316:22, 320:8	302:2	93:5, 101:3, 101:18,	231:14, 260:6,	79:1, 79:3, 79:6,
Commissioners [33] -	community 's [5] -	101:20, 118:18, 122:14, 122:15,	260:14, 277:14,	79:7, 79:8, 80:7,
3:19, 4:18, 4:19,	89:11, 90:9, 144:21,	122:14, 122:13, 122:25, 123:4,	308:25, 309:3,	81:3, 106:9, 108:25,
4:24, 5:9, 5:10, 7:16,	256:5, 286:14	123:5, 123:9,	309:8, 309:15,	128:7, 153:16,
4.24, 3.9, 3.10, 7.10, 29:22, 33:4, 33:5,	companies [4] -	123:19, 124:1,	309:19, 309:22,	158:5, 177:16,
43:18, 51:24,			310:4	195:7, 196:14,
43.18, 31.24, 132:11, 180:5,	131:10, 178:18, 220:5, 222:7	131:16, 132:22,	<b>concerned</b> [3] - 172:4,	214:21, 214:22,
262:4, 262:8,	229:5, 232:7 company [8] - 94:25,	142:9, 142:15, 142:16, 144:12,	201:9, 203:6	215:25, 246:25
262:19, 262:24,			<b>concerns</b> [25] - 42:15,	<b>conduct</b> [3] - 157:8,
263:2, 263:5,	131:7, 131:9, 132:1,	144:15, 146:22,	46:9, 46:10, 46:22,	157:13, 157:24
263:17, 264:19,	182:7, 240:20,	147:21, 148:2,	100:7, 203:10,	<b>conducted</b> [7] - 75:19,
265:17, 266:1,	259:8, 259:9	148:5, 148:7,	260:1, 260:2, 260:6,	90:4, 91:1, 157:2,
288:16, 289:4,	comparable [1] - 275:22	149:22, 150:4, 150:7, 151:6,	260:11, 261:1,	160:24, 176:20,
292:17, 294:15,		151:12, 151:13,	261:19, 262:11,	179:11
295:19, 296:9,	compare [13] - 10:9,	152:5, 154:13,	263:18, 264:20,	<b>conducting</b> [1] - 86:10
296:16, 296:20,	10:24, 11:1, 11:5, 11:7, 11:10, 11:13,	159:24, 159:25,	276:15, 276:16,	conferences [2] -
308:6	12:6, 90:1, 176:15,	160:16, 160:18,	286:3, 312:20,	69:6, 142:21
commissions [2] -	176:16, 298:15	160:25, 170:12,	313:6, 314:9, 315:3,	confidential [1] -
180:10, 237:20	compared [3] -	192:8, 192:10,	315:6, 316:5, 316:17	281:14
commit [1] - 316:15	-	192:13, 192:25,	concert [1] - 234:4	confidentiality [1] -
commitment [1] -	120:20, 205:23, 291:10	193:3, 211:10,	<b>conclude</b> [2] - 10:10,	123:6
282:5	comparing [2] - 12:1,	212:16, 213:25,	218:10	confirm [1] - 168:14
committed [1] - 63:3	149:20	227:8, 238:15,	<b>concluded</b> [5] - 3:6,	confirmable [1] -
		239:6, 256:5	142:17, 143:20,	170:10
committee [2] - 98:8, 103:10	comparison [3] -	complete [1] - 56:19	207:14, 209:25	conflicts [1] - 270:22
common [8] - 72:3,	10:14, 10:18, 138:14	<b>completed</b> [3] - 57:19,	<b>concludes</b> [2] - 174:7,	conformance [1] -
79:8, 79:16, 96:23,	compatible [5] -	66:11, 281:10	321:6	309:20
140:24, 174:1,	131:23, 145:19,	completely [11] - 22:9,	concluding [2] -	<b>confusion</b> [4] - 102:8,
175:12, 193:24	204:5, 204:14,	55:4, 58:7, 70:14,	117:9, 151:24	121:21, 143:22,
commonly [2] - 79:17,	204:22	73:23, 90:6, 106:12,	<b>conclusion</b> [8] - 40:8,	144:17
117:4	compelling [1] - 57:4	152:20, 279:21,	90:18, 91:2, 163:23,	consensus [1] -
communicate [4] -	compensate [3] -	282:22, 282:24	192:6, 202:12,	210:11
110:10, 199:17,	186:3, 203:15,	<b>complex</b> [1] - 164:5	202:13, 227:13	conservation [2] -
213:7	204:25	<b>compliance</b> [9] - 64:6,	conclusions [5] -	221:2, 221:3
communicated [1] -	compensation [3] -	76:10, 76:13, 76:22,	91:4, 163:21,	conservative [4] -
28:17	184:17, 202:24,	91:7, 92:5, 92:24,	169:13, 225:24,	228:25, 229:2,
communities [9] -	205:5	193:21, 309:4	228:2	230:24, 232:7
145:15, 147:16,	<b>complain</b> [3] - 65:22,	complicated [3] -	<b>condenser</b> [1] - 204:4	<b>consider</b> [2] - 27:16,
150:11, 151:10,	147 :21, 227 :9 complainant [3] -	106:8, 188:5, 275:1	<b>Condition</b> [2] - 76:3,	66:4
151:11, 152:7,	150:16, 152:8,	complies [1] - 91:19	155:8	consideration [7] -
198:10, 210:2, 234:3		comply [3] - 90:21,	<b>condition</b> [20] - 67:20,	36:20, 51:3, 68:9,
community [43] -	175:18	91:15, 152:14	76:2, 76:5, 88:3,	163:5, 197:9,
60:16, 64:10, 64:12,	Complainant [1] -	component [2] - 58:8,	90:16, 91:23, 94:5,	265:24, 304:21
65:12, 80:6, 89:6,	66:13	228:24	153:15, 154:3,	<b>considered</b> [6] - 35:4,
89:13, 89:16, 92:9,	<b>complained</b> [3] - 59:1, 150:22, 150:23	compress [1] - 190:24	180:15, 193:24,	35:24, 42:18,
92:10, 92:13, 92:15,		compressed [1] -	194:2, 194:5, 194:9, 195:9, 196:11,	131:11, 212:15,
52, 62.10, 62.10,	complaining [6] -		190.9, 190.11,	268:25

considering [5] -	conversation [4] -	161:20, 162:17,	counting [1] - 73:4	<b>40:21, 43:1, 44:3</b> , 10
12:24, 37:23, 38:9,	19:22, 49:15, 49:17,	163:20, 165:19,	countries [4] - 95:18,	45:15, 45:18, 45:21,
87:3, 252:5	117:13	165:20, 165:23,	96:1, 181:22, 222:8	48:17, 50:24, 60:3,
consistent [2] -	conversations [1] -	165:25, 166:1,	country [10] - 58:18,	60:8, 63:5, 261:5,
235:14, 250:8	50:6	166:4, 166:6,	71:24, 117:14,	261:13, 264:23,
consistently [1] -	convert [1] - 191:15	166:18, 166:20,	117:20, 118:4,	264:25, 265:3,
143:18	convinced [3] - 70:1,	169:3, 175:21,	118:15, 123:3,	265:5, 265:6,
constantly [1] - 151:7	70:3, 121:1	175:22, 176:13,	123:24, 182:9, 256:7	266:24, 267:1,
constituted [1] -	convincing [2] -	178:10, 178:11,	<b>County</b> [99] - 3:24,	267:23, 269:4,
106:24	54:22, 256:9	178:22, 179:21,	4:2, 4:5, 4:7, 4:19,	274:19,280:25,
constitutes [1] - 245:6	convincingly [1] -	180:12, 180:13,	4:24, 5:3, 5:4, 5:6,	281:4, 287:11,
constructed [1] -	255:1	186:15, 187:15,	5:10, 6:11, 6:14,	292:9, 292:10,
66:10	cool [2] - 195:24,	188:10, 189:7,	6:20, 6:21, 8:8, 9:14,	292:13, 292:15,
construction [2] -	195:25	190:8, 190:9,	14:8, 21:17, 21:18,	294:3, 296:16,
57:25, 203:17	cools [1] - 195:24	190:17, 192:25,	22:1, 32:15, 34:23,	300:10, 304:18,
consultant [1] - 52:25	<b>Cooper</b> [12] - 54:17,	193:14, 195:4,	34:25, 35:1, 36:5,	305:13, 305:14,
consultants [2] -	54:19,68:21,70:12,	202:16, 203:1,	37:1, 37:3, 38:7,	305:15, 306:2,
131:11, 177:25	73:6,85:16,103:24,	209:18, 210:18,	38:9, 38:14, 38:16,	306:16, 306:18,
consulting [1] - 86:25	120:21, 141:22,	217:18, 217:19,	39:11, 39:18, 40:4,	307:24, 310:14,
contact [2] - 151:7,	141:24, 142:7,	223:22, 228:4,	43:18, 44:9, 44:16,	314:10, 319:16
274 :9	182:12	228:7, 228:8,	45:22, 47:25, 49:12,	<b>county 's</b> [4] - 25:10,
contacted [4] -	Cooper 's [5] - 70:1,	233:13, 233:14, 233:19, 233:25,	50:19, 50:21, 51:1,	39:25, 41:16, 318:12
178:15, 274:6, 274:8	70:4, 165:2, 180:24,	· · ·	51:3, 54:8, 63:4,	couple [24] - 15:23,
contaminated [2] -	191 :23	236:10, 237:3, 237:21, 238:11,	64:6, 67:14, 87:13,	24:18, 31:18, 45:1,
194:17, 209:22	cooperative [2] -	239:5, 240:2, 240:8,	88:17, 132:10,	47:8, 72:13, 126:23, 186:21, 198:24,
contaminating [1] -	87:11, 88:15	240:12, 240:22,	139:3, 151:16, 151:23, 151:25,	204:7, 221:1, 221:2,
125:7	cooperatively [1] -	256:15, 256:21,	178:5, 201:10,	221:24, 230:11,
contamination [2] -	86:25	256:22, 280:6,	211:9, 261:6, 261:8,	234:18, 271:16,
109:23, 127:25	coordinator [1] -	315:4, 315:5	261:17, 262:4,	271:19, 280:17,
contend [1] - 299:14	179:16	corrections [1] -	262:8, 262:18,	284:10, 289:17,
contended [1] -	<b>copy</b> [7] - 61:6, 88:22,	223:14	262:22, 262:24,	301:10, 309:25,
314:11	102 :2, 112 :13, 267 :4, 267 :6, 267 :7	correctly [8] - 24:1,	263:1, 263:5,	316:23, 319:18
contends [1] - 54:4	<b>corner</b> [5] - 72:20,	24:8, 87:2, 170:1,	263:17, 264:24,	<b>course</b> [11] - 48:22,
content [1] - 86:1	108:4, 167:4,	190:6, 197:1,	265:1, 266:1,	49:19, 134:18,
contest [1] - 151:15	191:16, 300:16	244:22, 244:23	266:15, 267:23,	221:2, 230:5,
<b>continue</b> [18] - 12:23,	corporations [3] -	correlate [5] - 64:18,	267:24, 268:4,	230:23, 234:20,
15:7, 17:12, 19:19, 73:8, 73:13, 130:10,	131:12, 131:14,	137:21, 194:20,	268:15, 271:25,	239:16, 241:2,
225:2, 263:10,	307:16	232:9, 246:23	272:9, 274:14,	287:8, 318:19
263:21, 265:6,	<b>correct</b> [114] - 8:25,	correlates [1] - 58:2	286:17,287:13,	courses [1] - 221:1
267:24, 269:16,	17:6, 32:25, 39:20,	correlation [1] -	292:17,295:19,	<b>Court</b> [6] - 166:16,
270:8, 271:5, 284:9,	42:24, 42:25, 43:2,	231:20	296:17,296:18,	167:22,169:10,
299:21, 300:3	43:10, 44:6, 45:4,	corresponds [2] -	296:19, 296:20,	206:15, 244:13,
continued [3] - 265:7,	47:7, 47:13, 47:22,	119:18, 140:11	298:10, 306:1,	248:5
265:19, 268:8	47:23, 48:19, 64:2,	corroborate [2] -	309:15, 309:19,	<b>court</b> [18] - 63:10,
<b>contour</b> [2] - 93:13,	64:3,64:8,64:11,	176:19, 177:8	310:3, 311:3, 311:4,	160:2, 165:11,
103:5	65:2,65:14,65:15,	corroborated [1] -	314:10, 318:14, 318:25	207:1, 207:13,
contractual [1] - 123:7	65:19,65:23,67:19,	176:14	318:25 COUNTY [3] - 1:4, 1:4	219:5, 225:1, 242:22 243:14
contradict [1] - 108:14	67:23, 68:21, 68:22,	cost [1] - 284:24	<b>COUNTY</b> [3] - 1.4, 1.4 <b>county</b> [76] - 8:17,	242:22, 243:14, 248:3, 248:0
contrary [1] - 111:12	69:1, 74:25, 84:8,	coughed [1] - 304:1	10:2, 10:11, 13:18,	248:3, 248:9, 251:24, 253:19,
contrasted [2] - 136:5,	90:10, 93:11, 94:6,	<b>counsel</b> [2] - 161:16,	17:20, 18:22, 20:4,	255:21, 256:15,
138:10	104:6, 104:7, 112:3,	266:5	21:22, 22:17, 23:17,	302:25, 321:11,
contribution [1] -	118:4, 123:19,	<b>count</b> [2] - 134:13, 300:21	24:12, 26:21, 27:12,	321:16
194:16	134:17, 157:3, 157:10, 157:11	<b>counter</b> [1] - 56:3	27:15, 27:22, 28:17,	Court 's [1] - 169:23
<b>control</b> [5] - 37:2,	157:10, 157:11, 157:15, 157:22,	<b>counties</b> [11] - 25:25,	32:21, 32:25, 33:3,	cousin [1] - 5:21
48:17,95:1,126:10,	158:3, 158:9,	26:23, 32:2, 32:5,	33:7, 34:24, 35:10,	<b>cover</b> [2] - 59:6, 62:6
155:25	158:10, 159:13,	32:22, 33:10, 40:14,	35:16, 35:21, 36:1,	covered [2] - 106:13,
controlling [1] - 155:4	159:15, 159:19,	63:5, 67:15, 298:8,	38:18, 40:6, 40:9,	109:14
conventional [1] -	160:10, 161:19,	318:10	40:12, 40:15, 40:20,	crafted [1] - 284:15
55:14	, - · <del>-</del> ,			

create [3] - 82:2,	29:12, 42:4, 63:15,	141:17, 142:4,	147:16, 149:11,	<b>170:17, 171:17,</b> 11
285:8, 310:18	156:6, 174:6, 174:8,	148:15, 158:2,	150:10, 152:14,	171:22, 172:23,
<b>created</b> [9] - 66:20,	174:10, 206:10,	158:6, 158:13,	154:7, 154:20,	172:25, 173:5,
75:3, 77:7, 79:23,	208:12, 232:19,	158:15, 164:18,	155:5, 175:24,	173:23, 174:5,
145:11, 167:16,	252:17, 253:11,	165:17, 168:11,	183:13, 183:15,	174:9, 174:12,
180:15, 195:16,	257:22, 271:11,	177:16, 179:3,	183:16, 183:17,	174:14, 174:16,
300:24	308:12, 314:24	179:10, 188:15,	183:23, 184:6,	180:4, 180:14,
<b>creates</b> [3] - 106:10,	CROSS -	190:24, 194:12,	186:8, 186:9,	181:8, 181:12,
192:16, 203:16	EXAMINATION [24] -	194:19, 204:8,	186:11, 186:13,	182:22, 197:21,
creating [3] - 154:15,	29:13, 31:15, 34:18,	208:25, 209:20,	193:10, 204:11,	197:24, 206:5,
186:11, 195:20	42:7, 43:5, 46:4,	210:5, 210:9, 212:6,	210:14, 228:6,	206:7, 208:5,
creation [1] - 305:10	46:15, 47:4, 51:21,	224:1, 224:5,	246:19	208:11, 208:14,
credence [1] - 70:17	63:19, 70:9, 96:20,	229:22, 300:6, 300:8	<b>de</b> [11] - 1:12, 3:2,	208:16, 208:18,
credentials [1] -	97:14, 156:16,	<b>date</b> [7] - 6:19, 39:17,	130:16, 130:19,	212:18, 217:6,
249:21	174:19, 232:25,	73:14, 153:3,	165:5, 217:10,	217:13, 218:9,
	252:19, 271:14,	164:21, 181:9,	218:18, 218:21,	218:11, 218:14,
<b>credible</b> [3] - 161:11,	272:23, 273:11,	312:23	257:14, 308:15,	218:17, 219:4,
167:24, 260:10	287:9, 308:16,	dates [3] - 4:4, 8:4, 8:6	321:9	219:23, 224:11,
credit [1] - 29:16	314:5, 315:1	<b>Daubert</b> [5] - 207:1,	<b>DE</b> [229] - 3:1, 10:17,	224:13, 224:19,
Cremer [1] - 1:13	cross -examine [3] -	207:4, 207:13,	14:3, 14:6, 14:12,	224:22, 224:25,
crest [1] - 192:21	29:7, 180:6, 181:14	207:18, 243:2	14:15, 14:19, 15:9,	232:18, 247:21,
crickets [1] - 128:1	cross -examined [1] -	daughter [1] - 46:20	16:21, 17:5, 19:19,	248:11, 248:15,
crippling [1] - 116:8	321:10	daughters [2] - 221:17	20:10, 20:20, 21:15,	248:18, 249:10,
<b>criteria</b> [13] - 96:6,	crossed [1] - 307:3	<b>David</b> [4] - 52:16,	22:6, 22:19, 23:1,	250:24, 252:2,
150:10, 154:14,	CRR [1] - 1:24	52:17, 52:24, 178:9	23:4, 23:11, 23:15,	252:5, 252:13,
155:23, 163:13,	cultural [1] - 280:22	days [5] - 31:20,	28:8, 28:25, 29:11,	252:16, 253:3,
184:20, 186:22,	culturally [1] - 284:8	57:12, 304:25,	31:9, 31:11, 31:13,	253:5, 253:7, 253:9,
210:7, 210:14,	curious [6] - 92:16,	305:20, 317:18	33:13, 33:23, 33:25,	253:24, 254:1,
226:11, 226:13,	92:18, 113:21,	daytime [3] - 77:22,	34:3, 34:6, 34:12,	254:3, 257:1, 257:4,
226:14, 226:21	183:12, 278:6,	125:20, 126:9	39:8, 42:4, 43:4,	257:7, 257:9,
criterion [1] - 162:23	278:18	<b>DB</b> [35] - 20:4, 23:23,	46:3, 46:14, 46:25,	257:12, 257:19,
<b>critical</b> [2] - 54:11,	current [2] - 182:16,	24:5, 60:22, 145:14,	48:8, 49:2, 49:5,	263:8, 264:5,
147:24	182:17	145:21, 147:5,	49:7, 50:13, 50:15,	269:19, 270:8,
criticism [1] - 64:9	cuss [1] - 36:11	147:10, 147:15,	51:10, 51:12, 51:18,	271:3, 271:10,
Crocker [1] - 67:17	cuss [1] - 30:11 cut [2] - 30:6, 184:11	148:4, 155:16,	51:20, 52:7, 52:9,	272:21, 273:8,
<b>cross</b> [28] - 16:25,	<b>CV</b> [1] - 223:18	185:7, 191:22,	52:12, 63:9, 63:13,	273:21,276:7,
29:2, 29:7, 29:12,	<b>CV</b> [1] - 223.10	192:12, 192:24,	70:8, 75:16, 78:10,	277:16,277:18,
42:4, 63:8, 63:15,	<b>-</b>	213:12, 213:20,	79:14, 83:15, 83:25,	277:20,282:18,
156:4, 156:6,	D	213:21, 214:3,	84:8, 84:22, 88:18,	285:21, 286:6,
159:22, 174:6,	dad [2] - 13:13, 94:25	228:11, 228:21,	88:21, 88:25, 89:3,	286:8, 286:10,
174:8, 174:10,	daily [2] - 122:11,	228:24, 229:4,	90:20, 91:6, 91:10,	286:14,286:20,
180:6, 181:14,	203 18	229:8, 229:18,	91:15, 92:6, 92:20,	286:23, 287:2,
206:10, 208:12,	dairy [1] - 211:14	229:23, 230:1,	95:6,95:8,96:19,	287:7,287:20,
224:12, 232:17, 232:10, 252:17	<b>Dakota</b> [17] - 1:25, 2:2,	230:6, 230:17,	97:13, 100:12,	287:22,287:24,
232:19, 252:17, 253:11, 257:22	2:4, 34:22, 52:22,	230:18, 230:19,	100:19, 102:1,	288:3, 288:7,
253:11, 257:22, 271:11, 287:3	67:17, 130:14,	230:20, 231:10	102:7, 102:12,	293:16, 293:25,
271:11, 287:3, 308:12, 314:24,	195:12, 196:6,	<b>dB(G)</b> [1] - 106:18	103:19, 103:21,	299:18, 299:20,
308.12, 314.24, 321:10	219:8, 258:8, 259:4,	<b>dBA</b> [58] - 23:18, 26:3,	104:9, 104:13,	301:23, 302:19,
<b>CROSS</b> [24] - 29:13,	259:14, 259:24,	26:5, 26:9, 41:10,	105:1, 105:8, 113:4,	302:23, 303:11,
31:15, 34:18, 42:7,	283:16, 288:18,	41:23, 54:8, 55:18,	119:23, 120:7,	304:11, 308:3,
43:5, 46:4, 46:15,	311:25	57:9, 57:10, 58:3,	120:9, 122:18,	308:9, 308:11,
43.5, 46.4, 46.15, 47:4, 51:21, 63:19,	DAKOTA [2] - 1:1, 1:5	59:18, 61:4, 62:21,	122:20, 123:12,	314:2, 314:4,
70:9, 96:20, 97:14,	Dakotan [1] - 195:11	64:7, 65:9, 66:1,	123:14, 124:8,	314:21, 314:23,
156:16, 174:19,	damaged [1] - 281:20	67:21, 93:19, 93:23,	126:22, 128:23,	315:16, 316:20,
232:25, 252:19,	damaging [1] - 255:2	104:4, 111:1,	129:14, 129:17,	317:15, 320:8,
232.25, 252.19, 271:14, 272:23,	dashed [2] - 138:15,	111:19, 112:1,	129:25, 130:3,	321:1, 321:6,
271.14, 272.23, 273:11, 287:9,	138:22	113:14, 113:16,	130:6, 130:13,	321:13, 321:20,
273.11, 287.9, 308:16, 314:5, 315:1	dashes [1] - 137:21	122:4, 122:10,	130:16, 130:20,	321:24
cross -examination	data [32] - 53:12,	125:2, 132:22,	135:14, 135:17,	deadline [1] - 275:13
[18] - 16:25, 29:2,	58:15, 134:20,	145:20, 146:8,	153:1, 156:5, 156:9,	<b>deal</b> [11] - 24:20,
[10] - 10.20, 20.2,	, ;		158:20, 165:8,	96:13, 100:16,

172:7, 205:16,
205:21, 262:5,
262:16, 270:1,
279:19, 279:20
dealing [1] - 150:14
deals [4] - 6:10, 26:18,
92:9, 234:22
<b>dealt</b> [3] - 144:13,
144:16, 231:8
debated [1] - 201:10
debates [1] - 183:22
decay [1] - 115:18
<b>December</b> [1] - 127:5
decibel [6] - 185:6,
186:21, 194:7,
214:15, 316:6,
316:10
decibels [12] - 41:14,
145:17, 183:6,
183:18, 184:8,
184:13, 185:10,
185:21, 191:8,
214:19, 320:4
<b>decided</b> [6] - 132:2,
132:11, 177:24,
228:14, 250:15,
292:24
deciding [2] - 14:24,
40:22
decision [11] - 21:10,
110:16, 129:16,
161:13, 173:9,
207:7, 255:1,
255:20, 256:9,
256:14, 278:8
decisions [3] - 197:3,
255:4, 255:7
declared [3] - 151:16,
217:20, 256:11
decrease [4] - 150:5,
186:9, 213:5, 213:13
decreases [1] - 213:19
dedicated [1] - 9:14
deduce [1] - 102:20
deed [1] - 258:14
deep [2] - 196:1,
199:17
Defendant 's [1] -
207:18
defendants [1] -
169:10
Defense [1] - 201:25
defined [1] - 140:1
defines [1] - 227 : 17
definite [1] - 122:15
definitely [6] - 118:7,
227:5,260:14,
281:6, 315:8
definition [1] - 151:18
definitions [1] - 6:9

degree [5] - 103:2, 172:9, 219:2, 219:12, 278:25 degrees [3] - 28:23, 219:2, 278:9 delicate [1] - 139:21 delve [1] - 214:2 demeaned [1] -286:21 demonstrable [1] -73:11 demonstrate [3] -54:22, 70:12, 245:13 demonstrated [2] -70:5, 120:22 demonstrating [3] -54:7, 141:25, 245:10 denial [2] - 151:22, 276:14 denied [3] - 151:21, 181:10, 273:14 densely [2] - 81:19, 136:23 department [2] -220:24, 259:2 Department [6] -74:23, 142:14, 201:24, 211:9, 222:22,256:18 depicted [1] - 191:15 depiction [1] - 136:22 depth [2] - 28:16, 274:16 **describe** [4] - 130:25, 155:1, 274:21, 278:13 **described** [6] - 66:12, 72:18, 187:24, 195:10, 195:13, 238:15 describes [1] - 154:24 description [1] -102:24 descriptor [3] - 57:8, 57:11, 125:5 **design** [12] - 60:14, 62:4, 80:3, 94:10, 94:13, 112:1, 126:8, 131:17, 142:2, 204:21, 227:3, 229:1 designated [1] - 38:1 designation [1] -217:24 **designed** [10] - 60:3, 137:12, 145:6, 148:1, 150:9, 154:19, 183:14, 189:14, 204:14, 204:16 designing [1] - 145:7

desired [1] - 131:14 detail [1] - 133:1 detect [11] - 69:23, 104:17, 105:25, 106:23, 109:23, 125:15, 178:25, 191:20, 199:18, 199:21, 200:19 detectable [2] -104:20, 200:12 detected [1] - 87:10 detecting [1] - 125:16 detection [2] - 188:24, 188:25 detectors [1] - 199:20 deteriorate [1] -150:13 deteriorating [1] -146:16 determination [1] -246:15 determine [13] -57:20, 74:4, 74:18, 81:9, 87:24, 110:6, 145:8, 233:22, 235:1, 235:2, 235:10, 235:21, 246:20 determined [1] -253:17 determines [1] - 64:23 determining [1] -42:18 Detroit [1] - 143:25 develop [4] - 97:9, 180:24, 222:23, 265:1 developed [5] - 151:5, 178:16, 178:21, 188:8, 215:21 developer [8] - 16:19, 17:3, 17:7, 17:15, 61:8, 146:7, 198:13, 202:23 developers [1] -313:14 developing [2] -270:3, 283:20 development [7] -17:21, 66:20, 95:18, 95:20, 181:17, 264:2, 272:16 diabetes [1] - 236:6 diagnose [6] - 235:3, 235:6, 236:5, 239:22, 240:4, 240:17 diagnoses [2] - 171:4, 234.22 diagnosis [5] - 171:2,

235:16, 235:21, 240:6, 240:9 diagnostic [2] - 220:8, 235:25 diagram [1] - 140:16 dialed [1] - 115:3 diaphragm [1] -175:14 died [3] - 13:13, 212:11, 222:24 difference [16] -80:11, 124:16, 125:1, 129:10, 140:18, 145:14, 175:12, 183:5, 186:22, 194:8, 213:23, 214:19, 295:16, 297:23, 305:25 differences [3] -231:22, 231:23, 246.24 different [31] - 30:16, 76:8, 86:25, 95:13, 99:6, 99:7, 112:7, 117:17, 125:19, 126:5, 136:1, 162:1, 183:11, 188:22, 190:7, 205:14, 210:8, 229:22, 229:25, 247:4, 257:17,260:25, 275:7, 277:25, 282:10, 282:22, 282:24, 300:24, 301:7, 301:14, 318:13 differential [2] - 64:22, 90:1 differentiate [1] -250:22 difficult [12] - 105:24, 106:14, 106:22, 107:19, 173:22, 173:24, 186:1, 187:20, 266:20, 275:3, 279:5, 282:23 difficulty [1] - 58:8 diligence [1] - 305:17 diminish [1] - 284 :7 diminishing [1] -62:10 dire [2] - 248:3, 249:8 direct [9] - 3:6, 20:22, 53:10, 56:20, 83:14, 83:16, 156:3, 165:6, 209:9 Direct [13] - 65:2, 84:2, 97:16, 105:13, 112:20, 140:3,

152:25, 153:2, 12 170:19, 170:20, 178:3, 178:10, 245:25 **DIRECT** [6] - 3:16, 52:20, 130:22, 218:22, 258:4, 288:13 directly [4] - 58:1, 58:2, 163:2, 163:12 director [1] - 169:24 disadvantage [1] -213:7 disappointed [2] -274:2, 274:11 discern [1] - 81:2 disclosures [1] -312:1 discomforted [1] -117:22 discovery [1] - 310:19 discuss [1] - 268:16 **discussed** [17] - 5:12, 16:19, 18:2, 50:2, 69:6, 120:2, 140:6, 239:21, 243:2, 248:10,249:3, 255:8, 255:9, 261:13, 261:18, 262:22, 268:13 discusses [2] - 72:8, 170:20 discussing [5] -141:23, 167:21, 174:21,268:22, 269:8 Discussion [5] -165:4, 220:3, 232:24, 257:18, 308:10 discussion [11] - 50:3, 84:10, 135:21, 190:1, 193:9, 196:24, 244:7, 244:11,268:24, 279:13, 321:13 discussions [2] -73:9, 183:10 disease [2] - 226:19, 236:6 diseases [1] - 235:3 dismiss [1] - 306:15 dismissed [2] -257:10,269:2 disorders [2] - 220:6, 226:20 disparaging [1] -305:21 dispute [1] - 5:12 disqualified [1] -

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
170:7	296:24, 296:25,	244:20, 290:15,	202:12, 202:14,	<b>146:13, 216:5</b> , 13
disruption [2] -	297:1, 297:2, 297:3,	310:11, 315:22	202:19, 216:22,	216:6, 217:25,
269:14, 269:15	297:23	documentation [3] -	219:4, 219:25,	239:1, 275:4, 305:17
disruptive [1] - 72:5	<b>District</b> [11] - 10:5,	167:22, 250:1,	220:2, 227:7,	<b>duly</b> [5] - 3:14, 34:16,
dissatisfied [1] -	18:12, 26:25, 32:11,	310:17	229:11, 229:13,	52:18, 258:2, 288:11
274:4	37:6, 37:9, 166:16,	documented [3] -	230:6, 230:12,	duplicate [1] - 180:25
<b>dissipate</b> [2] - 108:16,	264:2, 264:17,	239:2, 239:3, 277:1	243:18, 270:8,	durability [1] - 139:20
110:6	295:12	documents [10] -	277:10, 299:21,	durable [2] - 139:22,
	districts [1] - 296:24	11:8, 11:15, 12:10,	302:19, 309:1,	189:1
dissipated [2] -	disturb [2] - 248:8,	20:1, 156:23,	311:11	
108:18, 140:7	249:1		<b>Dr</b> [37] - 56:7, 57:5,	during [23] - 13:5,
dissipates [4] - 110:5,		169:10, 230:8,	84:24, 107:22,	45:1, 66:20, 80:4,
198:25, 213:12,	disturbance [7] -	230:9, 233:4, 233:6	123:14, 140:3,	81:4, 86:15, 96:8,
231:4	116:7, 154:12,	<b>dog</b> [2] - 56:15,		120:4, 127:23,
dissipation [2] -	231:15, 239:10,	149:16	141:6, 141:13,	128:3, 134:18,
212:23, 212:25	241:5, 251:22,	dogs [1] - 177 :10	142:13, 142:25,	155:17, 195:18,
distance [40] - 40:10,	251:23	<b>dollars</b> [3] - 205:8,	143:3, 155:5, 163:4,	196:8, 221:21,
40:18, 40:19, 80:14,	disturbing [3] -	291:2, 291:6	165:1, 168:4, 168:6,	262:2, 262:17,
80:17, 108:7, 110:8,	270:18, 279:16,	dome [1] - 109:5	169:23, 201:21,	268:25, 292:5,
138:25, 139:13,	286:22	dominant [1] - 277 :5	209:17, 223:5,	294:24, 294:25,
149:14, 185:12,	divided [1] - 291:19	<b>done</b> [44] - 4:15, 4:22,	225:3, 225:4, 225:7,	302:21, 313:23
199:1, 199:7, 201:8,	division [1] - 131:8	28:25, 32:5, 54:21,	225:22, 229:20,	duty [1] - 90:11
211:19, 212:5,	dizziness [13] - 70:24,	58:18,64:17,83:25,	229:21, 232:21,	dying [1] - 307:6
212:10, 213:1,	72:19, 74:11, 74:18,	86:24,89:16,92:18,	233:2, 243:16,	dynamics [1] - 283:23
213:12, 213:15,	75:12, 75:22, 123:1,	99:9, 105:20, 108:6,	244:18,247:16,	
213:20, 213:21,	132:23, 142:16,	119:3, 127:21,	248:6, 249:12,	E
214:3, 214:14,	146:14, 211:21,	131:22, 131:23,	252:21, 253:9, 254:6	
215:14, 215:19,	211:23, 239:11	143:7, 150:3, 152:4,	draft [16] - 10:3, 10:9,	<b>e-mail</b> [11] - 18:18,
216:16, 216:18,	dizzy [2] - 141:19,	178:14, 179:23,	11:6, 11:14, 11:18,	18:21, 19:4, 19:13,
231:18, 231:19,	191 :25	180:11, 181:20,	12:7, 12:13, 13:9,	19:23, 21:23, 22:13,
232:1, 232:5, 232:9,	doable [1] - 61:23	193:25, 195:1,	13:17, 14:5, 37:10,	61:7, 241:24,
232:12,246:18,	Docket [7] - 3:2, 53:3,	198:2, 204:3,	268:18, 294:20,	241:25, 242:4
246:19, 246:21,	53:8, 67:17, 158:2,	220:11, 226:3,	298:3, 298:5, 311:10	e-mails [2] - 21:21,
247:3, 315:4	303:6, 303:18	227:23, 233:23,	drafting [2] - 13:19,	151:8
distances [22] - 40:3,	docket [1] - 249:13	234:3, 257:21,	309:12	ear [6] - 73:10, 118:15,
82:20, 83:18, 83:19,	dockets [4] - 67:18,	279:19, 279:20,	drafts [1] - 87:18	129:11, 129:20,
83:20, 108:25,	68:10, 183:10,	284:10, 293:13,	dramatic [2] - 126:3,	199:8, 235:3
110:11, 197:8,	183:11	298:4, 304:9, 306:3,	138:16	early [8] - 142:15,
197:14, 200:8,	<b>doctor</b> [7] - 160:20,	310:21	draw [3] - 37:6, 62:13,	182:3, 190:1,
200:9, 200:14,	167:13, 171:12,	door [2] - 50:2, 154:15	227 :1	198:20, 204:17,
209:20, 213:5,	226:11, 235:5,	dose [1] - 227:6	drawing [1] - 225:24	268:14, 282:5, 292:4
215:2, 215:16,	243:20, 251:3	doubling [5] - 183:7,	drawn [2] - 6:25,	earned [1] - 34:8
231:4, 231:21,	doctors [3] - 129:22,	183:16, 213:20,	275:14	earphones [1] -
232:10, 246:6, 247:9	161:3, 161:7	213:21, 214:3	dread [1] - 121:15	235:10
distant [1] - 199:19	document [50] - 6:3,	doubt [2] - 38:15,	drew [1] - 57:6	ears [2] - 177:1,
distinction [1] - 75:21	10:11, 19:5, 19:7,	245:18	dripping [1] - 118:11	211:20
distinctive [4] - 111:4,	19:9, 19:11, 19:12,	<b>Doug</b> [2] - 256:3,	drive [3] - 30:5,	earth [2] - 200:3,
111:22, 119:17,	19:14, 19:15, 19:18,	256:4	139:23, 277:9	201:4
138:24	19:19, 20:8, 21:8,	<b>down</b> [46] - 6:6, 11:21,	driven [4] - 44:18,	easement [2] - 186:5,
distinguish [3] -	21:9, 22:5, 22:10,	33:14, 34:6, 42:17,	132:14, 149:3	187:7
81:23, 112:14,	23:6, 23:8, 23:14,	52:10, 88:12,	drives [1] - 149:7	easements [6] -
113:11	25:18, 38:18, 38:20,	100:17, 103:22,	driving [1] - 69:18	184:16, 184:22,
distinguishable [1] -	38:21, 39:7, 39:9,	106:1, 106:6,	drop [4] - 184:12,	198:14, 203:7,
200:14	39:10, 39:11, 39:14,	109:13, 122:12,	185:10, 185:17,	203:9, 266:7
<b>distribute</b> [3] - 284:15,	39:10, 39:11, 39:14, 39:19, 39:22, 39:23,	128:11, 138:20,	194:15	easier [1] - 188:2
284:25, 285:14	40:1, 40:22, 42:23,	139:8, 168:7,	drops [2] - 213:15,	easily [4] - 12:19,
distribution [1] -	62:17, 62:20, 63:2,	168:18, 180:7,	216:22	78:14, 79:5, 149:8
284:21	87:11, 88:14,	183:12, 187:5,	drove [1] - 44:22	East [1] - 2:3
distributor [2] -	155:15, 163:10,	192:16, 195:10,		east [8] - 3:21, 148:12,
	209:6, 228:12,	192.10, 195.10, 195:23, 197:24,	duck [1] - 316:7	182:5, 210:21,
284:23, 284:24		200:22, 200:25,	<b>due</b> [11] - 68:25,	260:16, 260:23,
district [7] - 5:5,	228:18, 231:14,	200.22, 200.23,	104:2, 131:25,	200.10, 200.20,

077 0 000 40
277:3, 289:16
easy [7] - 58:12,
58:20, 106:12,
184:18, 185:6,
188:3, 264:5
echo [1] - 200:2
echoed [1] - 270:17
economic [1] - 264 :2
economically [2] -
152:6, 284:8
economics [1] -
159:17
edge [2] - 210:20,
296:19
education [2] -
130:25, 218:25
educational [1] -
219:11
EDWARDS [33] - 14:5,
51:15, 52:16, 52:21,
63:7, 79:12, 83:13,
88:20, 91:21, 95:5,
98:1, 100:13,
120:11, 120:13,
122:16, 135:13,
171:18, 174:17,
174:20, 180:1,
208:19, 208:21,
212:17, 224:21,
249:7, 249:11,
249:16, 249:19,
249:23, 250:4,
253:8, 257:8, 287:23
Edwards [3] - 1:23,
51:14, 89:6
Eerie [1] - 210:21
effect [4] - 70:1,
107:14, 124:24,
166:24
effectively [2] -
142:22, 209:21
effects [58] - 68:19,
69:3, 73:15, 74:16,
84:13, 101:3, 116:6,
116:13, 146:13,
160:8, 160:13,
162:16, 162:19,
162:20, 162:25,
163:2, 163:5, 163:6,
163:7, 163:9,
163:12, 164:14,
164:22, 166:22,
167:18, 168:21,
170:8, 170:9,
170:16, 170:22,
171:10, 172:1,
172:12, 173:12,
173:18, 173:20,
176:9, 192:4,
206:16, 207:16,

225:10, 225:25, 227:14,236:10, 239:15,240:21, 242:19,245:8, 245:15, 247:18, 247:23,248:20, 251:2, 251:16, 251:18, 255:2 effort [2] - 312:8, 319:14 efforts [1] - 218:7 eight [8] - 4:6, 4:23, 151:22, 201:10, 211:14, 226:14, 294:18, 304:18 either [23] - 9:4, 22:24, 28:7, 48:11, 48:23, 53:23, 78:10, 99:7, 144:4, 145:21, 149:11, 157:14, 158:1, 171:14, 196:6, 211:12, 214:24, 220:1, 250:9,276:13, 292:3, 292:18, 293:19 EL18-026 [4] - 1:2. 3:3, 130:8, 218:14 elaborate [2] - 161:16, 165:9 elaborating [1] - 174:1 elbow [1] - 82:4 elderly [1] - 150:12 elected [2] - 256:4, 297:14 election [2] - 297:9, 297:14 electrophysiologic [1] - 235:9 elements [1] - 127:10 elephant [2] - 213:6, 213:7 elephants [2] -110:10, 199:16 elevator [1] - 148:24 Elgin [1] - 277:10 eligibilities [4] -317:19, 318:4, 318:11, 318:15 eligibility [1] - 318:8 eliminate [2] - 155:3, 186:10 eliminating [1] -186:16 Ellenbogen [1] - 84:24 Elsberry [9] - 18:4, 18:10, 18:19, 19:13, 21:22, 21:24, 22:7, 22:20, 23:7 elsewhere [1] - 303:1

emanates [1] - 228:11 embarrassment [1] -127.19emergency [6] -36:22, 37:16, 37:23, 38:5, 42:19, 269:5 emerging [1] - 75:10 emeritus [1] - 169:24 emissions [3] -113:18, 125:22, 164:14 emitted [2] - 41:13, 214:25 emotional [1] - 278:4 emotionally [1] -270:11 emphasizing [1] -285:12 employee [1] - 131:14 employers [2] - 205:2, 205:3 encapsulate [2] -180:16, 201:13 encourage [2] -198:10, 198:11 end [18] - 17:10, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 73:23, 97:18, 106:11, 115:17, 119:1, 124:24, 133:6, 141:19, 156:13, 209:18, 210:3, 211:11, 304:10, 313:5 ended [3] - 20:23, 222:15,280:11 ends [1] - 236:25 Energy [1] - 196:4 energy [24] - 3:4, 9:15, 25:11, 25:12, 25:21, 26:3, 98:8, 103:10, 138:2, 142:14, 183:8, 184:14, 193:25, 199:3, 222:3, 222:4, 222:10, 222:23, 268:24, 268:25, 269:1, 306:3, 306:23 **ENERGY** [1] - 1:3 energy 's [1] - 199:8 engaged [2] - 98:11, 292:8 engineer [5] - 53:21, 54:20,90:11, 233:15, 233:16 engineering [1] - 95:1 enhance [1] - 78:13 enhanced [1] - 124 : 14 enjoy [5] - 117:13, 117:15, 146:19,

276:20 enjoyed [1] - 119:6 ENT [1] - 235:23 enter [2] - 173:25, 186.4entertain [1] - 269:4 entire [5] - 28:6, 80:2, 96:10, 195:11, 269:10 entirely [4] - 54:6, 113:13, 113:15, 121:1 entities [7] - 4:13, 16:16, 16:17, 32:2, 33:3, 272:17, 275:7 entitled [2] - 2:2, 88:15 entity [1] - 4:9 environment [8] -145:20, 145:22, 146:21, 146:22, 196:16, 204:15, 261:1, 285:8 environmental [2] -280:18, 280:22 environments [1] -210:10 envision [1] - 277:6 EPA [1] - 210:10 epidemiological [6] -225:23, 226:3, 226:18, 227:4, 227:20,245:6 epidemiologist [3] -167:14, 171:12, 243:20 epidemiology [1] -226:16 equate [1] - 146:1 equation [1] - 232:14 equipment [2] -109:16, 133:7 equivalent [5] -183:13, 183:19, 185:8, 185:9, 185:17 Eric [6] - 18:4, 18:19, 18:20, 21:21, 21:23, 23.7 err [1] - 197:6 erupted [1] - 200:1 eruption [1] - 200:2 especially [6] - 83:21, 114:12, 121:14, 124:13, 145:12, 225:20 essentially [8] - 41:25, 88:8, 106:20, 154:15, 178:21, 220:6, 222:23, 255:21

establish [2] - 227:21, 14 318:11 establishes [1] -243:25 Estate [2] - 311:23, 311:25 estate [2] - 280:5, 288:22 esthetically [1] -270:18 estimate [5] - 185:6, 241:4, 241:11, 241:12,291:3 estimated [1] - 247:9 estimator [1] - 290:17 estrange [1] - 279:9 estranged [1] - 278:21 et [14] - 83:18, 116:22, 123:1, 135:22, 136:6, 142:17, 170:23, 188:1, 188:25, 194:22, 210:25, 211:21, 211:23, 212:9 **Europe** [1] - 255:22 **European** [2] - 95:25, 222:7 evaluated [1] - 58:14 evaluating [1] - 54:9 evaluators [1] -168:13 evening [7] - 8:3, 39:16, 125:20, 277:22,308:4, 320:9, 320:25 evenings [1] - 195:6 events [3] - 125:7, 234:4, 279:12 eventually [1] - 15:23 everywhere [2] -195:14, 195:15 evidence [17] - 81:13, 121:5, 144:8, 168:15, 181:23, 199:25, 217:25, 225:9, 225:15, 225:21, 225:22, 225:23,249:25, 256:17, 316:25, 317:2 evidenced [1] - 305:16 evidently [1] - 107:12 evil [1] - 282:10 exact [8] - 8:4, 45:18, 63:2, 109:16, 194:21,207:7, 217:22, 306:19 exactly [10] - 9:16, 58:16, 77:13, 148:23, 171:5,

188:12, 188:16,	2
231:25, 262:13,	2
283:6	
	2
exaggerating [1] -	ex
148:25	2
exam [1] - 235:18	ex
EXAMINATION [40] -	2
3:16, 29:13, 31:15,	1
34:18, 42:7, 43:5,	
46:4, 46:15, 47:4,	ex
49:9, 50:16, 51:21,	5
52:20,63:19,70:9, 96:20,97:14,	ex
120:12, 122:22,	ex
120:12, 122:22, 124:9, 127:1, 129:1,	
130:22, 156:16,	ex
174:19, 206:12,	1
208:20, 217:14,	ex
218:22, 232:25,	1
252:19, 258:4,	ex
271:14, 272:23,	ex
273:11, 287:9,	1
288:13, 308:16,	1
314:5, 315:1	2
examination [21] -	ex
16:25, 20:22, 29:2,	ex
29:12, 42:4, 63:15,	ex
156:6, 160:24,	9
174:6, 174:8,	1
174:10, 206:10,	2
208:12, 232:19,	2
252:17, 253:11,	ex
257:22, 271:11,	5
300:3, 308:12,	2
314:24	ex
examinations [1] -	ex
238:22	4
examine [3] - 29:7,	6
180:6, 181:14	ç
examined [2] - 161:8,	
321:10	1
examiner [1] - 130:17	2
Examiner [3] - 3:2,	2
218:18, 219:24	2
examines [7] - 11:8,	3
11:15, 12:10, 20:1,	3
25:18, 62:17, 62:20	Ex
example [32] - 57:24,	6
64:16,83:6,96:5,	7
104:15, 107:6,	1
145:6, 145:20,	1
151:16, 154:6,	2
155:14, 181:4,	3
183:12, 184:4,	2
186:18, 186:19,	6
187:23, 189:19,	8
196:12, 198:12,	ę
199:10, 199:16,	1
199:19, 201:15,	1
204:1, 207:12,	1

210:9,211:17, 234:4,235:15, 240:16 camples [2] - 40:17, 200:10 **(ceed** [7] - 26:3, 41:10, 142:23, 143:5, 143:10, 198:12,202:21 ceedance [2] -56:16,94:4 ceeds [1] - 158:24 cellent [2] - 73:12, 174:4 cept [2] - 21:8, 189:10 ception [2] -189:16, 205:24 **(change** [1] - 205:7 cluded [7] - 166:21, 166:23, 170:2, 170:3, 242:22, 243:1, 249:24 clusive [1] - 57:21 clusively [1] - 9:15 **(cuse** [10] - 78:22, 92:4, 134:14, 158:12, 192:2, 217:10,220:17, 256:4,289:14, 294:20 cused [7] - 34:11, 52:11, 130:1, 130:2, 257:11, 288:5, 321:5 cecuted [1] - 188:15 **chibit** [23] - 21:4, 41:3, 41:5, 42:21, 62:15,62:22,62:25, 94:21, 97:24, 137:2, 137:7, 162:8, 162:21,201:16, 208:25,225:17, 225:18,233:11, 236:14, 291:23, 302:14,310:9, 312:11 xhibit [69] - 6:1, 6:2, 6:5, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14, 7:4, 10:20, 10:22, 10:25, 14:2, 18:14, 18:18, 21:4, 22:23, 22:24, 23:21, 23:22, 38:22, 38:25, 39:1, 40:25,41:6,47:9, 62:13, 67:5, 75:25, 88:14,94:19,94:21, 94:22,95:4,97:24, 107:24, 133:19, 134:22, 135:11, 136:22, 136:25,

137:1, 153:11, 164:12, 166:11, 207:6,208:22, 223:10, 223:25, 224:9, 236:16, 237:16, 237:24, 238:10, 254:6, 254:10, 254:11, 289:11, 290:12, 290:14,298:17, 298:20, 300:4, 301:2, 301:3, 301:18, 303:19, 308:22, 321:11 exhibition [1] - 7:3 **exhibits** [20] - 134:11, 134:12, 135:11, 136:21, 153:13, 156:24, 161:18, 162:16, 172:10, 172:15, 172:16, 172:19, 190:2, 208:23, 223:18, 224:9, 224:23, 245:13, 305:1 **Exhibits** [1] - 134:15 exist [4] - 78:4, 79:7, 79:8, 80:7 existed [2] - 83:1, 264:24 existence [3] - 307:13, 313:17, 313:19 existing [3] - 41:10, 157:9, 202:22 expand [2] - 142:9, 142:12 expect [10] - 73:12, 77:24,80:8,122:10, 123:5, 149:22, 194:15, 202:8, 265:14, 273:15 expectation [7] -78:17, 145:16, 146:4.146:5. 150:18, 204:12, 273:17 expected [2] - 87:7, 145.14expensive [4] -139:22, 188:5, 188:20, 226:5 experience [34] -32:15, 32:20, 55:16, 57:18, 60:10, 66:11, 67:4, 77:17, 83:24, 84:3, 93:23, 118:21, 122:10, 123:20, 123:21, 126:3, 131:1, 133:2, 136:17, 150:14,

160:3, 160:4, 176:8, 182:8, 182:10, 196:18, 210:13, 218:25, 219:10, 239:15,240:21, 241:5, 247:5, 248:1 experiences [6] -133:25, 134:5, 160:19, 210:12, 237:7,238:18 experiencing [1] -99:7 **experiment** [3] - 69:7, 141:6, 168:12 experimentation [1] -226:14 experiments [1] -54:21 expert [27] - 79:13, 84:19,90:24, 121:22, 126:17, 132:15, 134:1, 134:6, 159:11, 159:17, 159:20, 161:13, 165:24, 169:12, 170:7, 172:2, 172:13, 173:25, 201:24, 236:9, 237:6, 237:8, 241:14, 242:19, 247:24,249:19, 250:19 expertise [3] - 207:15, 236:4, 248:24 experts [4] - 84:9, 90:22, 91:3, 131:12 explain [18] - 4:12, 4:14, 7:18, 102:22, 103:1, 137:8, 144:24, 153:20, 162:18, 164:13, 195:17, 212:3, 212:7, 212:23, 219:22, 228:9, 295:3, 311:8 explained [7] - 158:4, 187:19, 190:5, 192:1, 192:3, 193:12, 216:25 explaining [1] - 195:3 explains [1] - 141:13 explanation [3] - 78:5, 139:24, 222:12 explanations [1] -186:7 explanatory [1] -137.9explore [1] - 211:10 expose [1] - 247:2 exposed [2] - 231:21,

241:4 15 exposure [3] - 97:5, 97:9,255:3 **expound** [1] - 251:15 express [2] - 116:24, 266:20 expressed [8] - 56:8, 262:8, 262:11, 262:23, 262:25, 265:12, 278:2, 291:16 expresses [2] - 126:6, 265:19 extend [1] - 302:14 extended [1] - 117:12 extensive [2] - 204:3, 298:4 extent [16] - 16:23, 19:6, 68:11, 108:11, 109:12, 159:22, 166:24, 172:18, 205:10,238:18, 252:1, 252:2, 275:18, 279:11, 293:12, 301:19 external [1] - 226:20 extra [2] - 205:4 extraordinarily [1] -203:19 extraordinary [1] -60:6 extreme [1] - 241:5 **extremely** [7] - 54:23, 55:13, 61:11, 70:13, 87:8, 105:24, 116:21

## F

eyes [1] - 141:16

fabric [1] - 278:19 faces [1] - 260:16 facilities [2] - 170:23, 269:5 facility [4] - 3:4, 128:6, 262:21, 283:21 FACILITY [1] - 1:3 fact [26] - 14:8, 29:21, 55:19, 71:20, 74:7, 82:1, 106:8, 112:7, 123:22, 126:4, 141:5, 143:12, 150:6, 192:17, 201:4, 207:6, 218:2, 220:18, 254:22, 254:25,255:17, 255:19, 272:8, 281:9, 296:7, 305:7 factor [2] - 199:7, 232:12 factors [6] - 145:17,

164:1, 182:2, 247:1,	85:4, 85:15, 85:17,	favorably [1] - 268:5	92:15, 110:20,	fix [1] - 118:14 16
276:9, 304:7	100:18, 108:22,	fear [6] - 66:19, 261:2,	110:22, 113:25,	flat [1] - 124:22
factory [1] - 177:18	109:21, 110:6,	270:10, 270:11,	173:2, 259:3,	flavor [1] - 9:6
facts [1] - 59:25	110:14, 110:16,	274:18,279:8	260:21, 299:5	fleshing [1] - 153:3
factual [1] - 20:11	110:17, 110:21,	fears [1] - 67:2	figuring [1] - 172:8	flicker [14] - 26:18,
faculty [1] - 219:19	117:21, 124:12,	feature [1] - 277 :5	file [3] - 101:24, 152:8,	26:22, 26:24, 27:4,
fail [1] - 245:13	135:25, 136:18,	February [2] - 292:3,	223:7	260:13,305:11,
faint [1] - 191:21	139:24, 152:24,	310:24	filed [5] - 153:8,	305:18, 307:1,
fair [14] - 8:5, 60:9,	238:21, 249:3	feelings [4] - 92:12,	156:24, 233:4, 276:3	308:19, 315:7,
66:2, 68:4, 68:7,	Farm [11] - 8:24,	270:17,277:24,	files [2] - 233:9,	315:8, 315:12,
83:23, 113:22,	16:10, 67:17, 87:13,	278:1	310:20	316:13, 316:16
148:8, 148:22,	87:16,88:16,127:3,	feet [14] - 40:19,	filings [1] - 60:2	flies [1] - 203:16
157:23, 161:1,	178:4, 188:8,	196:1, 214:4,	filled [1] - 280:15	flight [1] - 143:25
170:6, 194:24, 232:6	217:17,256:11	215:16, 215:18,	filtering [1] - 191:10	flip [8] - 7:1, 7:5,
fairly [13] - 7:14, 62:3,	farm [51] - 3:21, 3:22,	216:9, 295:13,	filters [1] - 125:6	11:21,88:10,95:17,
80:18, 81:19, 94:7,	5:11, 5:16, 5:22,	296:13, 316:10,	final [3] - 87:17, 173:9,	298:17, 300:4,
98:17, 101:19,	8:19, 8:23, 9:19,	319:2, 319:17,	275:20	301:13
113:10, 115:7,	16:3, 16:5, 16:6,	319:22, 320:3	finalize [1] - 276:2	flipped [2] - 28:13,
121:8, 140:11,	16:9, 16:14, 17:16, 17:17, 20:5, 20:11	fellow [1] - 61:8	finally [3] - 70:5,	28:14
194:8, 222:3	17:17, 30:5, 30:11, 33:18, 55:1, 67:17,	<b>felt</b> [11] - 70:23,	120:22, 307:6	floor [1] - 99:8
fairness [1] - 232:6	87:4, 114:12,	221:22, 263:12,	financial [1] - 5:18	Florida [1] - 259:10
fall [2] - 293:6, 294:19	149:16, 164:15,	263:13, 265:14, 265:20, 265:25,	findings [1] - 176:16	fluctuated [1] - 154:8
falls [1] - 155:2	180:12, 217:21,	266:20, 270:13,	fine [7] - 7:15, 17:12,	fluctuating [1] - 156:1
Falls [2] - 296:3, 318:9 Falmouth [1] - 72:12	249:14, 258:13,	286:1, 304:20	59:24, 158:20,	fluctuation [1] -
false [3] - 106:10,	258:15, 258:19,	<b>few</b> [14] - 10:1, 11:25,	169:23, 216:4, 224:18	154:21 fluctuations [2] -
175:4, 175:8	258:21, 259:4,	30:2, 59:23, 62:1,	<b>finish</b> [2] - 120:5,	154:6, 154:11
familiar [27] - 5:11,	259:6, 259:16,	66:17, 118:19,	261:14	fluent [1] - 251:9
6:2, 53:18, 54:17,	259:17, 273:1,	148:2, 183:6,	finished [1] - 206:9	flush [1] - 259:20
55:23, 61:14, 62:15,	277:14, 284:3,	221:12, 259:18,	firms [1] - 87:1	flying [1] - 56:16
72:11, 83:7, 84:11,	284:6, 284:9,	260:12,270:16,	first [50] - 3:11, 3:14,	foam [3] - 175:5,
84:15, 84:20, 84:22,	284:13, 284:14,	307 :4	8:16, 8:19, 8:23,	175:7, 175:11
99:3, 115:2, 116:12,	284:16,309:15,	Fiegen [9] - 33:14,	12:1, 16:9, 19:1,	focus [6] - 131:17,
126:12, 126:15,	309:20, 310:3,	49:5, 113:4, 180:7,	26:1, 34:16, 35:7,	131:21, 144:19,
126:16, 141:22,	312:3, 312:4, 312:5	181:13, 197:25,	39:14, 47:12, 52:18,	177:13, 210:1,
142:5, 145:12,	farmed [1] - 288:23	253:12,282:18,	54:4,62:18,80:18,	263:11
178:6, 210:8,	farmer [1] - 10:6	317:15	108:20, 115:14,	focused [4] - 54:6,
241:16,249:12,	farmers [1] - 291:9	<b>FIEGEN</b> [30] - 1:10,	118:22, 132:8,	132:13, 133:11,
271:20	farmhouse [4] - 179:4, 259:18, 284:4,	33:16, 33:21, 49:6,	133:7, 141:6,	210:14
familiarize [1] - 19:3	285:12	129:15, 181:15,	141:24, 150:2,	focuses [1] - 179:5
families [6] - 182:11,	farming [1] - 211:14	182:21, 197:22,	152:4, 152:11,	focusing [2] - 113:13,
209:21, 211:10,	farms [16] - 7:22,	198:4, 198:15, 198:22, 254:2,	158:22, 163:22,	113:15
211:11, 283:17, 284:10	26:24, 58:13, 72:9,	282:19, 283:1,	168:2, 168:11,	folder [1] - 127:18
284:10 family [14] - 5:17,	73:15, 74:4, 85:1,	283:9, 283:12,	177:23, 181:25, 206:10, 206:14,	folks [12] - 60:7,
150:12, 220:20,	85:5, 113:24,	283:15, 283:19,	200.10, 200.14, 216:15, 220:4,	107:16, 110:17,
221:16, 222:12,	114:13, 123:3,	285:18, 308:7,	210:13, 220:4, 222:13, 237:15,	110:18, 117:14, 117:20, 117:22
258:14, 258:19,	162:23, 163:14,	317:16, 317:21,	248:18, 258:2,	117:20, 117:23, 118:4, 118:6,
260:7, 275:16,	164:24, 218:1, 284:7	317:25, 318:3,	260:3, 261:16,	118:15, 205:25,
283:10, 284:3,	farmsite [1] - 259:22	318:20, 319:6,	281:9, 284:3,	227:19
284:4, 284:9, 317:4	faster [1] - 79:4	319:8, 320:5, 320:7,	288:11, 293:3,	follow [12] - 21:5,
family 's [2] - 273:5,	father [1] - 151:5	321:22	295:6, 296:17,	82:16, 83:3, 119:3,
288:1	fathers [1] - 96:24	field [4] - 131:4,	309:11	145:1, 207:8,
fan [6] - 55:18, 144:10,	faucet [1] - 118:14	181:16, 210:12,	firsthand [2] - 176:10,	212:18, 262:14,
184:5, 184:6, 184:7,	faulted [2] - 113:9,	225:20	176:13	281:18, 292:9,
204:20	113:13	fields [1] - 188:23	fit [2] - 37:1, 216:3	309:23, 309:24
fans [1] - 184:10	favor [6] - 9:4, 31:2,	fifth [2] - 21:5, 24:3	five [9] - 5:1, 5:4,	followed [1] - 188:11
far [28] - 13:22, 30:10,	36:7, 37:20, 108:25,	fight [1] - 121:11	59:10, 95:21,	following [7] - 2:1,
45:18, 46:22, 65:12,	113:24 favorable [1] - 222:4	<b>figure</b> [12] - 32:24, 32:25, 50:25, 69:17,	134:12, 181:18,	70:11, 87:15, 88:3,
73:25, 80:9, 80:10,		52.25, 50.25, 09.17,	296:21, 318:17	184:24, 285:21,

				<b>,</b>
314:10	27:16, 27:23, 54:11,	Fuerniss 's [3] - 47:21,	gentlemen [1] - 36:10	great -grandfather 's 17
follows [5] - 3:15,	54:24, 69:23, 70:13,	71:9, 299:10	German [3] - 140:3,	[1] - 5:15
34:17, 52:19, 258:3,	73:22, 73:23, 85:16,	<b>full</b> [7] - 38:1, 128:18,	143:12, 143:16	greater [7] - 40:10,
288:12	86:1, 87:8, 87:12,	149:10, 193:15,	Germany [1] - 108:6	117:1, 145:16,
foot [5] - 49:22, 80:12,	88:16, 96:13,	193:22, 196:21,	Geronimo [1] - 306:13	185:11, 197:14,
313:23, 319:24,	104:17, 104:19,	303:24	Gerpen [1] - 15:16	200:14, 264:23
320:1	106:6, 106:11,	fully [3] - 215:21,		<b>Greek</b> [1] - 190:3
footprint [5] - 5:22,	106:21, 107:13,	244:15, 250:10	Gipe 's [1] - 222:2	Green [1] - 151:25
258:10, 288:25,	110:12, 113:17,	function [2] - 65:5,	<b>given</b> [13] - 68:9, 73:5,	
	114:18, 115:3,	128:10	79:20, 83:17, 83:21,	<b>Greg</b> [2] - 1:13, 299:7
289:9, 298:24 FOR [2] - 1:3, 1:5	115:4, 115:9,		150:4, 157:24,	<b>Gregg</b> [14] - 1:17,
.,	115:13, 115:18,	fund [1] - 182:12	171:3, 183:25,	30:3, 288:9, 288:10,
force [2] - 229:9,	115:21, 115:23,	funded [3] - 86:23,	189:23, 248:23,	288:15, 288:17,
229:11	115:21, 116:2,	182:11, 182:13	304:16, 306:2	293:14, 303:5,
Ford [1] - 256:4		funding [5] - 152:7,	<b>goal</b> [6] - 60:15, 88:9,	303:8, 304:13,
forefront [1] - 72:4	119:17, 124:24,	180:23, 182:18,	112:1, 229:1, 229:2,	308:1, 311:7, 314:7,
foreign [1] - 181:22	136:6, 144:13, 156:1, 157:14	226:6, 226:8	318:25	316:23
forever [3] - 15:13,	156:1, 157:14,	<b>funds</b> [2] - 151:15,	goals [2] - 94:10,	grew [6] - 118:8,
121:12, 152:12	190:12, 191:1,	152:1	94:13	258:19, 273:3,
forget [1] - 126:8	199:6, 209:24,	funny [2] - 70:23,	Google [1] - 66:24	277:12,277:13,
forgot [1] - 103:14	210:2, 212:8,	299:5	Government [2] -	293:9
form [5] - 40:8, 131:9,	212:12, 216:1,	funsies [1] - 50:25	98:7, 103:10	grievances [1] - 59:15
215:18, 215:21,	228:17, 231:8,	future [8] - 17:23,	government [13] -	ground [20] - 51:7,
244:19	245:10,245:14,	17:25, 38:14, 73:7,	3:24,84:14,84:25,	59:25, 79:9, 79:25,
formal [2] - 148:14,	248:22	82:3, 82:24, 226:4,	159:8, 180:15,	80:4, 109:5, 124:20,
238:20	frequent [1] - 143:14	268:8	182:16, 182:17,	124:22, 124:23,
format [1] - 172:21	frequently [4] - 24:17,		199:20, 203:7,	147:22, 193:23,
formed [1] - 131:6	78:4, 78:8, 79:20	G	226:6, 226:8,	195:18, 195:19,
former [1] - 253:18	fresh [1] - 29:19		227:12,227:16	195:22, 195:23,
formulate [1] - 22:12	friction [1] - 201:4	game [1] - 83:23	governmental [1] -	196:3, 196:14,
formulating [1] -	friend [1] - 201:21	<b>GARY</b> [1] - 1:10	86:12	196:22, 215:24,
53:15	friends [1] - 202:6	gas [1] - 89:20	governments [2] -	285:2
<b>Fort</b> [1] - 276:24	friendships [1] -	gather [1] - 286:10	180:10, 210:13	group [4] - 55:5,
forth [5] - 61:3,	270:19	gauge [4] - 89:10,	Governor [1] - 144:1	177:21, 222:22,
124:15, 222:8,	front [24] - 6:1, 6:22,	89:16, 90:9, 90:15	grade [1] - 43:17	237:18
234:5, 235:10	10:19, 21:9, 22:13,	gears [4] - 81:4,	gradient [1] - 195:20	grow [1] - 277:13
forward [9] - 8:20, 9:1,	23:22, 27:25, 38:23,	85:21, 93:9, 110:25	graduate [1] - 221:3	grown [1] - 159:6
	67:6, 75:25, 134:22,	Geddes [1] - 34:22	grain [1] - 148:24	guess [40] - 6:9, 7:19,
38:6, 42:19, 56:3, 264:22, 268:10	138:1, 142:19,	general [11] - 8:13,	grandfather 's [1] -	8:14, 10:6, 16:3,
264:22, 268:19, 280:25, 287:17	153:12, 156:23,	64:14, 81:17,	5:15	16:5, 24:22, 25:22,
280:25, 287:17	166:14, 184:5,	132:16, 170:22,		26:23, 28:10, 30:14,
fought [1] - 319:12	190:20, 208:23,	211:21, 211:22,	grant [1] - 173:2	31:6, 33:6, 36:19,
foundation [10] - 14:8,	233:6, 236:13,	262:20, 268:18,	granted [2] - 117:16,	43:11, 55:16, 68:13,
19:7, 19:8, 19:11,	241:19, 298:21,	288:23, 297:14	207:23	70:19, 74:24, 75:24,
19:17, 21:9, 21:13,	299:24	General [1] - 131:13	graph [4] - 137:23,	91:21, 100:13,
23:8, 23:9, 169:12	FUERNISS [16] -	generally [6] - 8:12,	138:12, 138:20,	129:19, 130:8,
foundational [1] -	29:14, 31:8, 43:6,	61:17, 62:9, 66:16,	191:17	136:22, 142:9,
243:24	50:17, 51:8, 96:21,	81:6, 132:15	graphical [1] - 113:9	171:7, 179:16,
four [11] - 32:9, 86:25,	97:11, 124:10,	generate [4] - 44:14,	graphing [1] - 176:5	181:23, 181:25,
99:5, 99:6, 138:21,	126:21, 174:11,	105:6, 132:22,	graphs [4] - 137:2,	261:2, 261:7, 266:4,
143:3, 184:10,	208:13, 252:20,	105.0, 132.22, 140:14	137:4, 137:10,	
229:21, 259:12,	253:1, 272:24,		139:17	270:15, 279:2, 280:17, 202:14
289:14, 299:13	273:7, 314:3	generated [11] - 86:3,	grata [1] - 177:25	280:17, 292:14, 200:23, 208:11
fourth [1] - 309:1	<b>Fuerniss</b> [17] - 1:18,	87:15, 106:13, 108:12, 109:15,	gravel [1] - 24:20	299:23, 308:11, 318:23
free [1] - 28:1	29:11, 36:10, 36:13,		gray [2] - 32:24,	
freedom [3] - 97:19,	43:4, 50:15, 71:14,	136:2, 136:8, 202:20, 206:16	173:24	guesswork [1] - 177:5
97:21,97:22	96:19, 105:15,	202:20, 206:16,	great [12] - 5:15,	guidance [1] - 10:8
frequencies [5] -	124:8, 171:22,	245:8, 269:21	31:25, 61:9, 97:1,	<b>guide</b> [4] - 10:8,
73:18, 110:10,		generates [1] - 175:8	100:16, 205:16,	145:2, 264:9, 264:13
190:7, 190:11,	174:10, 208:11,	generator [1] - 80:8	205:20, 213:5,	guidelines [2] -
191:15				
191.15	252:17, 272:21,	gentleman [2] - 19:22,	262:5, 262:15,	145:19, 228:13
frequency [51] -	252:17, 272:21, 287:7, 314:2	gentleman [2] - 19:22, 320:14		145:19, 228:13 guinea [1] - 245:11

gusts [1] - 201:7	118:3, 118:8,	159:23, 160:8,	heard [51] - 3:6, 8:14,	heated [1] - 183:22 18
<b>guy</b> [2] - 5:3, 18:6	118:21, 119:5,	160:13, 162:16,	14:25, 21:16, 21:18,	heating [1] - 195:17
<b>guys</b> [6] - 30:21, 31:2,	173:7, 174:4,	162:19, 162:20,	21:20, 28:14, 39:23,	heavily [1] - 143:6
45:1, 88:6, 117:3,	182:25, 183:2,	162:25, 163:2,	45:11, 45:12, 59:15,	heck [1] - 118:12
321:14	184:1, 184:23,	163:5, 163:6, 163:7,	60:1, 71:11, 71:16,	height [2] - 64:20,
	185:13, 186:6,	163:8, 163:9,	74:12, 74:14, 77:22,	79:10
н	186:15, 186:24,	163:12, 163:25,	84:24, 106:17,	held [1] - 2:2
	187:8,202:10,	166:22, 167:17,	108:18, 110:11,	helicopter [1] - 144:2
<b>H-1</b> [1] - 97:24	203:11, 205:12,	168:20, 170:8,	111:1, 111:12,	helicopters [1] - 144 :1
H-U-B-N-E-R [1] -	205:15,205:20,	170:9, 170:16,	123:4, 144:23,	hello [3] - 3:20, 96:22,
288:17	277:22,278:15,	170:21, 170:22,	147:18, 152:16,	252:21
hair [1] - 245:11	278:18,278:24,	171:9, 172:1,	160:17, 187:14,	help [19] - 11:22, 23:1,
half [19] - 31:5, 32:7,	279:4,279:10,	172:12, 173:12,	187:16,221:20,	25:16, 31:19, 86:4,
45:12, 61:19, 81:5,	280:1, 320:9,	173:20, 201:9,	225:13,225:19,	103:24, 105:11,
81:10, 81:15, 81:17,	320:11, 320:14,	201:11, 217:20,	231:3, 242:23,	105:20, 108:22,
81:23, 81:24, 82:7,	320:18, 320:24	217:22, 217:23,	244:8, 253:24,	109:2, 110:5,
88:7, 149:17,	Hanson [13] - 33:23,	218:1, 225:10,	265:21,265:22,	110:14, 113:3,
151:17, 183:13,	47:1, 48:8, 50:18,	225:25, 227:14,	302:6, 302:9,	189:4, 198:25,
184:11, 201:12,	113:5, 122:24,	236:9, 237:5, 237:8,	302:21, 303:4,	264:9, 264:13,
201:18, 296:13	173:6, 182:23,	238:2, 238:3, 239:7,	303:6, 303:12,	283:23, 302:19
half -mile [3] - 45:12,	197:21, 254:3,	239:15, 242:19,	303:15, 303:17,	helped [2] - 10:8,
149:17, 296:13	277:21,285:22,	245:8, 245:15,	314:7, 316:6, 316:8	142:4
halfway [2] - 88:12,	320:8	247:18, 247:23,	Hearing [4] - 1:6, 3:2,	helpful [2] - 235:16,
199:21	Hanson 's [1] - 281:18	248:20, 251:2,	218:18, 219:23	303:13
Hall [1] - 196:13	happenstance [1] -	251:16, 251:17,	hearing [54] - 83:20,	hertz [16] - 55:12,
hall [1] - 29:24	275:12	252:7, 254:8,	86:15, 86:18, 103:9,	69:24,73:18,73:19,
Hall 's [1] - 194 :12	happy [4] - 77:1, 93:7,	255:20, 256:12,	114:14, 117:22,	104:19, 106:2,
hallway [2] - 49:14,	172:20, 173:15	256:13, 260:6, 260:10, 260:18,	126:13, 126:16,	106:7, 109:13,
50:3	hard [9] - 9:16, 69:25,	261:1, 261:2,	129:8, 130:17,	116:1, 119:17,
halving [2] - 183:8,	72:12, 80:22, 107:1,	261:18, 270:11,	141:9, 149:20, 172:10, 195:2	190:14, 191:3,
183:16	122:12, 200:4,	317:4	173:19, 185:3,	191:4, 215:17
hampered [1] - 159:24	216:1, 232:11	Health [18] - 74:21,	207:1, 207:4, 207:14, 207:19,	Hessler [40] - 52:16,
Hampshire [1] - 182:4	harder [2] - 110:3,	74:23, 146:9, 163:5,	219:2, 219:12,	52:17, 52:22, 52:24,
hand [15] - 5:22,	185:7	175:23, 176:4,	219.2, 219.12, 220:5, 220:6, 220:8,	52:25, 62:15, 63:14,
88:22,94:20, 138:11,156:19,	hardly [1] - 205:17	211:9, 211:17,	220:9, 221:2, 221:3,	63:16, 63:21, 78:11,
166:8, 167:4, 168:8,	hardware [1] - 204:23	211:25, 212:6,	221:10, 222:20,	88:1,96:16,96:22,
191:8, 191:16,	hate [2] - 112:23, 282:11	227:23, 228:12,	222:24, 231:3,	105:10, 113:7,
243:5, 245:2, 251:8,	haul [1] - 35:23	228:15, 229:19,	234:12, 234:22,	120:14, 123:14,
284:15		230:1, 231:7,	234:23, 235:2,	124:7, 129:25,
handed [2] - 87:11,	hauls [1] - 234:5	252:22, 256:18	235:11, 235:14,	132:7, 137:15, 140:12, 142:6
94:22	hazard [7] - 151:18, 201:12, 217:21,	hear [46] - 3:9, 55:6,	235:15, 238:2,	140:12, 142:6,
handful [6] - 9:3, 9:4,	201.12, 217.21, 217:22, 217:23,	59:19, 61:3, 62:7,	243:2, 249:4, 249:5,	144:24, 147:19, 150:21, 151:5,
72:11, 100:6, 101:3,	255:20, 256:13	71:6, 72:22, 77:21,	255:21, 269:8,	152:16, 155:14,
116:22	head [4] - 25:23,	78:18, 91:13,	269:10, 288:7,	156:15, 175:15,
handing [2] - 166:10,	124:25, 183:21,	104:10, 111:14,	295:17,295:18,	178:9, 178:17,
301:3	275:18	111:18, 114:7,	296:8, 302:10,	179:5, 179:11,
hands [1] - 207:4	headache [2] -	114:8, 114:19,	302:12, 302:21,	181:5, 182:7,
handwritten [1] -	239:18, 240:16	114:22, 115:4,	313:23, 321:6	193:18, 198:19,
233:7	headaches [4] -	115:6, 117:18,	hearing 's [1] - 299:23	202:5
HANSON [53] - 1:10,	139:4, 141:20,	119:11, 123:21,	hearings [4] - 37:13,	Hessler 's [2] - 187:15,
33:24, 48:9, 48:12,	142:17, 239:11	135:14, 135:20,	132:15, 194:20,	199:12
48:15, 48:21, 48:25,	health [86] - 46:10,	142:6, 143:1, 144:2,	319:18	hi [2] - 18:20, 320:10
113:6, 114:6,	46:22, 68:19, 69:3,	149:14, 149:15,	hearsay [5] - 20:19,	high [26] - 57:23, 62:3,
114:10, 114:21,	71:7, 84:13, 84:19,	149:17, 151:1,	23:9, 279:3, 302:16,	76:7, 93:6, 115:13,
114:25, 115:7,	99:7, 100:7, 101:3,	173:15, 176:25,	302:24	115:23, 115:24,
115:20, 115:24,	116:6, 131:25,	187:18, 205:17,	heart [2] - 132:1,	120:17, 132:21,
116:4, 116:11,	134:1, 134:3, 139:3,	242:24, 244:11,	236:5	133:6, 144:9,
116:16, 116:20,	146:12, 146:16,	274:10, 276:25, 279:17, 279:20	heartbeat [1] - 283:5	144:10, 146:14,
117:11, 118:1,	151:17, 151:23,	279:17, 279:20, 280:21, 295:8, 316:9	heat [1] - 34:10	147:12, 147:18,
		280:21, 295:8, 316:9		

177:2, 192:17,	260:13, 271:22,	112:17, 112:21,	31:13, 33:13, 33:23,	<b>253:5, 253:7, 253:9,</b> 19
192:20, 194:3,	273:1, 273:3, 283:8,	124:18, 127:7,	33:25, 34:3, 34:6,	253:24, 254:1,
199:6, 210:24,	283:22, 283:25,	179:9, 181:5, 181:6,	34:12, 39:8, 42:4,	254:3, 257:1, 257:4,
215:7, 270:13,	293:9, 299:3,	199:11, 199:13,	43:4, 46:3, 46:14,	257 :7, 257 :9,
279:12, 285:24,	305:10, 307:11	203:15, 260:15,	46:25, 48:8, 49:2,	257:12, 257:19,
286:12	homes [14] - 136:9,	289:13, 290:10,	49:5, 49:7, 50:13,	263:8, 264:5,
<b>high -rise</b> [3] - 144:9,	144:15, 148:4,	290:16, 291:25,	50:15, 51:10, 51:12,	269:19, 270:8,
144:10, 192:17	150:8, 150:10,	293:1, 293:2, 293:6,	51:18, 51:20, 52:7,	271:3, 271:10,
	179:3, 179:18,	293:1, 293:2, 293:0, 293:8, 294:5, 294:6,	52:9, 52:12, 63:9,	272:21, 273:8,
higher [8] - 78:25,		294:7, 294:9,	63:13, 70:8, 75:16,	273:21, 276:7,
115:20, 145:13,	179:23, 193:4, 197:13, 197:19,	294:14, 295:14,	78:10, 79:14, 83:15,	277:16, 277:18,
148:4, 176:2, 211:6, 212:1, 219:1	204:23, 209:22,	312:2, 312:5,	83:25, 84:8, 84:22,	277:20, 282:18,
	204.23, 209.22, 212:13	316:14, 318:16,	88:18, 88:21, 88:25,	285:21, 286:6,
highest [2] - 60:4, 122:5		318:19	89:3, 90:20, 91:6,	286:8, 286:10,
	homestead [2] - 5:16, 273:1	households [1] -	91:10, 91:15, 92:6,	286:14, 286:20,
highly [12] - 38:15,		267:3	92:20, 95:6, 95:8,	286:23, 287:2,
66:21, 93:25,	Homme [23] - 3:23,		96:19, 97:13,	287:7, 287:20,
146:11, 175:25,	6:11, 6:14, 6:20, 6:21, 0:12, 54:0	housekeeping [2] -	100:12, 100:19,	
176:1, 189:1,	6:21, 9:13, 54:8,	43:9, 321:8	102:1, 102:7,	287:22,287:24, 288:3,288:7,
235:14, 295:11,	63:4, 64:6, 67:14,	houses [18] - 59:3,	102:1, 102:7, 102:19,	288:3, 288:7, 293:16, 293:25,
306:17	262:8, 264:24,	59:7, 59:11, 59:17,	102:12, 103:19, 103:21, 104:9,	
Highway [1] - 277:8	265:1, 296:17,	60:12, 60:17, 60:20,		299:18, 299:20, 301:23, 302:10
highway [3] - 35:14,	296:18, 296:19,	69:19, 70:25, 81:21,	104:13, 105:1,	301:23, 302:19,
44:19, 319:21	298:10, 311:2,	93:3, 102:25, 103:6,	105:8, 113:4,	302:23, 303:11,
<b>hill</b> [4] - 124:19, 139:8,	311:4, 312:21,	106:25, 109:20,	119:23, 120:7,	304:11, 308:3,
276:23, 276:25	314:10, 317:11,	118:8, 125:10,	120:9, 122:18,	308:9, 308:11,
Hill [2] - 226:11,	318:14	318:12	122:20, 123:12,	314:2, 314:4,
226:12	HOMME [1] - 1:4	housing [6] - 317:19,	123:14, 124:8,	314:21, 314:23,
Hill 's [1] - 226:25	hone [1] - 223:5	318:4, 318:7, 318:8,	126:22, 128:23,	315:16, 316:20,
hills [1] - 277 :11	honest [4] - 190:2,	318:11, 318:15	129:14, 129:17,	317:15, 320:8,
hilltop [1] - 124:17	210:6, 234:1, 292:16	Howell [16] - 53:18,	129:25, 130:3,	321:1, 321:6,
hilly [1] - 124:15	honestly [3] - 28:19,	53:19, 53:20, 54:2,	130:6, 130:13,	321:13, 321:20,
himself [1] - 17:20	221:20, 264:3	54:16, 56:2, 56:6,	130:16, 130:20,	321:24
hire [1] - 177:25	hope [2] - 4:22, 282:7	93:11, 145:25,	135:14, 135:17,	huge [8] - 61:14,
hired [3] - 18:7, 179:7,	hopefully [1] - 240:1	147:3, 148:22,	153:1, 156:5, 156:9,	61:16, 61:18,
220:25	hoping [2] - 120:3,	154:25, 157:12,	158:20, 165:8,	109:11, 110:11,
history [4] - 3:25,	285:5	246:3, 246:14, 247:7	170:17, 171:17,	260:18, 284:25,
9:22, 276:23, 292:20	Hopkins [1] - 57:1	Howell 's [7] - 54:12,	171:22, 172:23,	285:7
hit [3] - 201:1, 201:2,	horizontal [3] -	55:23, 56:4, 157:16,	172:25, 173:5,	Huller [2] - 245:9,
299:4	137:24, 138:23,	158:6, 246:1, 246:9	173:23, 174:5,	245:12
hitting [1] - 257 : 15	190 :25	Hubner [13] - 1:17,	174:9, 174:12,	human [12] - 107:12,
hog [3] - 24:25, 25:1,	horizontally [1] -	1:17, 15:13, 36:14,	174:14, 174:16,	141:10, 151:17,
32:23	109:10	288:9,288:10,	180:4, 180:14,	201:11, 207:21,
<b>hold</b> [6] - 17:20,	horns [1] - 118:10	288:17,289:12,	181:8, 181:12,	217:21, 217:22,
37:13, 163:18,	Hornstra [3] - 290:8,	308:18, 309:12,	182:22, 197:21,	217:23,245:15,
267:17, 303:5, 303:8	291:23, 313:9	311:12, 315:3, 321:3	197:24, 206:5,	254:8, 255:20,
holds [1] - 227:19	horrific [1] - 66:24	Hueck [11] - 1:12, 3:2,	206:7, 208:5,	256:13
holes [3] - 276:10,	hospital [1] - 13:13	130:16, 130:19,	208:11,208:14,	humans [1] - 164:22
	host [2] - 131:23,	165:5, 217:10,	208:16,208:18,	hundreds [2] - 59:7,
280:12, 280:15	159:1	218:18, 218:21,	212:18, 217:6,	199:18
home [39] - 114:2,	hostility [1] - 286:11	257:14, 308:15,	217:13, 218:9,	hunting [1] - 316:8
136:14, 136:16, 137:13, 137:14	hot [1] - 78:22	321:9	218:11, 218:14,	Huron [1] - 210:20
137:13, 137:14, 127:10, 129:14		HUECK [229] - 3:1,	218:17, 219:4,	husband [1] - 114:6
137:19, 138:14,	hotel [1] - 221:19	10:17, 14:3, 14:6,	219:23, 224:11,	husbands [1] - 114:13
138:20, 139:1, 130:2, 130:6, 130:7	hours [6] - 31:5,	14:12, 14:15, 14:19,	224:13,224:19,	HUTCHINSON [1] -
139:2, 139:6, 139:7,	114:5, 125:23,	15:9, 16:21, 17:5,	224:22,224:25,	1:4
143:24, 175:17,	137:18, 190:24,	19:19, 20:10, 20:20,	232:18,247:21,	
178:7, 179:4, 192:9,	221:24	21:15, 22:6, 22:19,	248:11,248:15,	
193:5, 193:7, 203:8,	house [41] - 38:1,	23:1, 23:4, 23:11,	248:18, 249:10,	
220:20, 220:21,	60:5, 77:14, 103:6,	23:15, 28:8, 28:25,	250:24, 252:2,	<b>I-1</b> [4] - 133:19,
221:18, 242:1,	109:22, 109:24,	29:11, 31:9, 31:11,	252:5, 252:13,	135:11, 137:1
259:10, 260:9,	111:13, 111:14,	20.11, 01.0, 01.11,	252:16, 253:3,	<b>I-16</b> [2] - 290 :12,
				,

290:14	141:15, 149:5,	included [6] - 135:6,	277:13, 277:24	<b>140:7, 140:20</b> , 20
<b>I-2</b> [3] - 223:10,	204:9, 272:25,	163:4, 225:16,	industry [8] - 15:20,	141:7, 141:25,
223:12, 254:17	273:2, 273:4	237:16, 267:7,	83:10, 119:20,	142:8, 142:11,
<b>I-29</b> [1] - 303 :22	impacted [3] - 64:15,	275:16	142:20, 177:24,	142:18, 143:5,
<b>I-34</b> [2] - 134 :22,	187:6, 274:7	includes [2] - 145:10,	204:2, 306:18, 307:5	143:15, 144:6,
223:25	impactful [1] - 275:15	147:17	inexpensive [1] -	144:19, 150:22,
<b>124</b> [7] - 14:2, 18:14,	impacts [1] - 131:19	including [4] - 168:21,	189:2	150:24, 151:1,
18:18, 21:5, 22:23,	impartial [1] - 53:1	233:5, 235:17, 310:2	inference [1] - 227:12	157:14, 167:15,
22:24, 23:22	impeach [1] - 22:18	income [1] - 50:24	inferences [1] - 227 :1	168:20, 172:11,
ice [1] - 319:19	impeachment [3] -	inconceivable [1] -	influence [5] - 81:1,	172:13, 174:23,
Idaho [3] - 258:20,	22:25, 23:14, 100:17	60:19	240:25, 247:1,	175:6, 175:16,
258:25, 259:25	impediments [1] -	incorporated [1] -	267:22, 272:5	178:25, 180:16,
<b>idea</b> [10] - 8:16, 44:8,	213:2	285:10	influenced [4] - 21:9,	180:17, 180:21,
44:11, 61:9, 82:18,	impetus [2] - 86:14,	incorrectly [1] - 185:3	164:1, 295:11,	181:10, 181:11,
90:2, 177:2, 261:12,	86:22	increase [8] - 82:20,	306:17	187:20, 188:3,
265:22, 270:12	implement [1] - 81:14	97:4, 108:10, 146:7,	influences [1] - 159:2	188:24, 190:16,
ideal [10] - 60:14,	implemented [1] -	148:1, 150:5,	informally [1] - 221:17	191:6, 192:9,
65:13, 66:7, 66:16,	298:6	185:11, 185:12	information [35] -	192:10, 196:25,
88:9, 94:14, 112:1,	implementing [1] -	increased [4] -	19:23, 33:8, 40:6,	198:25, 199:2,
122:13, 196:16,	37:4	108:10, 151:13,	41:11, 41:17, 53:15,	199:3, 199:9,
231:19	implying [1] - 230:3	181:17, 181:19	157:11, 157:16,	199:15, 199:16,
ideas [1] - 182:16	important [7] - 230:3	increases [1] - 195:21	158:1, 167:21,	199:18, 200:3,
identical [1] - 64:21	110:3, 154:21,	incredibly [3] - 69:25,	187:9, 222:6,	200:7, 200:21,
identification [2] -	183:6, 221:14,	87:10, 271:5	229:22, 238:16,	201:3, 201:5, 201:6,
94:19, 301:2	275:15, 284:7	independent [2] -	245:6, 255:13,	201:23, 201:25,
identified [4] - 112:18,	impose [1] - 68:3	40:13, 60:8	262:5, 262:12,	209:24, 210:18,
235:20, 238:25,	imposed [2] - 158:8,	independently [1] -	262:16, 265:17,	211:2, 211:12,
310:1	158:25	33:7	270:14, 270:15,	212:13, 213:1,
identify [12] - 62:22,	impossible [4] -	Indian [2] - 299:9,	274:3, 274:5, 275:1,	213:18, 213:20,
111:4, 111:21,	53:24, 54:5, 136:15,	299:11	275:13, 279:16,	215:1, 215:5,
113:11, 128:11,	139:7	Indiana [1] - 148:11	281:5, 281:13,	215:14, 216:9,
190:15, 219:5,	impractical [2] -	indicate [10] - 66:19,	281:14, 293:18,	225:9, 227:5,
240:1, 285:17,	82:15, 230:3	108:17, 157:18,	303:21, 305:23,	228:23, 230:22,
299:12, 300:10,	impression [9] -	158:7, 178:20,	305:24	231:1, 231:9, 245:8,
309:2	59:20, 261:15,	237:10, 240:18,	infrasonic [9] -	245:15,248:21,
identifying [1] - 237:5	261:22, 262:6,	241:13, 244:16	143:23, 164:14,	249:4, 249:6, 251:7,
idiot [1] - 31:24	263:19, 264:19,	indicated [6] - 64:25,	175:9, 188:12,	251:12, 253:14,
IFLN [1] - 210:13	265:16, 268:2, 268:7	67:10, 178:8,	199:4, 199:23,	253:18, 316:25,
ignore [1] - 212:4	impressive [1] -	193:12, 233:12,	213:9, 215:17,	317:1, 317:5
ignored [4] - 143:18,	243:16	246:18	247 :25	infrasounds [5] -
145:24, 209:23,	improper [2] - 21:12,	indicates [1] - 249:3	infrasound [125] -	104:10, 105:4,
226:23	143:21	indicating [1] - 226:17	27:16, 27:23, 71:19,	129:3, 129:19,
ignoring [1] - 210:2	improvement [3] -	indicating ) [1] - 289:6	73:2, 74:1, 74:5,	129:21
<b>III</b> [10] - 1:8, 10:5,	8:21, 62:11, 126:2	indicative [1] - 269:24	75:9,85:15,87:13,	inhabitants [1] - 278:2
18:12, 26:25, 32:11,	improvements [4] -	indirectly [1] - 163:1	88:16,96:13,	inhibit [1] - 182:16
37:6, 37:9, 264:2,	7:20, 9:2, 9:5, 9:7	individual [5] - 83:5,	104:14, 105:18,	initial [3] - 89:23,
264:17,295:12	<b>IN</b> [2] - 1:2, 1:4	177:21, 240:6,	106:19, 108:9,	167:8, 211:10
ILFN [1] - 209:21	in-betweens [1] -	240:9, 306:10	108:12, 108:16,	initializing [1] -
ill [3] - 69:18, 211:4,	177:3	individual 's [1] -	108:18, 119:13,	179:16
282:3	inappropriate [3] -	75:20	119:14, 119:16,	injure [1] - 90:15
illegal [1] - 307:10	53:24, 105:17,	individuals [19] - 5:1,	123:2, 123:18,	inner [2] - 73:10,
Illinois [2] - 136:13,	179:24	8:19, 9:1, 42:11,	124:12, 127:6,	129:20
148:11	inaudible [8] - 55:4,	70:18, 71:19, 77:15,	133:1, 133:8,	input [26] - 8:14, 15:1,
illustrate [1] - 303:2	70:15, 71:19, 90:3,	82:21, 83:7, 83:11,	135:22, 135:23,	15:2, 15:12, 15:18, 15:21 18:1 18:10
illustrated [1] - 187 :23	157:20, 191:23,	192:7, 215:3, 238:7,	135:25, 136:2,	15:21, 18:1, 18:10, 20:3, 20:25, 21:19,
immediately [2] -	247:25,251:8	238:8, 240:3, 240:4,	136:5, 136:8, 136:9, 136:16, 136:18	20:3, 20:23, 21:19, 21:21, 21:25, 22:3,
132:4, 280:18	inches [1] - 189:12	248:8, 249:1, 275:2	136:16, 136:18, 137:12, 137:17	21:21, 21:23, 22:3, 22:16, 22:20, 23:17,
impact [13] - 53:25,	include [4] - 202:6,	induce [1] - 196:3	137:12, 137:17, 130:1, 130:12	44:24, 49:11, 63:1,
64:16,64:24,112:7,	223:17,226:13,	induced [1] - 235:15	139:1, 139:12, 139:21, 140:6,	141:16, 263:20,
112:10, 131:5,	231 :9	industrial [3] - 167:13,	100.21, 140.0,	

265:10, 268:5,	249:1	inversions [1] - 78:13	items [1] - 281:9	<b>287</b> : <b>18</b> , <b>314</b> : <b>6</b> , 21
281:1, 281:4	interject [1] - 262:2	investigate [3] - 19:8,	itself [7] - 20:9, 104:2,	314 :20
inquirer [1] - 91:22	internet [4] - 121:17,	86:21, 159:24	104:5, 104:10,	Jenkins 's [1] - 121:18
insects [1] - 177:9	222:13, 250:21,	investigated [1] -	104:13, 163:7, 163:8	Jerry [3] - 56:5,
inside [10] - 106:25,	251:11	139:6		218:16, 219:6
109:22, 111:13,	interpose [2] - 15:7,	investigation [2] -	J	job [2] - 18:8, 284:19
127:6, 136:14,	302:13	15:4, 211:11	50.40	jobs [1] - 205:2
139:1, 175:17,	interpret [1] - 160:11	investing [1] - 159:25	Jamaica [1] - 58:18	join [1] - 14:13
199:13,230:20,	interpretation [1] -	investors [3] - 266:6,	James [59] - 55:25,	Jones [1] - 256:4
231:7	301:20	296:3, 306:8	56:3, 130:12, 120:12, 120:14	Jorgenson [1] - 15:22
inspection [1] -	interrupt [3] - 100:11,	invited [1] - 50:10	130:13, 130:14, 130:15, 130:24,	journal [4] - 95:2,
259:21	217:11, 219:24	involve [1] - 59:7	131:2, 131:3, 132:1,	168:16, 222:14,
install [1] - 256:1	interrupted [1] -	involved [32] - 3:23,	133:15, 135:18,	238:2
installed [1] - 222:7	158:19	6:24, 15:11, 15:17,	141:21, 144:18,	journals [1] - 160:11
instance [10] - 80:20,	interrupting [1] -	15:20, 16:8, 18:1,	150:20, 156:2,	judge [1] - 207:14
118:6, 125:24,	262:1	121:23, 148:12,	156:5, 156:15,	judgment [2] - 64:15,
205:17, 233:22, 234:23, 235:3,	Intervener [1] - 260:3	178:18, 182:3,	156:18, 161:14,	69:12
234:23, 235:3, 239:10, 239:18,	intervening [1] -	198:19, 219:21, 210:22, 220:7	165:9, 165:16,	judicial [1] - 282:23
239.10, 239.18, 278:9	131:10	219:22, 220:7, 220:17, 221:14,	165:24, 166:9,	<b>July</b> [8] - 266:3,
instances [3] - 56:2,	Intervenor [11] - 56:21, 58:15, 68:15,	220.17, 221.14, 222:9, 222:16,	166:12, 167:9,	267:11, 267:13, 267:15, 267:10
65:24, 309:16	82:4, 111:11,	234:16, 240:4,	169:12, 170:2,	267:15,267:19, 268:8,269:22,
instead [5] - 31:23,	112:17, 120:19,	242:25, 255:8,	170:15, 171:6,	208.0, 209.22, 279:23
117:18, 142:21,	130:9, 254:7, 260:5,	255:10, 256:18,	171:8, 180:1, 180:4,	jump [1] - 228:1
189:17, 231:10	304:13	271:24, 280:9,	182:22, 182:25,	June [4] - 259:14,
instructor [1] - 221:1	Intervenor 's [1] -	280:16, 284:5,	187:12, 198:5,	263:25, 264:17,
instrument [3] -	112:21	292:15, 319:18	202:10,205:15,	265:8
55:14, 137:12,	Intervenors [18] -	involvement [2] -	206:8, 206:9,	Jurgens [14] - 16:4,
139:16	1:17, 3:7, 29:4,	292:13, 294:3	206:14, 207:9,	17:14, 18:1, 18:18,
instrumentation [3] -	68:13, 82:11,	involving [3] - 134:1,	208:9, 217:9,	19:13, 20:4, 20:24,
104:16, 105:20,	130:12, 179:15,	134:6, 249:13	217:16, 218:10,	21:23, 22:16, 23:7,
106:7	218:16, 223:25,	ionosphere [1] -	220:18, 223:19, 226:7, 227:19,	23:18, 61:9, 290:10,
instruments [6] -	224:1, 224:4, 224:5,	215:24	229:3, 233:18,	291 :23
59:12, 178:24,	257:23,273:15,	lowa [1] - 148:11	237:14, 238:10,	jurisdictions [4] -
187:22, 188:3,	274:23, 275:22,	Iraq [1] - 144:5	244:16, 247:13,	95:13, 95:25, 126:4,
188:4, 195:6	286:18, 310:2	Ireland [1] - 255:24	255:9	207 :23
insufficient [1] -	interviewed [3] -	irrelevant [3] - 68:1,	James 's [5] - 168:9,	justifiable [1] - 206:2
217:25	221:16, 238:8,	85:24, 279:21	170:19, 241:25,	
insulted [1] - 286:19	238:22	irreparably [1] -	242:24, 244:8	K
intelligence [3] -	interviewing [3] -	121:11	January [4] - 95:2,	<b>Karen</b> [4] - 1:13, 1:20,
26:14, 28:16, 29:17	238:7, 238:14,	irritate [1] - 117:19	258:22, 259:5, 297:9	30:15, 31:3
intend [2] - 171:20,	238:20	<b>ISO</b> [1] - 196:12	Jeff [1] - 142:25	<b>Karen 's</b> [2] - 30:5,
287:25	interviews [1] - 238:13	<b>issue</b> [23] - 63:24,	Jenkins [17] - 1:20,	43:14
intensity [1] - 199:25	intimately [1] - 182:3	69:6, 72:5, 73:9,	31:9, 46:3, 51:10,	<b>Katlyn</b> [1] - 180:6
intention [2] - 270:3,	intimidating [1] - 306:9	73:24, 75:9, 77:23,	97:13, 100:10,	<b>keep</b> [3] - 131:15,
270:4		123:23, 131:20,	100:19, 102:1,	153:7, 286:14
interactions [1] - 291 :22	introduce [8] - 3:18, 34:20, 52:23,	132:20, 142:8, 147:24, 171:20	111:11, 126:22,	keeps [1] - 90:12
<b>interest</b> [3] - 221:9,	130:24, 181:23,	147:24, 171:20, 188:7, 203:25,	171:23, 174:12,	<b>Keith</b> [6] - 34:14,
221:10, 221:13	218:24, 258:6,	219:20, 222:5,	208:14, 253:3,	34:15, 34:22, 43:7,
interested [6] - 8:4,	288:15	219.20, 222.3, 226:7, 235:20,	273:8, 287:7, 314:4	46:2, 46:17
132:20, 272:3,	introduced [2] -	243:2, 249:9,	<b>JENKINS</b> [24] - 31:10,	Kelli [1] - 1:21
293:5, 294:18, 304:2	149:24, 153:2	256:11, 314:14	46:5, 46:13, 51:11,	<b>Kelly</b> [8] - 141:6,
interesting [7] -	introducing [1] -	<b>issues</b> [14] - 7:20,	97:15, 101:1, 102:3,	142:13, 143:3,
114:21, 115:20,	100:20	26:24, 27:2, 27:3,	102:10, 103:18,	168:4, 168:6,
116:4, 125:4,	introduction [1] -	27:8, 27:9, 54:11,	126:23, 127:2, 128:20, 174:13	168:10, 168:11,
143:13, 221:11,	118:5	131:14, 131:25,	128:20, 174:13, 208:15, 253:4	244:18
221:15	intuitively [1] - 185:13	170:4, 216:2, 218:1,	208:15, 253:4, 273:10, 273:12,	Kelly 's [2] - 43:14,
interests [1] - 276:5	Invenergy [3] - 166:5,	236:1, 260:18	273:20, 277:15,	168:15
interfere [2] - 248:8,	241:17, 248:14	issuing [1] - 32:23	287:8, 287:10,	kept [1] - 31:3
	1	1	207.0, 207.10,	

kickoff [1] - 180:8	250:11	262:21, 265:2,	212:14, 269:7	lesion [2] - 235:7 22
kid [1] - 204:3	laboratory [2] - 55:2,	269:2, 269:5, 277:6,	learned [4] - 160:1,	less [17] - 40:11,
<b>kids</b> [2] - 115:2, 115:8	180:25	277:7,277:11,	196:19, 252:25,	106:2, 106:6,
kilometers [3] -	labs [1] - 193:25	277 :24	270:5	124:14, 125:8,
199:18, 211:19,	lack [9] - 262:11,	largely [2] - 66:21,	learning [3] - 35:25,	131:20, 138:18,
232:2	262:20,270:14,	68:1	117:13, 319:19	154:18, 187:25,
kind [48] - 9:11, 10:7,	274:3, 275:5, 275:8,	larger [5] - 168:13,	leases [1] - 303:16	188:20, 195:8,
10:10, 27:13, 43:21,	279:16, 281:5	200:16,265:12,	least [17] - 30:15,	196:1, 221:17,
44:5, 54:10, 58:24,	lacking [1] - 281:6	265:22	40:18, 44:20, 79:23,	240:20, 281:25,
59:25, 61:15, 62:6,	lady [1] - 253:14	largest [1] - 80:8	96:23, 112:13,	310:21, 318:18
62:8, 71:4, 71:7,	laid [6] - 14:8, 19:7,	last [34] - 4:6, 17:15,	113:8, 116:23,	letter [7] - 275:11,
72:18, 73:21, 75:7,	19:8, 19:17, 21:8,	18:6, 33:6, 41:5,	135:3, 153:25,	311:21, 311:22,
79:6, 82:4, 87:1,	21:13	41:6, 68:10, 70:11,	176:21, 225:13,	311:24, 312:22,
96:24,98:21,	lake [2] - 210:20,	71:15, 91:14, 95:21,	255:19, 255:21,	312:23, 313:2
104:24, 106:12,	277 :2	102:14, 107:15,	257:20, 262:17,	letters [2] - 254:15,
110:9, 121:2, 133:1,	Lake [4] - 210:21,	126:12, 162:8,	281:14	280:20
138:8, 177:13,	276:25, 277:1	163:17, 163:22,	leave [5] - 20:23,	level [84] - 25:17, 26:2,
182:18, 191:19,	LAmax [2] - 56:9,	167:7,168:18,	70:25, 174:5, 193:7,	55:17, 55:19, 56:9,
205:10,213:22,	231:10	181:17, 196:23,	230:3	56:17, 57:21, 58:1,
220:16, 223:1,	laminar [1] - 94:1	196:24,219:17,	leaves [2] - 127:24,	58:6, 58:11, 58:21,
223:4, 226:8, 228:1,	land [34] - 50:22,	254:21,259:18,	127 :25	59:12, 60:5, 62:1,
261:15, 264:8,	258:9, 284:4,	260:21,268:10,	leaving [5] - 33:18,	62:3, 62:6, 64:18,
267:20,276:22,	285:19,288:24,	281:17,288:23,	151:23, 193:5,	64:21,65:5,65:17,
286:4, 294:21,	288:25, 289:9,	297:9,297:14,	220:21, 221:18	65:23,66:14,77:13,
299:4, 311:14,	289:12,289:15,	299:20, 302:3,	lectures [1] - 221:2	79:9, 79:25, 81:1,
318:24	290:1, 290:19,	312:19	led [3] - 132:25,	85:8,85:10,85:12,
kinds [3] - 128:2,	291:15, 298:25,	late [3] - 131:6, 132:7,	143:22, 280:25	93:22, 94:9, 97:5,
228:23, 246:25	299:1, 299:6, 299:8,	220:11	left [15] - 49:13, 71:1,	102:6, 108:10,
kitchen [1] - 72:20	299:9,299:10,	lately [1] - 29:19	90:12, 108:4, 109:4,	111:2, 111:20,
<b>knowing</b> [3] - 196:18,	299:11, 299:24,	latest [3] - 101:6,	131:9, 137:13,	120:17, 122:12,
232:1, 285:14	300:11, 300:22,	112:16, 279:14	137:18, 150:11,	125:9, 126:8, 126:9,
knowledge [15] - 6:16,	305:3, 305:6,	latitude [1] - 100:16	150:13, 168:8,	126:10, 128:14,
6:21, 18:13, 23:19,	306:24, 306:25,	law [11] - 91:7, 91:8,	181:5, 245:2,	145:21, 147:24,
27:7, 59:23, 74:10,	307:1, 317:22,	91:16, 91:18, 91:19,	267:19, 299:9	148:1, 149:4, 149:6,
120:15, 144:9,	318:12, 319:23,	256:15, 270:2,	left-hand [2] - 168:8,	149:11, 152:18,
168:15, 169:11,	319:25, 320:1	298:7, 307:13,	245:2	152:19, 153:25,
174:2, 244:1,	landowner [2] -	309:23, 309:24	legal [14] - 51:16,	175:2, 184:6,
262:21, 281:2	300:11, 301:15	laws [3] - 284:20,	90:17,90:24,	185:18, 185:19, 180:15, 102:0
<b>known</b> [9] - 4:9, 15:13,	landowners [11] -	307:19,318:15	151:18, 159:10,	189:15, 192:9, 102:10, 102:12
55:2, 74:7, 87:1,	15:23, 15:25,	lawsuit [2] - 152:1,	250:13, 250:24,	192:10, 192:12, 104:2, 105:20
97:7, 141:5, 158:24,	198:14,240:19,	152:8	255:1, 255:4, 255:7,	194:3, 195:20, 196:22, 200:21,
221:5	291:10, 295:24,	lawsuits [1] - 132:16	255:20, 256:9,	202:21, 204:11,
<b>knows</b> [2] - 195:4,	296:2, 300:9,	lawyer [1] - 250:9	266:5, 313:14	213:5, 215:5,
255:10	300:21, 300:25,	<b>lay</b> [3] - 3:7, 173:25,	legally [2] - 4:14,	216:12, 229:8,
Krakatoa [1] - 200:1	301:8	309:25	307:7	229:18, 230:1,
Kristen [1] - 1:23	lands [5] - 48:20,	layer [1] - 195:25	legislative [2] -	230:4, 232:13,
<b>KRISTIE</b> [1] - 1:10	48:21, 50:18, 51:4,	layers [1] - 216:7	282:22, 284:18	246:19, 246:20,
<b>Kristie</b> [1] - 253:12	114:1 <b>language</b> [9] - 11:7,	laying [1] - 109:10	legislator [1] - 282:21	269:13, 273:22,
		layout [1] - 271:17	legislature [1] -	286:12, 307:24,
L	11:17, 12:12, 12:21, 14:10, 67:10, 95:22,	layperson [1] - 183:9	284:19	308:19, 310:14
<b>L10</b> [2] - 125:13,	167:19, 222:20	lead [1] - 78:4	length [1] - 274:11 lengthy [1] - 202:14	level 's [2] - 62:5,
154 :23	Lansing [1] - 143:25	leading [4] - 20:22,	lenient [1] - 202.14	184:8
<b>L90</b> [6] - 85:7, 85:12,	laptop [1] - 233:9	20:23, 276:13, 204:21	LEQ [11] - 154:7,	levels [51] - 54:10,
125:3, 125:10, 147:6	large [21] - 25:12,	294:21 leads [1] - 146:16	154:20, 155:22,	57:22, 58:3, 59:17,
Lab [1] - 196:4	25:20, 26:2, 74:18,	leaf [2] - 194:4, 196:3	178:1, 211:6, 228:6,	60:11, 64:25, 67:25,
lab [1] - 182:13	74:22, 144:8, 144:9,	lean [3] - 66:7, 205:11,	228:11, 228:21,	80:4, 93:3, 93:18,
labeled [3] - 147:6,	186:20, 212:15,	213:22	229:4, 229:8, 229:23	93:20, 102:5,
254:7, 254:14	216:21, 238:18,	leaning [1] - 242:14	Leq [1] - 125:13	105:15, 105:16,
labels [2] - 162:2,	256:4, 261:4,	learn [4] - 35:7, 35:9,	LEQS [1] - 147:7	112:20, 125:20,
	, - ,	icani [4] - 00.7, 00.8,		

126:5, 132:21,	93:10, 95:12, 186:2,	274:6, 296:3, 296:17	243:3, 243:9,	<b>55:13, 65:22, 70:13,</b> 23
141:2, 145:9, 146:8,	198:12	lived [5] - 55:3,	243:18, 245:1,	73:22, 79:2, 85:10,
147:14, 148:3,	line [22] - 19:24, 26:1,	117:14, 258:18,	252:12, 260:23,	85:15, 85:25, 87:8,
154:20, 157:9,	133:24, 139:10,	258:25, 288:19	270:21, 274:16,	87:10, 87:12, 88:16,
158:25, 163:25,	145:3, 155:11,	lives [5] - 116:9,	274:25,275:17,	93:5, 96:13, 104:24,
175:24, 183:7,	158:9, 158:21,	122:11, 259:16,	277:3, 277:9, 278:9,	106:6, 106:11,
184:19, 187:3,	202:18, 202:22,	260:16, 320:15	283:4, 290:12,	110:12, 113:17,
187:5, 194:13,	203:9, 237:4,	living [10] - 77:16,	298:14, 299:14	114:18, 115:9,
199:13,202:20,	243:15, 289:5,	90:16, 123:8,	looked [27] - 18:25,	122:12, 124:24,
210:25, 211:6,	299:21, 304:5,	137:16, 150:15,	29:18, 32:1, 36:3,	126:1, 136:6,
214:25, 229:20,	304:9,316:11,	258:23, 259:19,	37:5, 37:8, 38:20,	143:14, 144:13,
231:20, 232:1,	319:17, 319:21,	259:22,288:21,	40:4, 40:7, 40:8,	154:1, 156:1,
232:10,233:22,	320:3	295:20	40:9,44:15,54:10,	157:14, 209:24,
246:6, 247:1, 247:2,	lines [11] - 49:23,	LLC [4] - 1:3, 3:3,	93:12,98:18,	210:2, 212:7,
247:5, 247:9,	73:8, 137:24,	166:5, 241:17	101:13, 103:14,	212:12, 215:25,
247:20,270:13,	158:22, 172:3,	LMACS [1] - 154:22	112:8, 112:12,	228:17, 231:8,
316:16	187:24, 191:1,	Lmax [3] - 56:14,	143:19, 147:3,	245:10,245:14,
Leventhal [1] - 142:25	236:24, 273:23,	125:14, 198:12	154:8, 190:3,	248:22
Lewis [1] - 277:1	298:23,319:9	lobbying [1] - 229:13	266:23, 294:16,	lower [8] - 108:4,
library [1] - 222:2	link [8] - 70:5, 70:6,	local [2] - 152:7,	299:4, 319:13	109:4, 125:24,
licensed [7] - 159:14,	70:12, 73:5, 120:22,	182:11	<b>looking</b> [43] - 8:6, 9:5,	167:4, 220:19,
160:4, 234:8,	120:23, 217:25,	locate [1] - 41:7	9:10, 18:22, 21:4,	229:3, 231:9, 243:5
234:14,234:15,	225:9	located [3] - 7:13,	23:21, 26:1, 31:24,	lows [1] - 177:2
234:19, 288:22	linked [1] - 142:8	176:25, 206:23	33:6, 37:9, 39:1,	loyal [1] - 285:17
licensing [1] - 234:11	lion 's [1] - 285:16	location [2] - 76:16,	40:20, 41:6, 84:3,	loyalty [1] - 285:7
<b>lie</b> [2] - 79:3, 79:17	lips [1] - 219:25	185 :20	93:22, 96:5, 97:17,	lunch [5] - 120:1,
life [4] - 195:11,	Lisa [2] - 1:15, 1:17	locations [7] - 59:9,	100:1, 105:13,	120:4, 120:5, 130:3,
203:18, 280:5,	<b>list</b> [5] - 40:15, 96:10,	59:10, 59:11, 59:13,	112:15, 112:19, 137:23, 154:19,	130:5
292:17	223:11, 233:11,	66:13, 266:17	155:24, 158:22,	lung [2] - 307:6, 307:12
lifelong [1] - 221:9	241:21	lodgod (4) 66:10		
lifestule un 004.0		lodged [1] - 66:10		001.12
lifestyle [1] - 204:6	listed [2] - 161:25,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8	162:6, 162:13,	
light [3] - 137:24,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23,	M
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21	listed <sub>[2]</sub> - 161:25, 311:6 listen <sub>[4]</sub> - 42:14, 71:9,	log [2] - 128 :9, 242 :8 logarithmic [1] - 185 :5 logarithms [1] -	162:6, 162:13,	
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11,	М
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14,	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8,	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3	log [2] - 128 :9, 242 :8 logarithmic [1] - 185 :5 logarithms [1] - 183 :20 long -term [11] - 57 :12, 58 :9, 58 :21, 94 :4, 145 :5, 146 :12,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24,	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3 listening [5] - 111:22,	log [2] - 128 :9, 242 :8 logarithmic [1] - 185 :5 logarithms [1] - 183 :20 long -term [11] - 57 :12, 58 :9, 58 :21, 94 :4, 145 :5, 146 :12, 152 :21, 154 :5,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12,	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21,	log [2] - 128 :9, 242 :8 logarithmic [1] - 185 :5 logarithms [1] - 183 :20 long -term [11] - 57 :12, 58 :9, 58 :21, 94 :4, 145 :5, 146 :12, 152 :21, 154 :5, 154 :7, 154 :14,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13,	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3,	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long-term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listener [1] - 164:3 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 looks [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 looming [1] - 286:8 lose [1] - 114:14	<b>M</b> ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6,	listed $[2] - 161:25$ , 311:6 listen $[4] - 42:14$ , $71:9$ , 150:6, $170:11listened [2] - 114:3,314:15listener [1] - 164:3listening [5] - 111:22,135:18$ , $150:21$ , 244:9, $295:7listing [1] - 226:13lit [1] - 307:9literally [1] - 189:21literature [12] - 46:21,$	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 looks [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 looming [1] - 286:8 lose [1] - 114:14 losing [1] - 220:14	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25,	listed $[2] - 161:25$ , 311:6 listen $[4] - 42:14$ , $71:9$ , 150:6, $170:11listened [2] - 114:3,314:15listening [5] - 111:22,135:18$ , $150:21$ , 244:9, $295:7listing [1] - 226:13lit [1] - 307:9literally [1] - 189:21literature [12] - 46:21,72:7$ , $74:15$ , $166:25$ ,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 looks [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 looming [1] - 286:8 lose [1] - 114:14 losing [1] - 220:14 loss [11] - 124:20,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation [2] - 264:25,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation [2] - 264:25, 265:5	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation [2] - 264:25, 265:5 live [21] - 3:20, 5:14,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15, 249:4, 313:9	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15, 153:21, 231:18	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation [2] - 264:25, 265:5 live [21] - 3:20, 5:14, 117:20, 117:23,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21, 164:17, 164:21,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15, 249:4, 313:9 <b>lost</b> [1] - 225:17	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23, 22:13, 61:7, 241:24,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15, 153:21, 231:18 limitations [3] - 27:22,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation [2] - 264:25, 265:5 live [21] - 3:20, 5:14, 117:20, 117:23, 118:4, 146:18,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21, 164:17, 164:21, 167:7, 168:2, 168:7,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15, 249:4, 313:9 <b>lost</b> [1] - 225:17 <b>loud</b> [4] - 11:3, 21:6,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23, 22:13, 61:7, 241:24, 241:25, 242:4
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15, 153:21, 231:18 limitations [3] - 27:22, 228:3, 231:16	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation [2] - 264:25, 265:5 live [21] - 3:20, 5:14, 117:20, 117:23, 118:4, 146:18, 152:11, 159:1,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21, 164:17, 164:21, 167:7, 168:2, 168:7, 169:4, 169:9,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15, 249:4, 313:9 <b>lost</b> [1] - 225:17 <b>loud</b> [4] - 11:3, 21:6, 77:11, 149:5	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23, 22:13, 61:7, 241:24,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15, 153:21, 231:18 limitations [3] - 27:22, 228:3, 231:16 limited [4] - 108:10,	listed [2] - 161:25, 311:6 listen [4] - 42:14, 71:9, 150:6, 170:11 listened [2] - 114:3, 314:15 listening [5] - 111:22, 135:18, 150:21, 244:9, 295:7 listing [1] - 226:13 lit [1] - 307:9 literally [1] - 189:21 literature [12] - 46:21, 72:7, 74:15, 166:25, 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation [2] - 264:25, 265:5 live [21] - 3:20, 5:14, 117:20, 117:23, 118:4, 146:18, 152:11, 159:1, 219:6, 239:14,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21, 164:17, 164:21, 167:7, 168:2, 168:7, 169:4, 169:9, 181:18, 181:21,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 220:14 <b>loss</b> [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15, 249:4, 313:9 <b>lost</b> [1] - 225:17 <b>loud</b> [4] - 11:3, 21:6, 77:11, 149:5 <b>love</b> [4] - 117:12,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23, 22:13, 61:7, 241:24, 241:25, 242:4 mails [2] - 21:21,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15, 153:21, 231:18 limitations [3] - 27:22, 228:3, 231:16 limited [4] - 108:10, 182:19, 202:5, 252:6	listed $[2] - 161:25$ , 311:6 listen $[4] - 42:14$ , $71:9$ , 150:6, $170:11listened [2] - 114:3,314:15listening [5] - 111:22,135:18$ , $150:21$ , 244:9, $295:7listing [1] - 226:13lit [1] - 307:9literally [1] - 189:21literally [1] - 189:21literature [12] - 46:21,72:7, 74:15, 166:25$ , 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation $[2] - 264:25$ , 265:5 live $[21] - 3:20, 5:14$ , 117:20, 117:23, 118:4, 146:18, 152:11, 159:1, 219:6, 239:14, 258:7, 259:15,	log $[2] - 128:9, 242:8$ logarithmic $[1] - 185:5$ logarithms $[1] - 185:5$ logarithms $[1] - 183:20$ long -term $[11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14$ look $[62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21, 164:17, 164:21, 167:7, 168:2, 168:7, 169:4, 169:9, 181:18, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 181:21, 181$	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 looks [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 looming [1] - 286:8 lose [1] - 114:14 losing [1] - 220:14 loss [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15, 249:4, 313:9 lost [1] - 225:17 loud [4] - 11:3, 21:6, 77:11, 149:5 love [4] - 117:12, 276:19, 283:17,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23, 22:13, 61:7, 241:24, 241:25, 242:4 mails [2] - 21:21, 151:8
light $[3] - 137:24$ , 307:7, 307:21 lights $[1] - 305:11$ likely $[6] - 64:15$ , 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit $[31] - 23:18, 54:8$ , 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation $[8] - 20:24$ , 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15, 153:21, 231:18 limitations $[3] - 27:22$ , 228:3, 231:16 limited $[4] - 108:10$ , 182:19, 202:5, 252:6 limiteded $[1] - 42:6$	listed $[2] - 161:25$ , 311:6 listen $[4] - 42:14$ , $71:9$ , 150:6, $170:11listened [2] - 114:3,314:15listening [5] - 111:22,135:18$ , $150:21$ , 244:9, $295:7listing [1] - 226:13lit [1] - 307:9literally [1] - 189:21literature [12] - 46:21,72:7, 74:15, 166:25$ , 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation $[2] - 264:25$ , 265:5 live $[21] - 3:20, 5:14$ , 117:20, 117:23, 118:4, 146:18, 152:11, 159:1, 219:6, 239:14, 259:23, 259:25,	log [2] - 128:9, 242:8 logarithmic [1] - 185:5 logarithms [1] - 183:20 long -term [11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14 look [62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21, 164:17, 164:21, 167:7, 168:2, 168:7, 169:4, 169:9, 181:18, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 192:20, 202:1,	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 <b>looks</b> [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 <b>looming</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 114:14 <b>losing</b> [1] - 286:8 <b>lose</b> [1] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:2, 235:11, 235:24, 313:9 <b>lost</b> [1] - 225:17 <b>loud</b> [4] - 11:3, 21:6, 77:11, 149:5 <b>love</b> [4] - 117:12, 276:19, 283:17, 321:22	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23, 22:13, 61:7, 241:24, 241:25, 242:4 mails [2] - 21:21, 151:8 main [3] - 15:19,
light [3] - 137:24, 307:7, 307:21 lights [1] - 305:11 likely [6] - 64:15, 226:2, 226:4, 240:20, 269:16 limit [31] - 23:18, 54:8, 56:8, 57:9, 57:10, 60:4, 60:9, 61:15, 62:8, 63:4, 66:2, 66:4, 67:25, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 85:6, 85:23, 86:2, 86:6, 87:22, 88:8, 92:25, 106:1, 106:16, 113:14, 149:8, 158:8, 183:23, 210:4, 316:7 limitation [8] - 20:24, 24:12, 25:20, 41:21, 42:1, 152:15, 153:21, 231:18 limitations [3] - 27:22, 228:3, 231:16 limited [4] - 108:10, 182:19, 202:5, 252:6	listed $[2] - 161:25$ , 311:6 listen $[4] - 42:14$ , $71:9$ , 150:6, $170:11listened [2] - 114:3,314:15listening [5] - 111:22,135:18$ , $150:21$ , 244:9, $295:7listing [1] - 226:13lit [1] - 307:9literally [1] - 189:21literally [1] - 189:21literature [12] - 46:21,72:7, 74:15, 166:25$ , 171:13, 222:13, 225:22, 232:3, 239:3, 243:25, 251:17, 320:12 litigation $[2] - 264:25$ , 265:5 live $[21] - 3:20, 5:14$ , 117:20, 117:23, 118:4, 146:18, 152:11, 159:1, 219:6, 239:14, 258:7, 259:15,	log $[2] - 128:9, 242:8$ logarithmic $[1] - 185:5$ logarithms $[1] - 185:5$ logarithms $[1] - 183:20$ long -term $[11] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:7, 154:14, 260:14$ look $[62] - 6:17, 24:17, 25:3, 32:21, 33:3, 37:11, 40:14, 58:16, 62:16, 62:19, 86:18, 92:17, 95:25, 98:11, 100:24, 119:19, 122:1, 137:7, 137:20, 138:2, 138:3, 138:11, 147:12, 155:11, 161:22, 162:21, 163:14, 163:21, 164:17, 164:21, 167:7, 168:2, 168:7, 169:4, 169:9, 181:18, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 163:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 187:4, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 181:21, 183:2, 187:4, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 183:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, 181:21, $	162:6, 162:13, 163:20, 170:23, 171:7, 191:11, 192:5, 209:14, 209:15, 213:8, 223:11, 236:24, 237:10, 243:12, 252:23, 283:13, 283:20, 295:23 looks [9] - 6:4, 12:22, 95:13, 98:7, 112:9, 140:15, 148:3, 154:23, 311:22 looming [1] - 286:8 lose [1] - 114:14 losing [1] - 220:14 loss [11] - 124:20, 220:6, 220:9, 221:10, 234:23, 235:2, 235:11, 235:14, 235:15, 249:4, 313:9 lost [1] - 225:17 loud [4] - 11:3, 21:6, 77:11, 149:5 love [4] - 117:12, 276:19, 283:17,	M ma'am [1] - 47:14 machine [6] - 73:21, 78:19, 111:9, 177:17, 186:13, 193:20 machinery [2] - 24:20, 114:12 machines [9] - 132:8, 185:2, 185:10, 185:16, 185:22, 185:24, 186:10, 187:1, 187:3 magazine [1] - 222:19 magnitude [4] - 69:24, 107:11, 111:5, 186:20 mail [12] - 18:18, 18:21, 19:4, 19:13, 19:21, 19:23, 21:23, 22:13, 61:7, 241:24, 241:25, 242:4 mails [2] - 21:21, 151:8 main [3] - 15:19, 30:20, 127:11

97:20, 98:4, 98:7,	master 's [2] - 219:2,	190:20, 203:3,	147:2, 155:15,	<b>278</b> :5, <b>279</b> : <b>22</b> , 24
98:19, 100:21,	219:11	204:19	176:10, 177:5,	291:25, 292:5,
103:9, 121:19,	matched [1] - 14:11	<b>meant</b> [3] - 37:9,	177:8, 177:11,	292:8, 292:17,
136:12, 182:4	matches [3] - 12:12,	54:10, 299:16	177:12, 193:10,	292:18, 295:6,
maintain [1] - 284:11	278:11, 278:14	measurable [3] -	222:17, 234:3,	295:7, 295:8,
maintained [2] - 15:8,	materials [2] - 207:7,	139:1, 139:13,	234:5, 234:7	295:18, 304:23,
218:6	207:9	215:22	measures [3] - 189:6,	304:25, 306:5,
maintenance [2] -	<b>math</b> [3] - 214:18,	measure [29] - 55:14,	189:10, 189:18	306:7, 306:10,
128:5, 128:11	291:18, 291:21	56:19, 59:9, 66:12,	measuring [14] -	306:14, 319:1
<b>major</b> [4] - 131:13,	<b>matter</b> [17] - 2:2, 3:3,	72:23, 76:6, 76:22,	119:13, 139:18,	meetings [46] - 13:6,
181:2, 197:2, 227:10	38:11, 64:18, 71:10,	85:7, 94:6, 106:6,	140:19, 140:20,	17:22, 37:14, 37:18,
<b>majority</b> [3] - 176:8,	131:12, 133:16,	106:9, 106:14,	140:21, 140:22,	37:22, 37:25, 39:15,
295:19, 295:21	143:15, 143:16,	106:24, 107:3,	148:23, 172:13,	39:16, 42:10, 43:25,
maladies [2] - 236:5,	152:8, 218:19,	109:9, 109:21,	175:10, 175:13,	44:24, 44:25, 45:1,
238:25	223:8, 225:5, 233:5,	119:14, 125:6,	177:7, 189:17,	45:3, 46:7, 46:19,
Malcom [1] - 201:21	251:9, 296:7, 321:8	133:8, 137:12,	189:22, 214:23	49:12, 51:23, 51:24,
managed [1] - 133:7	<b>MATTER</b> [1] - 1:2	141:25, 153:21,	mechanical [1] -	52:2, 52:3, 151:24,
manager [3] - 16:5,	matters [7] - 36:23,	153:23, 153:24,	204 :21	261:8, 261:11,
259:1, 259:8	36:24, 67:20, 174:1,	187:20, 188:4,	mechanisms [1] -	261:13, 262:3,
managers [1] - 297:7	238:3, 238:4, 297:18	189:14, 191:9,	167:17	262:16, 262:17,
maneuver [1] - 282:23	max [7] - 122:4, 228:7,	210:23	medical [24] - 69:12,	262:20, 263:7,
manner [3] - 94:1,	230:6, 230:17,	measured [33] - 56:11,	69:13, 84:9, 159:11,	263:9, 263:15,
168:17, 170:4	230:18, 230:19,	57:12, 58:6, 58:17,	160:11, 160:20,	263:22, 265:6,
manuals [1] - 319:19	230:20	64:19, 71:3, 73:1,	160:24, 161:2,	267:25, 268:3,
map [22] - 49:19,	maximize [1] - 82:20	105:16, 105:19,	161:7, 170:5, 170:9,	268:8, 286:17,
59:10, 93:13, 103:5,	maximized [1] -	106:5, 108:9,	171:2, 171:11,	294:16, 294:19,
103:6, 266:13,	215:14	109:17, 112:1,	172:2, 173:13,	294:25, 295:1,
266:22, 267:1,	maximum [3] - 59:12,	127:6, 127:8,	173:18, 192:6,	299:2, 310:13,
267:4, 267:6, 267:7,	154:20, 232:13	132:22, 135:23,	226:12, 235:5,	311:1, 311:5
271:19, 280:4,	McBain [1] - 207:2	135:25, 136:2,	236:1, 236:2,	megawatt [1] - 128:9
		400.7 400.0 400.7	000 00 040 00	mogowette (4) 71.04
283:4, 289:3,	McComsey [1] - 1:24	136:7, 136:9, 138:7,	238:22, 243:20,	megawatts [1] - 71:24
283:4, 289:3, 298:23, 299:3,	McComsey [1] - 1:24 McDonnell [2] - 63:25,	140:1, 152:14,	238:22, 243:20, 251:3	member [1] - 22:2
		140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15	
298:23, 299:3,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9,	251:3	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19,
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24,	<b>McDonnell</b> [2] - 63:25, 93:10	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20,
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22	McDonnell         [2] - 63:25,           93:10         McGinnis         [6] - 264:2,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 <b>maps</b> [3] - 49:18,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 measurement [31] -	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8,	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25,
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 <b>maps</b> [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1,	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23,	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 <b>maps</b> [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 <b>March</b> [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4,	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] -
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22,	member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8,
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11, 166:2, 217:20,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11, 166:2, 217:20, 220:13, 222:5,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11, 166:2, 217:20, 220:13, 222:5, 233:12, 238:20,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11, 166:2, 217:20, 220:13, 222:5, 233:12, 238:20, 255:16, 272:25,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13	$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11, 166:2, 217:20, 220:13, 222:5, 233:12, 238:20, 255:16, 272:25, 281:9, 315:3,</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11, 166:2, 217:20, 220:13, 222:5, 233:12, 238:20, 255:16, 272:25, 281:9, 315:3, 315:10, 319:17</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10,	<pre>member [1] - 22:2 members [8] - 5:17, 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, 265:11, 265:20, 266:4, 285:25 memory [3] - 29:25, 98:20, 127:16 men [1] - 114:14 mentioned [23] - 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, 118:16, 127:11, 166:2, 217:20, 220:13, 222:5, 233:12, 238:20, 255:16, 272:25, 281:9, 315:3, 315:10, 319:17 mentions [1] - 163:5</pre>
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22 mask [2] - 194:4,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22,	member       [1] - 22:2         members       [8] - 5:17,         18:9, 36:16, 262:19,         265:11, 265:20,         266:4, 285:25         memory         [3] - 29:25,         98:20, 127:16         men         [1] - 114:14         mentioned         [23] -         14:25, 16:4, 45:8,         47:11, 47:20, 64:9,         69:24, 72:18, 86:9,         118:16, 127:11,         166:2, 217:20,         220:13, 222:5,         233:12, 238:20,         255:16, 272:25,         281:9, 315:3,         315:10, 319:17         mentions       [1] - 163:5         mercury       [1] - 189:12
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22 mask [2] - 194:4, 210:25	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23, 314:11	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18, 194:9, 207:15	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22, 267:9, 267:10,	member       [1] - 22:2         members       [8] - 5:17,         18:9, 36:16, 262:19,         265:11, 265:20,         266:4, 285:25         memory         [3] - 29:25,         98:20, 127:16         men         [1] - 114:14         mentioned         [23] -         14:25, 16:4, 45:8,         47:11, 47:20, 64:9,         69:24, 72:18, 86:9,         118:16, 127:11,         166:2, 217:20,         220:13, 222:5,         233:12, 238:20,         255:16, 272:25,         281:9, 315:3,         315:10, 319:17         mentions       [1] - 163:5         mercury       [1] - 189:12         merely       [3] - 20:11,
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22 mask [2] - 194:4, 210:25 masking [1] - 147:19	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23, 314:11 meaning [3] - 128:6,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18, 194:9, 207:15 <b>measurement</b> 's [1] -	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22,	member       [1] - 22:2         members       [8] - 5:17,         18:9, 36:16, 262:19,         265:11, 265:20,         266:4, 285:25         memory       [3] - 29:25,         98:20, 127:16         men       [1] - 114:14         mentioned       [23] -         14:25, 16:4, 45:8,         47:11, 47:20, 64:9,         69:24, 72:18, 86:9,         118:16, 127:11,         166:2, 217:20,         220:13, 222:5,         233:12, 238:20,         255:16, 272:25,         281:9, 315:3,         315:10, 319:17         mentions       [1] - 163:5         mercury       [1] - 189:12         merely       [3] - 20:11,         84:20, 85:25
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22 mask [2] - 194:4, 210:25 masking [1] - 147:19 masks [1] - 77:6	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23, 314:11 meaning [3] - 128:6, 180:5, 212:5	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18, 194:9, 207:15 <b>measurement</b> 's [1] - 191:7	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22, 267:9, 267:10, 267:11, 267:13,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{member} \ [1] - 22:2 \\ \textbf{members} \ [8] - 5:17, \\ 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, \\ 265:11, 265:20, \\ 266:4, 285:25 \\ \textbf{memory} \ [3] - 29:25, \\ 98:20, 127:16 \\ \textbf{men} \ [1] - 114:14 \\ \textbf{mentioned} \ [23] - \\ 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, \\ 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, \\ 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, \\ 118:16, 127:11, \\ 166:2, 217:20, \\ 220:13, 222:5, \\ 233:12, 238:20, \\ 255:16, 272:25, \\ 281:9, 315:3, \\ 315:10, 319:17 \\ \textbf{mentions} \ [1] - 163:5 \\ \textbf{mercury} \ [1] - 189:12 \\ \textbf{merely} \ [3] - 20:11, \\ 84:20, 85:25 \\ \textbf{message} \ [1] - 226:23 \\ \end{array}$
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22 mask [2] - 194:4, 210:25 masking [1] - 147:19 masks [1] - 77:6 Massachusetts [10] -	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23, 314:11 meaning [3] - 128:6, 180:5, 212:5 means [14] - 29:2,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18, 194:9, 207:15 <b>measurement</b> 's [1] - 191:7 <b>measurements</b> [23] -	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22, 267:9, 267:10, 267:11, 267:13, 267:15, 267:19,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{member} \ [1] - 22:2 \\ \textbf{members} \ [8] - 5:17, \\ 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, \\ 265:11, 265:20, \\ 266:4, 285:25 \\ \textbf{memory} \ [3] - 29:25, \\ 98:20, 127:16 \\ \textbf{men} \ [1] - 114:14 \\ \textbf{mentioned} \ [23] - \\ 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, \\ 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, \\ 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, \\ 118:16, 127:11, \\ 166:2, 217:20, \\ 220:13, 222:5, \\ 233:12, 238:20, \\ 255:16, 272:25, \\ 281:9, 315:3, \\ 315:10, 319:17 \\ \textbf{mentions} \ [1] - 163:5 \\ \textbf{mercury} \ [1] - 189:12 \\ \textbf{merely} \ [3] - 20:11, \\ 84:20, 85:25 \\ \textbf{message} \ [1] - 226:23 \\ \textbf{messes} \ [1] - 128:2 \\ \end{array}$
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22 mask [2] - 194:4, 210:25 masking [1] - 147:19 masks [1] - 77:6 Massachusetts [10] - 72:12, 84:10, 84:11,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23, 314:11 meaning [3] - 128:6, 180:5, 212:5 means [14] - 29:2, 30:24, 41:12, 78:8,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18, 194:9, 207:15 <b>measurement 's</b> [1] - 191:7 <b>measurements</b> [23] - 69:20, 76:17, 77:3,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22, 267:9, 267:10, 267:11, 267:13, 267:15, 267:19, 268:8, 268:10,	member       [1] - 22:2         members       [8] - 5:17,         18:9, 36:16, 262:19,         265:11, 265:20,         266:4, 285:25         memory         [3] - 29:25,         98:20, 127:16         men [1] - 114:14         mentioned         [23] -         14:25, 16:4, 45:8,         47:11, 47:20, 64:9,         69:24, 72:18, 86:9,         118:16, 127:11,         166:2, 217:20,         220:13, 222:5,         233:12, 238:20,         255:16, 272:25,         281:9, 315:3,         315:10, 319:17         mentions         mercury         [1] - 163:5         mercury         mercury         [3] - 20:11,         84:20, 85:25         message         [1] - 226:23         messes         [1] - 128:2         met<[2] - 31:20, 64:19
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps $[3] - 49:18$ , 102:24, 260:24 March $[3] - 290:11$ , 292:2, 292:3 margins $[1] - 285:4$ Mark $[3] - 57:1, 57:5$ , 57:6 marked $[12] - 10:19$ , 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market $[1] - 285:8$ marketing $[1] - 285:13$ Marsha $[3] - 1:17$ , 289:7, 317:22 mask $[2] - 194:4$ , 210:25 masking $[1] - 147:19$ masks $[1] - 77:6$ Massachusetts $[10] - 72:12, 84:10, 84:11$ , 84:12, 84:14, 84:15,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23, 314:11 meaning [3] - 128:6, 180:5, 212:5 means [14] - 29:2, 30:24, 41:12, 78:8, 96:9, 108:8, 146:11,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:11, 177:14, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18, 194:9, 207:15 <b>measurements</b> [23] - 69:20, 76:17, 77:3, 93:16, 108:8,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22, 267:11, 267:10, 267:11, 267:13, 267:15, 267:19, 268:8, 268:10, 268:12, 268:14,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{member} \ [1] - 22:2 \\ \textbf{members} \ [8] - 5:17, \\ 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, \\ 265:11, 265:20, \\ 266:4, 285:25 \\ \textbf{memory} \ [3] - 29:25, \\ 98:20, 127:16 \\ \textbf{men} \ [1] - 114:14 \\ \textbf{mentioned} \ [23] - \\ 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, \\ 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, \\ 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, \\ 118:16, 127:11, \\ 166:2, 217:20, \\ 220:13, 222:5, \\ 233:12, 238:20, \\ 255:16, 272:25, \\ 281:9, 315:3, \\ 315:10, 319:17 \\ \textbf{mentions} \ [1] - 163:5 \\ \textbf{mercury} \ [1] - 189:12 \\ \textbf{merely} \ [3] - 20:11, \\ 84:20, 85:25 \\ \textbf{message} \ [1] - 226:23 \\ \textbf{messes} \ [1] - 128:2 \\ \end{array}$
298:23, 299:3, 299:13, 299:24, 301:21, 313:22 maps [3] - 49:18, 102:24, 260:24 March [3] - 290:11, 292:2, 292:3 margins [1] - 285:4 Mark [3] - 57:1, 57:5, 57:6 marked [12] - 10:19, 21:4, 23:21, 94:19, 94:20, 94:22, 133:18, 134:15, 223:10, 241:19, 301:2, 301:3 market [1] - 285:8 marketing [1] - 285:13 Marsha [3] - 1:17, 289:7, 317:22 mask [2] - 194:4, 210:25 masking [1] - 147:19 masks [1] - 77:6 Massachusetts [10] - 72:12, 84:10, 84:11,	McDonnell [2] - 63:25, 93:10 McGinnis [6] - 264:2, 264:22, 266:4, 266:13, 266:14, 267:3 mean [34] - 6:19, 13:5, 26:6, 27:5, 40:1, 43:24, 44:18, 74:18, 96:7, 108:16, 110:18, 115:10, 121:4, 122:5, 143:1, 149:9, 155:16, 170:25, 181:18, 195:5, 201:3, 203:19, 204:18, 215:9, 286:4, 286:16, 286:18, 291:4, 291:13, 295:9, 295:10, 305:20, 306:23, 314:11 meaning [3] - 128:6, 180:5, 212:5 means [14] - 29:2, 30:24, 41:12, 78:8,	140:1, 152:14, 153:9, 185:23, 192:9, 200:7, 200:9, 200:20, 215:4, 216:9, 229:24 <b>measurement</b> [31] - 57:16, 58:9, 76:4, 87:12, 88:15, 106:12, 106:18, 131:5, 133:9, 133:12, 135:21, 136:16, 140:6, 147:15, 148:21, 152:18, 152:19, 154:14, 154:23, 175:16, 177:1, 177:15, 178:25, 185:23, 191:6, 193:13, 193:18, 194:9, 207:15 <b>measurements</b> [23] - 69:20, 76:17, 77:3, 93:16, 108:8, 109:13, 109:14,	251:3 medically [1] - 251:15 medicine [1] - 234:19 meet [4] - 35:14, 54:8, 150:10, 183:14 meeting [74] - 8:2, 15:24, 18:24, 19:1, 30:2, 31:5, 36:23, 37:24, 38:2, 38:4, 39:20, 39:21, 39:22, 42:16, 47:13, 47:16, 49:12, 49:13, 49:14, 49:18, 50:1, 50:5, 50:7, 52:1, 60:4, 63:4, 261:16, 261:18, 261:22, 262:4, 263:25, 264:1, 264:17, 264:18, 265:8, 265:9, 265:10, 266:3, 266:22, 267:9, 267:10, 267:11, 267:13, 267:15, 267:19, 268:8, 268:10, 268:12, 268:14, 268:17, 268:25,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{member} \ [1] - 22:2 \\ \textbf{members} \ [8] - 5:17, \\ 18:9, 36:16, 262:19, \\ 265:11, 265:20, \\ 266:4, 285:25 \\ \textbf{memory} \ [3] - 29:25, \\ 98:20, 127:16 \\ \textbf{men} \ [1] - 114:14 \\ \textbf{mentioned} \ [23] - \\ 14:25, 16:4, 45:8, \\ 47:11, 47:20, 64:9, \\ 69:24, 72:18, 86:9, \\ 118:16, 127:11, \\ 166:2, 217:20, \\ 220:13, 222:5, \\ 233:12, 238:20, \\ 255:16, 272:25, \\ 281:9, 315:3, \\ 315:10, 319:17 \\ \textbf{mentions} \ [1] - 163:5 \\ \textbf{mercury} \ [1] - 189:12 \\ \textbf{merely} \ [3] - 20:11, \\ 84:20, 85:25 \\ \textbf{message} \ [1] - 226:23 \\ \textbf{messes} \ [1] - 128:2 \\ \textbf{met} \ [2] - 31:20, 64:19 \\ \textbf{meteorological} \ [1] - \\ \end{array}$

196:9	middle [6] - 5:16,	201:12, 201:18,	37:1, 38:7, 38:9,	<b>43:7, 43:8, 46:17</b> , 25
meteorology [1] -	106:24, 116:2,	215:3, 232:2,	38:14, 39:11, 40:4,	46:18, 47:6, 48:9,
196:19	151:11, 174:6,	260:12, 277:7,	44:9, 44:16, 47:24,	60:25, 61:2, 63:21,
<b>meter</b> [8] - 55:19,	312:16	294:7, 295:4,	50:19, 50:20, 51:1,	63:22, 111:12,
149:4, 175:2, 184:6,	midnight [1] - 147:14	296:10, 296:11,	51:3, 261:6, 266:15,	120:3, 120:21,
202:2, 214:9,	Midwest [1] - 193:24	296:13, 316:8,	271:25, 272:8,	135:19, 140:12,
214:10, 230:4	might [21] - 51:1,	319:2, 319:12	272:18	141:23, 142:7,
meter 's [1] - 177:8	57:17, 81:2, 99:6,	military [1] - 201:25	MIX [1] - 1:4	147:13, 147:19,
meters [12] - 108:7,	112:7, 118:17,	million [2] - 291:2,	<b>mixed</b> [4] - 78:22,	152:17, 187:15,
108:17, 109:19,	123:6, 127:17,	291:6	99:20, 129:23,	193:19, 260:23,
110:4, 128:18,	154:9, 154:10,	min [1] - 227 : 17	277:24	296:2, 305:16, 308:5
140:8, 214:9,	177:18, 202:5,	mind [11] - 29:19,	mixes [1] - 195:19	<b>most</b> [34] - 40:12,
214:10, 214:11,	202:8, 227:3,	69:15, 76:24, 89:19,	<b>mode</b> [3] - 126:1,	44:14, 44:25, 45:2,
214:14, 214:16	230:24, 233:10,	121:7, 153:7,	177:19, 194:21	53:14, 56:2, 59:6,
method [7] - 75:4,	233:11, 239:17,	184:20, 257:17,	<b>model</b> [29] - 10:3,	59:18, 59:24, 60:9,
76:9, 109:8, 138:8,	291:7, 300:1	280:18, 287:14,	10:9, 11:6, 11:11,	61:14, 61:22, 67:1,
154:16, 184:20,	migraine [1] - 191:25	295:12	11:14, 11:18, 12:7,	73:14, 74:24, 75:3,
191:12	migraines [3] -	<b>mine</b> [3] - 114:24,	12:13, 13:9, 13:17,	75:4, 77:17, 81:19,
methodologies [1] -	132:24, 211:20,	161:23, 165:6	14:5, 14:18, 14:21,	94:7, 94:14, 100:1,
176:17	212:8	minimize [2] - 127:25,	28:18, 55:11, 93:2,	115:25, 118:22,
methodology [2] -	<b>Mike</b> [3] - 3:12, 3:13,	131:19	93:19, 142:15,	137:9, 147:14,
58:24, 63:24	3:20	minimum [8] - 80:24,	175:24, 187:3,	187:14, 192:13,
methods [4] - 133:9,	mild [1] - 72:19	85:8, 232:4, 232:12,	196:12, 247:8,	201:13, 239:2,
139:15, 180:24,	mile [58] - 45:11,	316:11, 318:16,	247:11, 259:3,	266:24, 266:25,
188:15	45:12, 45:23, 61:19,	319:22, 320:2	287:14, 298:3,	286:16
metric [1] - 125:3	81:2, 81:5, 81:10,	minority [4] - 68:24,	298:5, 311:10	mostly [6] - 44:24,
metropolitan [1] -	81:14, 81:17, 81:23,	69:11, 116:21,	<b>modeled</b> [4] - 93:10,	121:16, 181:21,
318:9	82:6, 82:8, 82:9,	164:23	93:18, 93:22, 142:1	219:16, 228:11
<b>Michigan</b> [17] - 132:5,	82:25, 119:10,	minus [1] - 155:15	modeling [8] - 63:24,	motel [1] - 221 :19
136:12, 155:4,	149:16, 149:17,	minute [5] - 54:4,	64:4, 64:6, 144:21,	motion [1] - 173:2
198:6, 198:8, 198:9,	151:17, 197:8,	62:16, 149:7,	157:2, 233:21,	Motion [1] - 249:23
207:2, 207:13,	201:17, 211:18,	155:23, 230:13	247:12, 247:13	motor [1] - 131:8
207:24, 219:6,	211:24, 212:4,	<b>minutes</b> [3] - 57:16,	moderate [1] - 196:22	Motors [1] - 131:13
219:17, 220:19,	212:11, 213:13,	62:1, 101:13	modify [1] - 60:19	mounds [1] - 274 :25
220:20, 221:3,	213:23, 215:2,	mischaracterizes [1] -	molecules [1] - 199:8	mountains [3] -
222:22, 229:10	231:17, 246:18,	39:6	<b>Mollie</b> [2] - 1:15,	225:15, 280:8,
<b>micro</b> [9] - 133:12,	260:8, 262:23,	misheard [1] - 35:19	156:18	280:15
137:11, 139:16,	265:12, 265:23,	misinformation [1] -	moment [1] - 57:7	<b>mouth</b> [2] - 17:10,
139:19, 139:22,	266:11, 266:25,	281:6	monetary [1] - 184:21	264:9
187:25, 188:18,	271:23, 283:8,	misogynistic [1] -	money [8] - 34:9,	<b>move</b> [33] - 14:1,
188:25, 199:19	293:9, 295:2,	114:11	182:12, 182:14,	17:11, 22:22, 42:19,
microbarometer [7] -	296:11, 296:12,	missed [2] - 4:4, 127:3	182:15, 205:4,	52:12, 88:14, 95:3,
189:5, 189:8,	296:13, 311:7,	missed [2] - 4.4, 127.3	276:5, 285:5, 307:17	102:9, 118:13,
189:14, 190:11,	311:14, 311:15,	missing [3] - 73:5,	monitor [6] - 26:7,	118:25, 135:10,
190:13, 190:23,	315:10, 315:23,	90:6, 130:8	26:10, 56:13, 57:19,	140:16, 146:4,
200:18	315:25, 316:9,	Mississippi [1] -	57:25, 59:3	156:9, 170:15,
microbarometers [1] -	316:10, 318:23,	148:12	monitoring [2] -	174:9, 180:7,
200:1	319:15, 320:3	misstate [1] - 175:21	176:20, 177:4	181:13, 185:5,
microphone [15] -	miles [42] - 3:20, 3:21,	misstates [1] - 315:13	<b>monitors</b> [3] - 58:10,	200:25, 224:8,
17:9, 36:12, 106:10,	5:15, 40:18, 44:17,	mistake [8] - 12:14,	58:20, 80:24	224:15,247:16,
109:9, 139:21,	44:20, 58:10, 59:7,	12:17, 12:19, 13:23,	<b>month</b> [2] - 262:17,	263:3, 270:4,
140:13, 140:14,	80:24,85:18,85:19,	140:24, 141:1,	302:3	280:25,287:16,
140:16, 140:23,	108:19, 109:21,	314:12	<b>monthly</b> [2] - 151:24,	293:8, 294:1,
175:2, 175:3, 175:8,	110:4, 111:13,	mistaken [2] - 301:11,	222:19	299:19, 301:17,
176:24, 176:25,	111:14, 114:22,	318:17	months [6] - 10:1,	308:11, 321:11
189:3	125:10, 137:19,	mistakes [1] - 32:13	35:8, 71:15, 146:15,	moved [12] - 84:1,
microphones [4] -	138:21, 138:23,	Mitchell [1] - 277:13	259:18, 263:16	143:3, 187:25,
106:6, 175:6,	139:1, 197:8, 200:7,	mitigation [1] - 154:17	moreover [1] - 168:15	205:16,258:19,
187:22, 188:13	200:8, 200:9,	<b>Mix</b> [23] - 34:23, 34:24,	morning [30] - 3:1,	258:21, 259:5,
mid [1] - 73:18	200:13, 200:21,	34:25, 35:1, 36:4,	3:18, 8:3, 29:23,	259:13,259:17,
		01.20, 00.1, 00.4,		

274:18, 274:19,	120:7, 120:8, 120:9,	272:24, 273:7,	129:2, 129:13,	<b>48:10, 52:7, 52:8</b> , 26
294 :5	122:18, 122:20,	273:8, 273:21,	129:24, 135:13,	52:9, 261:9
movement [5] -	122:21, 122:23,	276:7, 277:16,	135:16, 152:22,	<b>must</b> [5] - 72:24, 74:9,
140:13, 140:16,	123:12, 123:14,	277:18, 277:20,	156:14, 156:17,	99:9, 117:9, 243:23
141:17, 175:7, 188:1	124:6, 124:8,	282:18, 285:21,	165:5, 169:18,	
<b>moves</b> [3] - 175:3,	124:10, 126:21,	286:6, 286:8,	170:14, 171:8,	Ν
185:6, 190:20	126:22, 128:23,	286:10, 286:14,	171:18, 172:15,	IN
moving [7] - 3:8,	129:14, 129:17,	286:20, 286:23,	172:24, 173:4,	<b>N's</b> [1] - 179:4
141:18, 175:14,	129:25, 130:3,	287:1, 287:2, 287:7,	174:7, 174:13,	name [18] - 3:1, 3:20,
183:12, 221:21,	130:6, 130:12,	287:20, 287:22,	174:15, 174:17,	31:3, 36:15, 52:24,
252:17, 257:12	130:13, 130:16,	287:24, 287:25,	174:20, 180:1,	130:16, 131:2,
<b>MR</b> [333] - 3:1, 3:12,	130:20, 130:23,	288:3, 288:7, 288:9,	208:15, 208:17,	135:3, 156:18,
3:17, 7:10, 7:11,	135:10, 135:14,	288:14, 293:13,	208:19, 208:21,	206:23, 207:24,
10:17, 14:1, 14:3,	135:17, 153:1,	293:16, 293:25,	212:17, 217:10,	218:18, 258:7,
14:6, 14:12, 14:14,	156:2, 156:5, 156:9,	299:18, 299:20,	217:15, 218:8,	289:6, 289:12,
14:15, 14:16, 14:19,	158:18, 158:20,	301:17, 301:23,	223:1, 224:12,	293:4, 320:15
15:9, 16:21, 16:23,	165:8, 169:15,	302:8, 302:11,	224:17, 224:21,	named [1] - 226:22
17:5, 19:10, 19:19,	170:17, 170:19,	302:19, 302:23,	232:21, 233:1,	namely [1] - 94:13
20:10, 20:16, 20:20,	171:17, 171:22,	302:25, 303:11,	247:15, 249:2,	names [6] - 15:25,
21:14, 21:15, 21:16,	172:23, 172:25,	304:9, 304:11,	249:7, 249:11,	36:11, 36:15,
22:6, 22:15, 22:19,	173:5, 173:23,	304:12, 308:1,	249:16, 249:19,	131:15, 208:1, 300:9
22:21, 23:1, 23:3,	174:5, 174:9,	308:3, 308:9,	249:23, 250:4,	Naroof [1] - 155:14
23:4, 23:11, 23:13,	174:11, 174:12,	308:11, 314:2,	250:12, 251:20,	narration [1] - 262:2
23:15, 28:3, 28:8,	174:14, 174:16,	314:3, 314:4,	252:3, 252:8,	narrative [1] - 264:6
28:20, 28:25, 29:11,	180:4, 180:14,	314:19, 314:21,	252:14, 253:4,	narratives [1] - 264 : 14
29:14, 31:8, 31:9,	181:8, 181:12,	314:23, 315:13,	253:6, 253:8, 257:6,	narrow [3] - 138:4,
31:11, 31:13, 33:13,	182:22, 197:21,	315:16, 316:20,	257:8, 257:14,	188:14, 191:13
33:23, 33:25, 34:3,	197:24, 206:5,	317:15, 320:8,	261:20, 261:25,	NASA [1] - 142:14
34:5, 34:6, 34:12,	206:7, 206:13,	321:1, 321:6,	263:3, 269:18,	National [1] - 196:4
34:14, 34:19, 39:8,	208:5, 208:8,	321:13, 321:19,	270:6, 270:25,	national [2] - 72:16,
42:3, 42:4, 43:4,	208:11, 208:13,	321:20, 321:24	271:13, 271:15,	193:25
43:6, 46:3, 46:14,	208:14,208:16,	<b>MS</b> [182] - 10:13, 14:5,	272:20, 273:10,	natural [1] - 277 :2
46:25, 48:8, 49:2,	208:18, 212:18,	14:7, 14:13, 15:3,	273:12,273:16,	nature [7] - 55:11,
49:5, 49:7, 49:8,	217:6, 217:13,	15:10, 16:15, 17:1,	273:20, 276:6,	173:19, 203:14,
49:10, 50:9, 50:12,	218:9, 218:11,	19:5, 19:12, 20:7,	277:15,277:17,	277:25, 278:22,
50:13, 50:15, 50:17,	218:14, 218:16,	20:19, 21:7, 22:4,	277:19, 287:5,	279:12, 285:12
51:8, 51:10, 51:12,	218:17, 218:23,	23:5, 28:2, 28:5,	287:8, 287:10,	nausea [13] - 68:25,
51:18, 51:20, 52:7,	219:4, 219:23,	29:9, 31:10, 31:12,	287:18, 287:21,	69:18, 72:19, 74:11,
52:9, 52:12, 63:9,	224:8, 224:11,	31:14, 31:16, 33:12,	287:23, 293:11,	74:18, 75:12, 75:22,
63:13, 70:8, 70:10,	224:13, 224:14,	39:6, 42:5, 42:8,	293:24, 297:11,	123:1, 141:15,
75:16, 75:17, 78:10,	224:19,224:22,	43:3, 46:5, 46:13,	299:17, 299:19,	142:16, 146:14,
79:14, 80:5, 83:15,	224:25, 225:3,	46:16, 46:24, 47:3,	301:19, 301:22,	212:9, 239:11
83:16, 83:25, 84:8,	232:15,232:18,	47:5,48:7,50:14,	302:7, 302:13,	nauseous [1] - 141 :20
84:20, 84:22, 88:13,	247:21,248:2,	51:5, 51:11, 51:13,	302:22, 304:5,	navigate [1] - 275:2
88:18, 88:21, 88:24,	248:11,248:13,	51:15, 51:22, 52:6,	308:15, 308:17,	<b>Neal</b> [3] - 141:6,
88:25, 89:2, 89:3,	248:15,248:16,	52:16, 52:21, 63:7,	313:25, 314:6,	142:13, 168:6
90:19,90:20,90:22,	248:18, 248:21,	63:18, 63:20, 70:7,	314:20, 314:22,	near [13] - 38:14, 73:7,
91:2, 91:6, 91:8,	249:10, 250:24,	75:15, 78:7, 79:12,	314:25, 315:2,	76:15, 85:7, 159:1,
91:10, 91:12, 91:15,	252:2, 252:5,	83:13, 84:6, 84:17,	315:15, 316:19,	185:24, 195:19,
91:18, 92:1, 92:6,	252:13, 252:16,	88:19,88:20,90:17,	321:8, 321:18	197:13, 197:19,
92:14, 92:20, 95:3,	252:20, 253:1,	90:24,91:21,91:24,	muffler [1] - 149:3	215:11, 239:14,
95:6,95:8,96:16,	253:3, 253:5, 253:7,	92:2, 92:11, 95:5,	multiple [6] - 216:11,	260:9, 289:18
96:19,96:21,97:11,	253:9, 253:24,	95:7, 97:15, 98:1,	239:17,260:17,	nearest [2] - 80:25,
97:13,97:25,	254:1, 254:3, 257:1,	100:9, 100:13,	261:4, 261:12,	271:21
100:12, 100:19,	257:3, 257:4, 257:7,	101:1, 102:3,	266:16	neat [2] - 96:24,
102:1, 102:7,	257:9, 257:12,	102:10, 103:18,	municipalities [1] -	283:15
102:12, 103:19,	257:19,257:23,	103:20, 120:11,	48:22	Nebraska [2] - 277:9,
103:21, 104:9,	258:5, 263:8, 264:5,	120:13, 122:16,	MUSHITZ [1] - 7:10	277:10
104:13, 105:1,	269:19, 270:8,	122:19, 123:10,	<b>Mushitz</b> [9] - 34:14,	necessarily [9] -
105:8, 113:4,	271:3, 271:7,	124:3, 126:23,	34:15, 34:22, 47:6,	36:24, 102:16,
119:23, 120:2,	271:10, 272:21,	127:2, 128:20,		

102:17, 172:11,	110:2, 110:15,	298:7, 304:22,	85:3, 114:18,	<b>222:5, 225:25</b> , 27
186:12, 235:2,	110:20, 110:24,	305:6, 305:7,	151:14, 195:4	228:3, 228:13,
246:14, 255:6, 278:7	111:7, 111:10,	306:24, 307:24,	nobody 's [1] - 307:11	228:17, 228:19,
necessary [4] -	111:16, 111:24,	314:11	<b>noise</b> [181] - 20:5,	228:20, 228:22,
231:17, 265:14,	112:6, 112:15,	<b>new</b> [19] - 51:7, 117:6,	20:24, 23:23, 24:5,	228:24, 230:22,
275:6, 276:1	112:23, 119:9,	118:5, 118:6,	24:12, 25:3, 25:10,	231:16, 231:18,
need [34] - 11:3,	119:21, 187:12,	120:24, 131:6,	25:17, 25:20, 26:2,	231:20, 231:23,
13:21, 16:21, 18:13,	187:18, 188:6,	131:18, 144:22,	27:17, 27:23, 40:24,	232:1, 232:10,
62:5, 62:9, 79:2,	188:17, 189:4,	145:7,146:20,	41:1, 41:7, 41:9,	232:13, 234:3,
86:20,94:5,101:17,	189:8, 189:25,	153:2, 153:7,	41:18, 41:21, 41:22,	234:5, 234:6,
102:19, 127:17,	190:10, 190:15,	181:23, 182:1,	53:2, 53:24, 54:8,	235:15,236:10,
132:17, 139:23,	191:5, 192:5,	204:7, 220:17,	54:15, 55:17, 56:8,	237:6, 237:11,
145:20, 153:7,	192:23, 193:8,	256:3, 298:24	56:9, 57:9, 63:4,	247:1, 247:2, 247:5,
171:5, 172:8,	195:2, 195:9,	<b>New</b> [4] - 136:11,	63:24, 64:25, 65:7,	248:7, 248:25,
178:24, 181:7,	196:23, 197:20,	182:4, 230:8, 249:13	66:2, 66:24, 67:12,	251:22, 251:23,
203:15, 221:25,	198:23, 200:20,	<b>newly</b> [2] - 58:17,	71:5, 73:18, 76:23,	252:23, 254:8,
226:17, 229:15,	200:24, 202:9,	145:11	77:6, 77:7, 77:16,	255:3, 307:2
233:10, 233:11,	212:22, 213:11, 213:17, 214:2,	<b>news</b> [2] - 71:17,	80:8, 80:25, 85:5,	noise -induced [1] -
242:3, 242:8, 242:14, 250:19,	213:17, 214:2, 214:7, 214:17,	117:4	85:6, 85:16, 87:22,	235:15
242:14, 250:19, 263:11, 281:10,	214:7, 214:17, 215:4, 215:13,	newspaper [1] -	88:3, 89:12, 90:7, 93:12, 93:24, 94:7,	<b>noises</b> [7] - 117:22, 228:22, 228:23,
305:17, 307:16	216:8, 216:12,	131:15	93:12, 93:24, 94:7, 94:9, 94:13, 95:1,	228:22, 228:23, 231:8, 247:25,
<b>needed</b> [8] - 26:21,	216:17, 216:24,	<b>next</b> [28] - 31:4, 33:20,	95:11, 96:13, 98:12,	251:8, 252:24
58:10, 163:13,	217:5, 254:6,	33:22, 34:13, 88:22, 124:19, 129:3,	99:11, 102:22,	<b>noisier</b> [1] - 216:5
169:25, 174:23,	254:11, 254:14,	130:11, 135:3,	105:6, 106:13,	noisy [7] - 104:3,
188:22, 228:21,	254:17, 254:20,	148:23, 176:6,	109:15, 113:14,	184:5, 184:6, 184:7,
276:1	254:25, 256:8,	182:22, 205:18,	115:25, 116:3,	184:10, 204:20
needs [3] - 152:3,	256:14, 256:20,	216:4, 218:12,	118:5, 118:6, 122:3,	non [1] - 177:24
198:1, 228:19	256:24, 280:2,	218:15, 257:13,	125:22, 126:1,	<b>none</b> [6] - 54:11,
Neenah [1] - 245:21	280:7, 280:11,	257:20, 283:24,	129:5, 131:5,	96:14, 134:9, 254:2,
negative [1] - 240:21	280:14, 281:8,	288:8, 289:14,	131:12, 131:15,	287:1, 287:21
negotiate [3] - 184:16,	281:13, 281:17,	292:23, 292:24,	131:16, 132:14,	nonexistent [1] -
198:13, 318:25	281:23, 282:3,	299:8, 306:7,	132:15, 132:21,	79:24
negotiated [1] - 319:3	282:13, 316:23,	306:14, 319:13,	134:2, 134:6,	nonhearing [3] -
negotiations [2] -	317:6, 317:13	320:1	139:12, 140:15,	236:5, 240:11,
184:21, 186:4	Nelson [12] - 33:25,	nice [1] - 94:1	145:4, 145:7, 146:2,	240:13
neighbor [11] - 84:4,	49:2, 103:23,	night [39] - 28:22,	146:20, 147:19,	nonparticipant [3] -
159:1, 203:15,	113:19, 117:11,	30:2, 30:3, 31:1,	149:5, 149:21,	20:5, 23:23, 24:5
204:9, 204:12,	124:11, 173:14,	31:4, 34:9, 42:17,	149:24, 149:25,	nonparticipants [14] -
293:5, 293:7,	187:13, 212:19,	71:6, 72:22, 77:18,	151:24, 153:21,	20:6, 20:25, 23:18,
293:17, 299:2,	254:5, 285:22,	77:21, 77:25, 78:4,	153:24, 156:1,	23:25, 24:7, 24:13,
299:7, 306:24	316:22	78:6, 78:9, 78:12,	158:8, 158:24,	25:4, 81:24, 82:14,
neighbor 's [2] -	<b>Nelson 's</b> [2] - 217:7,	78:14, 78:17, 96:8,	163:14, 163:25,	112:10, 112:12,
149:16,305:10	257:5	104:3, 105:4,	164:2, 167:12, 167:15, 175:1	184:16, 187:6,
neighborhood [2] -	nervous [4] - 7:14, 7:16 12:19 30:14	106:24, 114:3,	167:15, 175:1, 175:4, 176:9,	202:22
30:6, 261:4	7:16, 12:19, 30:14	114:4, 125:24,	175:4, 176:9, 177:16, 177:18,	nonparticipating [10]
neighboring [1] -	neuro [1] - 235:11	126:5, 126:7,	184:17, 186:4,	- 25:11, 25:21,
262:7	neutral [1] - 100:15 neutrinos [1] - 107:17	147:22, 149:15,	194:17, 186:4, 194:25, 196:17,	41:10, 66:3, 67:21,
neighbors [7] - 261:2,	neutrinos [1] - 107:17 never [33] - 14:9,	194:13, 195:1, 195:3, 195:23	198:6, 198:7, 199:7,	157:21, 266:23,
270:21, 282:2,	19:14, 22:9, 22:19,	195:3, 195:23, 204:11, 220:21,	202:24, 202:25,	267:2, 267:3, 267:7
282:8, 282:9, 204:48, 240:25	37:5, 37:7, 38:5,	204.11,220.21, 221:18,228:6,	203:3, 203:13,	nonrelated [1] -
294:18, 319:25	43:24, 44:22, 56:11,	228:13	203:15, 203:20,	106:13
<b>NELSON</b> [86] - 1:11,	58:25, 65:19, 77:22,	nights [3] - 194:2,	204:5, 204:8,	nontrivial [1] - 228:16
34:1, 49:3, 105:10,	101:14, 119:2,	196:8, 196:20	204:25, 205:2,	nonwind [1] - 140:21
105:13, 106:17, 107:2, 107:5	121:5, 148:8,	<b>nighttime</b> [2] - 125:20,	205:5, 206:16,	norm [1] - 139:18
107:2, 107:5, 107:15, 107:21,	180:21, 233:23,	126:8	207:16, 207:21,	normal [11] - 33:2,
107.15, 107.21, 108:4,	274:5, 274:7, 284:6,	nil [1] - 182:19	207:22, 212:8,	33:3, 47:24, 48:2, 66:5, 68:6, 94:14,
108:1, 108:4, 108:22, 109:2,	292:16, 296:5,	nine [1] - 226:13	213:8, 216:1,	128:14, 147:11,
109:7, 109:25,	296:7, 296:12,	nobody [5] - 43:25,	219:21, 220:22,	147:18, 192:3
			221:9, 221:11,	111.10, 102.0

normally [3] - 60:8,	301:14,303:16,	observations [1] -	132:17, 204:19	<b>280:18,286:10</b> , 28
76:6, 93:1	303:17	176:10	on/off [3] - 94:5,	287:8, 289:25,
<b>north</b> [5] - 3:21, 32:5,	numbered [2] - 167:3,	observe [1] - 298:10	193:19, 194:23	296:21, 299:2,
289:15, 289:17,	254:15	observed [8] - 108:8,	once [11] - 30:16,	299:7, 299:12,
299:10	numbering [1] -	177:1, 177:11,	36:25, 62:10, 66:25,	304:23, 306:13,
Northwestern [1] -	161:22	192:7, 192:24,	120:21, 128:17,	306:14, 307:9,
219:13	numbers [12] - 45:7,	263:12, 266:24,	142:7, 148:5,	307:10, 311:6,
<b>note</b> [6] - 16:15,	66:11, 68:12, 176:3,	270:19	149:24, 151:14,	311:7, 311:14,
100:2, 239:10,	215:19, 216:25,	observer [1] - 177:13	152:4	312:14, 312:24,
251:7, 311:1, 311:5	217:1, 225:17,	observing [2] - 22:8,	one [153] - 5:2, 5:4,	315:3, 315:10,
noted [5] - 15:9,	228:16, 243:4, 301:8	80:9	6:5, 17:15, 17:17,	315:23, 315:25,
65:16, 66:25,	numerical [1] - 209:20	obtained [1] - 276:3	17:19, 23:2, 29:21,	316:9, 316:10,
157:24, 167:22	numerous [1] - 260:2	<b>obvious</b> [1] - 159:16	34:9, 37:24, 37:25,	317:9, 318:23,
notes [7] - 31:1,		obviously [5] - 68:8,	39:15, 42:16, 43:25,	319:15, 321:8
176:16, 230:11,	0	173:15, 183:9,	44:10, 45:17, 45:18,	one's [1] - 283:7
230:12, 230:14,	•	202:17, 232:5	45:25, 46:6, 58:8,	one -third [3] - 185:2,
233:7, 233:9	<b>o'clock</b> [4] - 147:13,	occasionally [1] - 80:2	58:15, 58:18, 58:23,	185:9, 186:11
nother [1] - 110:18	206:5, 308:3	occupant [1] - 139:2	61:11, 67:6, 67:23,	ones [4] - 9:9, 133:10,
nothing [20] - 36:2,	oath [9] - 3:15, 34:17,	occupational [1] -	70:20, 71:3, 72:20,	143:16, 299:15
44:2, 50:9, 59:18,	52:19,63:16,	221:10	77:11, 81:5, 88:5,	<b>Onida</b> [1] - 1:25
59:19, 73:11, 99:18,	130:19, 206:9,	occupied [3] - 26:4,	90:13, 92:21, 92:25,	online [2] - 161:23,
101:19, 102:11,	218:21, 258:3,	262:10, 266:25	96:5, 96:22, 97:1,	183:4
129:11, 132:24,	288:12	occur [8] - 78:9,	98:10, 101:6,	Ontario [9] - 150:9,
154:5, 249:2, 256:9,	object [15] - 14:7,	152:5, 184:21,	109:13, 109:20,	200:17,200:18,
293:17, 293:23,	19:5, 79:12, 91:21,	189:15, 197:18,	112:17, 112:19,	210:17, 210:19,
295:14, 295:15,	91:24, 92:2, 100:9,	213:1, 230:21, 239:1	113:3, 115:8,	210:20, 211:3,
304:22	152:22, 160:13,	occurred [5] - 117:7,	115:10, 118:17,	255:24, 256:3
notice [2] - 80:13	270:25,273:16,	151:6, 269:14,	126:12, 126:13,	open [10] - 6:2, 20:23,
noticed [1] - 143:14	293:11, 301:19,	269:15, 319:20	128:19, 129:22,	78:18, 133:13,
noticing [1] - 80:15	304:5, 315:13	occurrence [1] - 79:19	131:22, 132:6,	146:19, 154:15,
notify [1] - 151:19	objection [52] - 10:13,	occurring [1] - 215:7	132:20, 133:5,	209:6, 219:6,
notion [2] - 81:17,	14:3, 14:13, 15:3,	occurs [4] - 141:8,	136:21, 137:10,	242:14, 303:20
144:21	15:4, 16:15, 20:7,	194:2, 195:14, 196:7	137:13, 137:17,	open -ended [1] -
November [3] - 19:2,	20:19, 21:7, 28:2,	October [5] - 1:7, 2:4,	137:19, 145:2,	20:23
207:9	39:6, 43:24, 51:5,	7:25, 18:21, 30:1	146:2, 146:9,	opening [4] - 209:2,
nowadays [1] - 291:10	75:15, 78:7, 79:15,	odd [2] - 87:9, 132:24	146:10, 148:21,	209:3, 209:5, 276:19
nowhere [2] - 210:17,	83:13, 84:6, 84:17,	<b>OF</b> [4] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:3	150:6, 151:15,	operate [6] - 62:3,
319:13	88:18, 88:19, 88:20,	offer [4] - 88:13,	153:5, 162:6, 162:7,	89:24, 131:18,
nuclear [2] - 199:19,	88:21, 90:17, 92:7,	163:9, 249:16, 252:9	162:11, 162:21,	154:2, 155:12,
200:6	92:11, 95:5, 95:6,	offered [4] - 91:3,	163:20, 175:20,	190:22
number [48] - 58:13,	95:7, 123:10, 124:3, 135:13, 135:14,	92:17, 160:13,	176:21, 178:17,	operated [1] - 139:5
59:5, 59:22, 66:13,		246:18	179:24, 181:1,	operating [19] - 57:17,
68:13, 71:18, 72:16,	135:16, 169:15, 173:1, 224:11,	offering [1] - 241:11	182:6, 185:2, 185:8,	65:10, 74:8, 76:15,
73:1, 80:23, 88:4,	224:21, 261:20,	offers [1] - 178:1	185:9, 185:20,	119:10, 125:6,
88:7, 106:22, 110:9,	262:2, 269:18,	offhand [1] - 25:14	185:24, 186:11,	128:6, 128:7,
121:9, 122:25,	270:6, 276:6,	office [3] - 127:18,	186:13, 190:6,	128:13, 138:13,
123:5, 150:22,	293:24, 297:11,	143:24, 297:16	195:1, 196:5, 196:6, 197:22, 200:4,	138:15, 148:6,
150:24, 153:17,	299:17, 301:22,	offices [1] - 144 10	200:12, 200:4, 200:12, 200:15,	177:19, 185:24,
167:5, 168:13,	302:7, 302:14,	officially [2] - 131:6,	201:15, 204:14,	193:22, 194:6,
176:7, 176:15,	302:17, 302:22,	240:17	201:13, 204:14, 204:14, 204:18, 206:25,	194:21, 216:6, 216:9
182:2, 183:24,	321:19	officials [1] - 274:20	204:18, 200:23, 211:18, 215:11,	operation [1] - 128:5
186:20, 198:9,	objectionable [1] -	often [8] - 65:7, 77:6,	215:17, 216:4,	operational [10] -
202:6, 205:1, 205:8,	150:16	77:17, 93:7, 104:1,	217:12, 227:10,	58:17, 67:1, 79:11,
213:24,219:15,	objections [1] - 15:7	119:18, 144:7,	217.12, 227.10, 228:6, 230:20,	80:23, 98:9, 155:10,
230:24, 231:9,	obligate [1] - 43:1	279:20	231:24, 253:13,	176:11, 176:21,
232:8, 238:25,	observable [4] -	<b>Ohio</b> [3] - 198:6,	256:20, 265:12,	177:16, 194:19
253:21, 254:16,	173:12, 173:16,	198:8, 198:16	265:23, 266:11,	operations [1] - 256:1
277:25,278:3,	173:20, 173:21	<b>Ohio 's</b> [1] - 198 :17	266:25, 267:13,	operator [2] - 151:20,
279:13, 283:2,	observation [1] -	ohm [1] - 306:13	273:10, 275:20,	202:23
283:3, 301:9,	124:19	<b>old</b> [4] - 115:4, 132:1,	279:1, 279:13,	operators [1] - 152:7
1	127.10		210.1, 210.10,	

opine [7] - 23:10,	30:10, 33:8, 37:4,	189:12, 189:17	207:9,207:11,	parked [1] - 149:9 29
92:4, 167:15,	37:6, 45:7, 45:15,	overhead [2] - 147:23,	209:8, 209:9,	parks [1] - 259:2
207:17, 243:21,	45:17, 45:23,	203:16	209:10, 236:22,	parsed [1] - 174:24
247:17, 247:19	268:19, 272:1,	overlaid [3] - 266:15,	239:4, 240:18,	parsing [1] - 173:13
opined [1] - 150:21	298:3, 298:5,	266:17, 266:25	241:3, 243:3, 243:4,	
opinion [23] - 13:22,	298:16, 311:10,	overlooked [1] - 65:7	243:8, 243:18,	Part [1] - 193:21
53:16, 56:23, 73:25,	312:21	overlooking [1] -	244:4, 245:1, 248:9,	part [30] - 7:7, 20:3,
91:3, 98:13, 123:17,	Ordinances [3] - 6:12,	86:11	248:13, 254:9,	20:25, 21:20, 34:1,
142:8, 147:1,	6:15, 6:22	overrule [1] - 79:14	254:18, 254:20,	35:5, 44:25, 45:2,
157:19, 159:9,	ordinances [25] -		254:23, 301:13,	45:19, 49:3, 89:7,
166:15, 171:3,	6:18, 7:2, 7:4, 7:6,	overseeing [1] - 17:21	303:24, 308:22,	145:4, 145:10,
171 :5, 172 :2,	7:13, 8:12, 9:14,	owe [1] - 307:5	309:6, 309:7, 310:9,	145:23, 157:5,
173:12, 241:11,	10:15, 21:20, 24:17,	<b>own</b> [40] - 40:13,	311:19, 312:11	170:3, 179:8, 234:5,
243:24, 244:13,	25:5, 27:15, 27:22,	66:18, 98:3, 100:20,	pages [6] - 11:25,	239:21, 244:14,
248:6, 274:14,	28:4, 32:3, 35:2,	128:15, 131:9,	136:23, 164:17,	256:4, 266:15,
295:11, 296:5	37:6, 37:16, 37:23,	158:2, 160:18,	169:6, 236:12,	267:1, 282:20,
<b>opinions</b> [16] - 83:18,	40:10, 40:21, 41:20,	171:11, 176:12,	298:22	285:13, 286:16,
	126:6, 198:10, 298:5	177:1, 177:7,		299:10, 299:21
83:23, 91:4, 92:17, 160:16, 160:18	<b>Oregon</b> [4] - 136:11,	179:12, 182:14,	Pages [1] - 1:8	partially [2] - 71:22,
160:16, 160:18, 161:6, 163:9		196:18, 201:22,	paid [1] - 32:4	83:22
161:6, 163:9, 167:23, 206:16	148:13, 166:3, 166:16	228:20, 235:18,	paint [1] - 306:21	participant [2] - 23:23,
167:23, 206:16, 228:2, 238:17		238:18, 246:15,	painted [2] - 296:8,	24:5
228:2, 238:17,	Organization [6] -	258:9, 258:13,	296:9	participants [6] - 15:2,
246:13, 248:25,	228:12, 228:15,	258:16, 261:1,	panel [2] - 84:14,	15:12, 81:25,
250:21, 272:14	229:19, 230:1,	270:9, 280:25,	98:18	112:11, 124:2,
opportunities [1] -	231:8, 252:22	283:10, 288:25,	panic [1] - 168:21	272:14
281:1	organized [1] - 73:4	289:8, 289:13,	paper [26] - 49:23,	participate [6] -
opportunity [12] -	origin [2] - 119:14,	289:15, 289:17,	49:25, 56:10, 94:9,	179:20, 205:9,
29:5, 133:6, 134:19,	285:12	289:20, 289:21,	94:12, 94:16, 95:9,	240:19, 261:7,
140:2, 161:16,	original [1] - 294:2	289:25, 290:1,	96:3, 103:5, 141:13,	290:4, 309:11
179:18, 219:7,	originally [2] - 6:18,	290:2, 292:23,	141:25, 143:12,	participated [1] -
225:4, 248:2, 262:1,	184:25	317:22	143:16, 144:7,	166:2
300:21, 304:16	Orlando [1] - 259:10	owned [4] - 16:16,	163:7, 163:8, 165:2,	participating [1] -
opposed [5] - 65:8,	otherwise [4] - 21:11,	16:17, 181:5, 280:4	177:23, 178:24,	297:5
177:21, 202:25,	159:23, 250:20,	owner [1] - 205:9	216:15, 254:8,	participation [1] -
232:23, 306:12	313:13	owners [1] - 319:19	256:21, 274:25,	187:9
opposing [1] - 148:15	otolaryngologists [1]	owns [5] - 270:2,	280:8, 280:16, 304:3	particular [13] - 45:15,
<b>opposition</b> [5] - 66:6,	- 235:23	289:14, 289:21,	papers [3] - 97:8,	50:5, 77:12, 91:7,
68:8, 68:10, 87:1,				
100.11	ought [2] - 272:1,	299:1, 300:11	121:6, 201:22	129:6, 191:3, 229:1,
120:14	273 :19		<b>par</b> [6] - 9:12, 13:22,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14,
orally [1] - 153:8	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12,	299:1, 300:11 <b>P</b>	<b>par</b> [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25	273 :19	P	<b>par</b> [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] -	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1	<b>P</b> page [77] - 6:17, 7:7,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] -	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 particularly [9] -
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4	<b>P</b> page [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2,	<pre>par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1</pre>	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9,	<b>P</b> page [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20	<b>P</b> page [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25,	<pre>par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1,</pre>	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6,	<pre>par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22,</pre>	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9,	<b>P</b> page [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9,	<pre>par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5,</pre>	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17,	<pre>par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14,</pre>	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5 <b>parties</b> [1] - 23:1
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 particularly [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 particulars [1] - 45:5 parties [1] - 23:1 parties '[1] - 148:15
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5 <b>parties</b> [1] - 23:1 <b>parties</b> '[1] - 148:15 <b>partner</b> [1] - 132:1
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered [1] - 127:21	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5 <b>parties</b> [1] - 23:1 <b>parties</b> '[1] - 148:15 <b>partner</b> [1] - 132:1 <b>parts</b> [4] - 95:19,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered [1] - 127:21 orders [2] - 107:11	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] -	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5 <b>parties</b> [1] - 23:1 <b>parties</b> [1] - 148:15 <b>partner</b> [1] - 132:1 <b>parts</b> [4] - 95:19, 99:13, 135:20,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered [1] - 127:21 ordered [1] - 127:21 orders [2] - 107:11 ordinance [35] - 10:3,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10, 136:16, 140:13,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17, 163:18, 164:10,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] - 226:2	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5 <b>parties</b> [1] - 23:1 <b>parties</b> '[1] - 148:15 <b>partner</b> [1] - 132:1 <b>parts</b> [4] - 95:19,
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered [1] - 127:21 ordered [1] - 127:21 orderes [2] - 107:11 ordinance [35] - 10:3, 10:9, 11:2, 11:7,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10, 136:16, 140:13, 140:17, 149:15,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17, 163:18, 164:10, 164:11, 167:2,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] - 226:2 parcel [1] - 280:4	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5 <b>parties</b> [1] - 23:1 <b>parties</b> [1] - 148:15 <b>partner</b> [1] - 132:1 <b>parts</b> [4] - 95:19, 99:13, 135:20,
orally $[1] - 153:8$ orange $[1] - 298:25$ orchestrated $[1] - 178:21$ Order $[1] - 52:14$ order $[13] - 61:19$ , 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered $[1] - 127:21$ orders $[2] - 107:11$ ordinance $[35] - 10:3,$ 10:9, 11:2, 11:7, 11:11, 11:14, 11:18,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10, 136:16, 140:13, 140:17, 149:15, 175:10, 189:12,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17, 163:18, 164:10, 164:11, 167:2, 167:8, 168:3, 168:7,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] - 226:2 parcel [1] - 280:4 parcels [1] - 289:12	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 <b>particularly</b> [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 45:5 <b>parties</b> [1] - 23:1 <b>parties</b> [1] - 148:15 <b>parties</b> [1] - 132:1 <b>parts</b> [4] - 95:19, 99:13, 135:20, 148:14
orally $[1] - 153:8$ orange $[1] - 298:25$ orchestrated $[1] -$ 178:21 Order $[1] - 52:14$ order $[13] - 61:19$ , 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered $[1] - 127:21$ orders $[2] - 107:11$ orders $[35] - 10:3$ , 10:9, 11:2, 11:7, 11:11, 11:14, 11:18, 12:7, 12:13, 13:9,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10, 136:16, 140:13, 140:17, 149:15, 175:10, 189:12, 199:13, 203:14,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17, 163:18, 164:10, 164:11, 167:2, 167:8, 168:3, 168:7, 168:25, 169:2,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] - 226:2 parcel [1] - 280:4 parcels [1] - 289:12 PARK [2] - 1:3, 1:5	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 particularly [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 particulars [1] - 45:5 parties [1] - 23:1 parties [1] - 148:15 partner [1] - 132:1 parts [4] - 95:19, 99:13, 135:20, 148:14 party [1] - 100:15
orally $[1] - 153:8$ orange $[1] - 298:25$ orchestrated $[1] -$ 178:21 Order $[1] - 52:14$ order $[13] - 61:19$ , 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered $[1] - 127:21$ orders $[2] - 107:11$ ordinance $[35] - 10:3$ , 10:9, 11:2, 11:7, 11:11, 11:14, 11:18, 12:7, 12:13, 13:9, 13:17, 13:19, 14:5,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10, 136:16, 140:13, 140:17, 149:15, 175:10, 189:12, 199:13, 203:14, 228:6, 231:7,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17, 163:18, 164:10, 164:11, 167:2, 167:8, 168:3, 168:7, 168:25, 169:2, 169:4, 169:9,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] - 226:2 parcel [1] - 280:4 parcels [1] - 289:12 PARK [2] - 1:3, 1:5 Park [4] - 1:15, 3:3,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 particularly [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 particulars [1] - 45:5 parties [1] - 23:1 parties [1] - 148:15 partner [1] - 132:1 parts [4] - 95:19, 99:13, 135:20, 148:14 party [1] - 100:15 passage [1] - 33:8
orally [1] - 153:8 orange [1] - 298:25 orchestrated [1] - 178:21 Order [1] - 52:14 order [1] - 52:14 order [13] - 61:19, 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered [1] - 127:21 orders [2] - 107:11 ordinance [35] - 10:3, 10:9, 11:2, 11:7, 11:11, 11:14, 11:18, 12:7, 12:13, 13:9, 13:17, 13:19, 14:5, 14:18, 14:21, 15:5,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10, 136:16, 140:13, 140:17, 149:15, 175:10, 189:12, 199:13, 203:14, 228:6, 231:7, 259:23, 283:21	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17, 163:18, 164:10, 164:11, 167:2, 167:8, 168:3, 168:7, 168:25, 169:2, 169:4, 169:9, 169:14, 169:21,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] - 226:2 parcel [1] - 280:4 parcels [1] - 289:12 PARK [2] - 1:3, 1:5 Park [4] - 1:15, 3:3, 42:24, 272:17	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 particularly [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 particulars [1] - 45:5 parties [1] - 23:1 parties '[1] - 148:15 partner [1] - 132:1 parts [4] - 95:19, 99:13, 135:20, 148:14 party [1] - 100:15 passage [1] - 33:8 passed [2] - 150:12,
orally $[1] - 153:8$ orange $[1] - 298:25$ orchestrated $[1] -$ 178:21 Order $[1] - 52:14$ order $[13] - 61:19$ , 90:9, 93:19, 130:7, 152:14, 165:10, 166:15, 186:9, 214:14, 230:25, 235:21, 250:20, 274:16 ordered $[1] - 127:21$ orders $[2] - 107:11$ ordinance $[35] - 10:3$ , 10:9, 11:2, 11:7, 11:11, 11:14, 11:18, 12:7, 12:13, 13:9, 13:17, 13:19, 14:5,	273:19 ourselves [2] - 76:12, 294:13 outcome [1] - 164:1 outdoor [1] - 204:4 outdoors [2] - 109:9, 146:20 outlier [1] - 147:10 output [2] - 128:9, 194:22 outside [23] - 50:2, 50:7, 51:23, 83:13, 84:2, 84:6, 84:17, 95:14, 111:17, 121:24, 123:10, 136:16, 140:13, 140:17, 149:15, 175:10, 189:12, 199:13, 203:14, 228:6, 231:7,	<b>P</b> <b>page</b> [77] - 6:17, 7:7, 7:9, 7:10, 12:7, 24:2, 24:15, 25:6, 25:7, 25:8, 39:1, 40:25, 41:2, 41:5, 41:6, 87:19, 88:10, 95:9, 95:10, 95:17, 105:14, 108:2, 113:9, 133:24, 137:1, 137:7, 144:20, 145:4, 158:21, 163:17, 163:18, 164:10, 164:11, 167:2, 167:8, 168:3, 168:7, 168:25, 169:2, 169:4, 169:9,	par [6] - 9:12, 13:22, 28:11, 32:11, 32:12, 33:11 paradoxically [1] - 226:1 paragraph [17] - 21:5, 24:3, 25:14, 88:1, 92:25, 163:22, 168:9, 248:5, 248:23, 251:14, 308:25, 309:1, 309:9, 312:2, 312:14, 312:19, 313:5 paraphrasing [1] - 226:2 parcel [1] - 280:4 parcels [1] - 289:12 PARK [2] - 1:3, 1:5 Park [4] - 1:15, 3:3,	129:6, 191:3, 229:1, 247:3, 250:14, 251:24, 252:23, 278:21, 301:14 particularly [9] - 72:19, 154:18, 175:9, 188:24, 199:15, 220:7, 231:13, 239:23, 255:23 particulars [1] - 45:5 parties [1] - 23:1 parties [1] - 148:15 partner [1] - 132:1 parts [4] - 95:19, 99:13, 135:20, 148:14 party [1] - 100:15 passage [1] - 33:8 passed [2] - 150:12, 198:10

104:17, 142:18	45:6, 54:22, 55:2,	275:3, 275:16,	perimeter [1] - 26:4	phase [1] - 66:20 30
<b>past</b> [4] - 84:3, 132:19,	55:3, 55:6, 55:7,	276:19, 278:11,	period [15] - 26:15,	phenomena [1] -
241:14, 284:21	55:9, 59:6, 59:14,	278:20, 278:21,	57:12, 76:5, 94:6,	195:16
path [1] - 143:25	59:15, 59:16, 59:18,	279:6, 279:17,	112:2, 117:12,	
		279:22, 281:23,		phenomenon [1] -
patient [1] - 320:21	59:22, 59:24, 64:15,		137:17, 137:20,	195:13
patient 's [2] - 240:14,	65:8, 66:14, 68:24,	281:25, 282:7,	137:22, 138:13,	<b>phone</b> [2] - 55:19,
240:15	69:9, 69:20, 70:15,	282:8, 282:10,	138:21, 153:25,	115:12
patients [3] - 220:12,	72:8, 73:1, 74:1,	283:15,283:21,	154:17, 192:19,	phones [1] - 115:3
226:20, 234:12	74:5, 74:16, 75:11,	285:6, 285:9,	229:25	physical [7] - 71:13,
patio [2] - 285:9,	78:1, 78:17, 82:22,	285:16,286:15,	periods [8] - 76:7,	122:25, 173:17,
285:11	83:2, 86:17, 97:3,	293:12, 294:18,	146:15, 149:20,	199:10,235:18,
patriot [1] - 98:25	99:23, 100:6, 101:3,	295:19,295:20,	154:1, 154:9,	261:3, 278:16
Patriot [1] - 103:11	102:4, 104:22,	295:21, 295:22,	154:10, 155:16,	physically [2] -
patterns [1] - 231:23	115:3, 115:14,	296:2, 296:3,	155:19	260:25, 286:19
<b>Paul</b> [10] - 1:17, 88:5,	116:8, 116:21,	296:14, 299:14,	permissible [1] -	physician [3] - 159:14,
222:2, 229:21,	117:1, 118:19,	302:3, 302:15,	249:8	235:20, 240:7
244:18, 257:23,	118:22, 118:23,	306:9, 307:6,	permission [1] -	physicians [2] -
	118:25, 119:1,	307:13, 307:15,	136:20	• •
258:1, 258:7,	119:3, 121:4, 121:9,	307:16, 307:17,	PERMIT [1] - 1:3	235:16, 240:15
287:18, 295:5	121:10, 122:11,	317:11		physiological [3] -
pause [1] - 202:15	123:8, 123:17,	<b>people 's</b> [6] - 93:3,	<b>permit</b> [7] - 3:4, 181:9,	164:14, 167:16,
Pause [1] - 102:13	123:19, 131:5,	161:5, 161:6,	249:14, 259:20, 281:10, 295:2, 205:1	192:21
Pawlowski [9] - 39:2,	132:5, 137:9,		281:10, 285:2, 305:1	physiologist [1] - 57:2
47:10, 47:15, 49:13,	132.5, 137.9, 137:16, 139:11,	161:10, 218:1,	<b>permits</b> [2] - 275:6,	physiology [1] - 56:24
49:19, 50:6, 52:2,		238:16	276:1	<b>pick</b> [8] - 59:9, 107:1,
269:7, 305:2	141:12, 141:19,	<b>per</b> [11] - 51:2, 128:18,	permitted [4] - 148:6,	109:18, 111:5,
<b>pay</b> [4] - 43:17, 205:3,	144:4, 144:6, 144:8,	213:13, 213:20,	151:15, 152:5,	141:10, 141:17,
234:10, 291:1	144:11, 144:15,	213:21, 214:3,	206:15	191:24, 210:18
payment [1] - 290:17	145:25, 146:3,	227:17,249:21,	permitting [2] - 99:12,	<b>picked</b> [4] - 141:11,
payments [1] - 51:1	146:10, 146:18,	291:1, 291:20	197:12	143:7, 189:20, 247:2
<b>PAZOUR</b> [16] - 31:12,	147:20, 150:5,	<b>perceived</b> [4] - 70:15,	person [4] - 129:6,	picture [2] - 109:4
46:16, 46:24, 51:13,	150:11, 150:14,	121:3, 142:24,	203:4, 204:24, 279:7	pictures [1] - 137:6
51:22, 52:6, 103:20,	150:22, 150:25,	143:24	person 's [1] - 240:24	picturing [1] - 89:20
129:2, 129:13,	158:25, 160:1,	percent [19] - 55:5,	persona [1] - 177 :24	<b>piece</b> [6] - 145:16,
129:24, 174:15,	160:17, 160:25,	74:8,74:10,149:10,	personal [8] - 84:1,	
	175:20, 176:9,	175:24, 176:1,	159:9, 159:10,	289:25, 291:14,
208:17, 253:6,	181:3, 181:4,	176:2, 187:16,		299:7, 299:8, 299:11
277:17,287:21,	181:20, 181:21,	211:1, 211:3, 211:5,	160:19, 270:9,	<b>Pierpont</b> [5] - 232:4,
314:22	182:15, 186:3,	211:6, 212:1,	274:14, 276:16,	245:5, 245:21,
<b>Pazour</b> [14] - 1:21,	187:5, 188:21,	213:25, 241:4,	286:1	245:22, 253:14
31:11, 46:14, 51:12,	191:24, 192:12,	241:11, 284:23,	personally [7] - 27:4,	<b>Pierre</b> [1] - 2:3
51:20, 103:19,	192:13, 193:3,	291:10, 291:12	270:14, 278:9,	pigs [1] - 245:12
128:23, 171:23,	197:7, 201:13,		282:2, 286:7,	pitch [1] - 117:18
174:14,208:16,	201:14, 201:18,	percentage [3] - 74:5,	286:18, 313:9	place [19] - 19:23,
253:5, 277:16,	201:14, 201:18, 204:24, 205:6,	211:16, 211:22	personnel [1] - 24:21	27:22, 37:22, 44:17,
287:20, 314:21	204.24, 205.8, 206:17, 207:8,	percentile [1] - 147:7	persons [2] - 131:3,	72:15, 74:12, 85:2,
peace [2] - 146:5,		perception [5] - 64:10,	272:3	106:15, 127:8,
150:18	207:16, 211:19,	64:12,65:12,	perspective [6] -	143:18, 175:16,
peak [4] - 192:20,	211:24, 213:24,	107:12,240:24	39:25, 41:16,	200:17, 203:18,
216:23, 217:1, 217:2	220:9, 227:7,	Pereira [2] - 56:21,	187:19, 247:21,	259:21, 261:15,
<b>peaks</b> [4] - 154:24,	228:16, 229:7,	209:17	287:15, 287:16	272:1, 272:15,
216:15, 230:21,	231:12, 231:21,	perfect [1] - 280:7	persuaded [2] -	291:25, 292:16
231:11	238:13, 238:19,	perfectly [1] - 216:4	295:11, 296:15	<b>placed</b> [9] - 20:25,
<b>peer</b> [12] - 75:5, 98:8,	238:21, 238:23,	perform [4] - 233:21,	persuasiveness [1] -	•
	239:14, 247:2,	235:8, 235:17,	250:6	25:20, 44:9, 88:3,
99:10, 99:16, 101:16, 102:16	247:4, 260:9,	238:22		113:22, 270:12,
101:16, 102:16,	261:23, 265:21,	performed [4] - 58:19,	pertaining [2] - 173:9,	280:3, 300:12,
168:17, 179:1,	266:6, 266:24,	73:7, 75:19, 246:2	202:19	300:22
227:15, 227:16,	268:21, 270:7,	performing [1] -	<b>Peter</b> [5] - 39:2, 47:10,	placement [1] - 36:8
227:20, 265:4	270:10, 270:16,	301:25	49:13, 52:1, 269:7	places [3] - 143:19,
<b>people</b> [186] - 5:1,	270:22, 270:23,		<b>petitioned</b> [2] - 35:10,	196:5, 215:11
9:10, 21:21, 30:2,	271:1, 272:13,	perhaps [3] - 29:18,	35:16	plain [1] - 196:6
36:22, 37:19, 37:20,	273:15, 274:18,	78:5, 227:23	<b>Ph.D</b> [1] - 219:13	plains [1] - 277:4
	,			

plaintiff [1] - 242:18	political [1] - 272:5	201:16	prescription [1] -	prevalence [1] - 212:231
Plaintiff 's [1] - 207:17	pollution [1] - 184:17	practice [3] - 33:2,	148:5	prevalent [2] - 202:7,
plan [5] - 130:3, 259:3,	pooled [1] - 210:9	47:24, 234:19	present [6] - 60:25,	212:9
287:11, 287:17,	<b>poor</b> [1] - 311:13	practices [1] - 262 :22	177:13, 202:2,	prevent [3] - 123:7,
313:8	<b>poorly</b> [1] - 93:14	practicing [1] - 234 :11	212:13, 242:24,	163:13, 212:16
plane [1] - 56:15	populated [3] - 61:22,	practitioner [1] -	244:6	prevented [1] - 36:18
planned [1] - 86:16	67:24, 81:20	69:13	presentation [3] -	previous [4] - 53:6,
planning [4] - 4:8, 8:7,	population [11] - 74:3,	prairie [2] - 194:1,	107:16, 113:10,	95:17, 183:10,
22:2, 260:15	74:19, 75:1, 168:14,	285:12	206:3	220:13
<b>plans</b> [2] - 17:23,	175:25, 202:8,	praying [1] - 33:18	presentations [1] -	previously [4] - 8:7,
262:13	211:2, 211:3,	precautionary [2] -	278:4	162:7, 217:16,
plant [1] - 89:20	211:22, 211:23,	197:6, 197:16	presented [9] - 36:18,	224:15
plants [1] - 145:7	255:2	precedent [2] - 82:3,	47:16, 49:25,	primarily [1] - 238:16
plat [1] - 318:18	porch [1] - 285:9	82:23	132:10, 142:21,	primary [4] - 260:6,
play [1] - 150:18	portal [1] - 153:12	precise [1] - 186:19	147:4, 191:23,	262:3, 275:10,
played [2] - 8:13, 55:5	portion [5] - 187:18,	precisely [1] - 96:4	287:12, 287:14	284:17
pleasing [1] - 143:21	237:3, 257:20,	<b>Precision</b> [1] - 1:25	press [1] - 110:2	primitive [1] - 113:10
pleasure [2] - 105:12,	258:14, 312:19	precursor [1] - 280:19	pressure [24] - 26:4,	principal [2] - 197:6,
282:25	portions [2] - 172:21,	predict [2] - 64:20,	26:6, 26:9, 114:18,	197:17
plenty [1] - 210:12	244:17	231:25	132:24, 141:2,	principally [1] -
<b>plot</b> [1] - 190:25	<b>posed</b> [2] - 75:8,	predicted [7] - 54:10,	141:7, 142:22,	148:11
plugs [1] - 118:15	236:10	60:4, 67:24, 93:16,	167:12, 189:6,	print [1] - 5:22
<b>plus</b> [3] - 155:15,	position [7] - 159:2,	122:5, 155:16,	189:11, 189:12,	printed [1] - 103:5
158:6, 284:11	197:16, 202:20,	308:18	189:13, 189:15,	privacy [1] - 205:6
<b>point</b> [59] - 12:20,	219:18, 253:16,	prediction [4] - 93:12,	189:17, 189:18,	private [2] - 49:14,
23:12, 28:17, 39:18,	253:19, 270:24	145:4, 196:13,	189:19, 189:22,	49:17
54:4, 57:3, 58:23,	positions [2] - 54:1,	273:18	189:23, 191:24,	privilege [1] - 96:23
61:5, 63:10, 95:3,	202:11	predictions [2] -	192:11, 192:15,	<b>privy</b> [1] - 148:14
100:9, 108:5, 108:7,	possibility [6] - 42:11,	89:25, 308:19	202:4, 212:8	<b>pro</b> [4] - 1:19, 1:20,
108:16, 113:24,	122:14, 122:15,	predictor [1] - 54:5	pressures [1] - 191:14	1:22, 131:21
122:13, 124:18,	291:5, 291:7, 291:8	preferential [1] - 83:1	presumably [1] -	probability [2] - 93:5,
139:11, 152:20,	possible [8] - 64:14,	preferred [2] - 139:19,	200 :24	93:6
168:1, 170:14,	64:24, 111:18,	177:11	pretty [17] - 13:7, 16:9,	problem [25] - 34:10,
173:3, 174:8, 181:2,	129:19, 162:23,	prefiled [19] - 53:3,	37:25, 40:15, 69:7,	72:3, 74:8, 76:25,
184:14, 185:25,	229:7, 247:8, 320:17	97:17, 133:15,	98:2, 121:3, 122:12,	93:5, 99:23, 107:11,
189:24, 190:21,	possibly [6] - 49:24,	133:18, 134:7,	136:13, 248:4,	132:10, 143:3,
193:17, 200:16,	125:25, 221:14,	134:10, 135:6,	252:5, 261:10,	143:11, 143:12,
201:1, 201:6, 201:8,	273:4, 301:11, 318:5	144:20, 153:13,	263:8, 271:20,	143:18, 143:19,
203:22, 218:4,	post [1] - 275:12	171:1, 183:4, 198:5,	291:8, 291:13,	143:20, 144:14,
219:21, 225:23,	posthearing [1] -	223:7, 224:3, 225:4,	292:15	151:19, 151:22,
226:10, 227:22,	171:21	225:7, 228:2,	prevail [1] - 298:24	172:18, 186:20,
228:13, 229:8,	potential [11] - 45:7,	236:19, 295:3	<b>Prevailing</b> [37] - 1:15,	197:10,212:14,
248:11,255:12,	53:24, 68:19, 68:23,	prehearing [1] -	3:3, 19:16, 29:7,	213:9, 221:20,
255:14, 263:11,	69:3, 146:1, 236:9,	171:21	35:6, 36:19, 38:18,	282:25, 297:21
265:25, 268:3,	239:22, 239:25,	premier [1] - 256:3	40:2, 42:23, 50:13, 51:24, 63:17	problems [12] - 85:25,
269:2, 276:25,	272:25,310:1	premise [2] - 115:10,	51:24,63:17, 122:18,135:15,	101:21, 101:23,
279:23, 286:3,	potentially [3] -	141:2	145:18, 148:18,	117:22, 144:14,
289:4, 290:3,	113:17, 262:7, 273:2	premises [3] - 202:11,	145:18, 148:18, 148:19, 156:7,	197:18, 210:8,
304:16, 306:25,	power [12] - 36:7,	205:24	157:3, 232:20,	216:1, 227:8,
307:3	37:21, 38:1, 38:4,	preparation [1] -	257:4, 266:5,	234:13, 239:7, 252:7
<b>pointed</b> [2] - 251:13,	40:9, 40:16, 46:11,	226:6	267:16, 267:22,	procedure [2] -
315:22	71:24, 128:18,	prepare [4] - 31:19,	268:5, 272:16,	314:10, 314:11
<b>pointing</b> [4] - 169:8,	193:22, 194:22, 106:21	133:15, 223:7,	274:6, 274:9, 281:3,	proceed [1] - 63:17
172:5, 190:1, 191:17	196:21	274:23	287:3, 290:5,	proceeding [9] - 5:12,
pointless [1] - 176:23	powers [2] - 261:18,	prepared [4] - 31:22,	295:12, 297:1,	16:20, 35:5, 95:19,
pole [1] - 285:3	306:13	54:16, 99:11, 301:4	297:8, 303:17,	130:17, 134:18,
policies [1] - 182:16	practical [9] - 56:18,	preparing [1] - 64:1	306:8, 308:14	260:4, 271:18, 216:25
policy [1] - 182:17	57:11, 82:5, 82:11, 105:25, 106:23,	presbyacoustic [1] -	<b>PREVAILING</b> [2] - 1:3,	316:25
policymakers [1] -	105.25, 106.23, 125:21, 131:3,	235:14	1:5	proceedings [4] - 2:1, 148:14, 165:25,
163:24		prescribed [1] - 58:25		

279:21	proffer [1] - 79:13	148:20, 151:15,	158:4, 170:24,	<b>168:19</b> 32
process [68] - 8:13,	progressively [1] -	152:4, 152:14,	176:11, 182:4,	protect [14] - 20:6,
12:23, 15:2, 15:12,	125:14	153:9, 154:15,	183:11, 197:12,	23:24, 24:6, 60:15,
15:18, 15:21, 18:2,		154:19, 157:3,	200:16, 229:5,	61:10, 209:21,
20:3, 21:1, 21:21,	prohibit [1] - 173:6			, ,
	prohibited [1] - 124:1	157:9, 157:14,	229:6, 233:22	229:7, 265:15,
21:25, 22:3, 34:2,	project [214] - 5:11,	158:3, 176:22,	prolonged [1] - 97:5	276:5, 294:12,
37:3, 48:16, 49:4,	5:14, 5:18, 5:24,	177:20, 177:22,	promised [1] - 317:6	307:13, 307:16,
49:11, 102:15,	16:5, 16:17, 17:21,	179:17, 182:6,	promoted [1] - 143:6	307:22
205:10, 224:14,	35:4, 35:7, 35:9,	183:14, 183:25,	promoting [1] -	protected [1] - 159:7
239:21, 259:6,	35:13, 35:22, 35:25,	185:18, 185:19,	182:17	protecting [2] -
259:17, 261:8,	36:17, 37:20, 38:17,	185:21, 190:22,	proof [1] - 128:8	201:25, 307:15
261:10, 261:15,	39:12, 40:4, 43:19,	193:11, 197:12,	propagate [2] - 78:14,	protection [7] -
265:7, 269:10,	43:22, 43:23, 44:2,	201:12, 211:13,	200:7	228:21, 305:10,
272:6, 272:18,	44:8, 45:14, 47:21,	220:19, 229:2,	propagates [2] -	305:12, 305:13,
273:13, 273:19,	48:3, 53:2, 53:21,	236:10, 240:19,		306:16, 307:23,
273:22, 274:12,		240:24, 240:25,	213:4, 213:9	
	54:6, 54:7, 56:8,	240.24, 240.23, 247:20, 258:9,	propagating [2] -	307:24
274:22, 275:1,	56:12, 56:14, 56:19,		199:15, 200:2	protest [2] - 36:6,
275:2, 275:4, 275:5,	57:10, 57:11, 57:15,	260:1, 260:2,	propagation [1] -	36:16
275:9, 275:17,	57:17, 57:21, 57:23,	260:10, 262:6,	215:21	protests [1] - 36:3
276:13, 280:9,	58:5, 58:7, 58:11,	262:12,262:14,	proper [7] - 51:9,	protocol [2] - 178:22,
280:21, 280:24,	58:21, 59:1, 59:2,	266:5, 266:7,	130:7, 143:8,	178:23
281:7, 281:21,	60:3,60:7,60:14,	268:11,269:20,	175:16, 184:20,	protocols [4] - 178:16,
282:6, 282:12,	60:19, 60:23, 62:2,	271:17, 274:3,	193:19, 314:10	188:8, 188:9, 188:12
282:20, 282:21,	62:6, 63:5, 64:1,	274:17,275:16,	properly [4] - 139:15,	provide [17] - 53:1,
282:22, 284:5,	64:21, 64:23, 65:10,	276:2, 277:24,		62:14, 91:3, 157:19,
285:1, 292:9,	65:21, 66:10, 68:17,	280:20, 282:4,	140:1, 280:3, 317:8	
292:10, 292:13,	69:16, 71:1, 75:2,	289:1, 289:9,	properties [1] - 157:21	160:7, 165:21,
292:15, 294:3,		289:18, 290:4,	property [31] - 43:12,	172:22, 173:12,
294:4, 294:22,	75:23, 76:14, 76:18,	290:6, 291:12,	48:18, 50:20, 158:8,	202:23,206:19,
	80:1, 80:7, 80:19,		158:24, 159:7,	208:5, 208:6, 224:6,
294:24, 295:17,	81:3, 81:9, 81:11,	292:6, 292:9,	186:5, 202:17,	242:19,252:10,
297:21,298:14,	81:15, 81:19, 82:18,	292:22, 294:9,	202:22, 203:8,	265:4, 300:8
317:7, 320:21	82:19, 82:24, 83:6,	295:21, 297:19,	203:12, 205:9,	provided [11] - 93:10,
processes [2] -	85:8, 85:12, 85:22,	297:22, 319:13	270:2, 270:3, 270:4,	134:25, 158:1,
226:19, 297:6	85:23, 86:4, 86:12,	<b>PROJECT</b> [1] - 1:5	272:16, 283:2,	160:25, 161:3,
produce [6] - 132:21,	86:16, 87:4, 87:6,	project 's [3] - 72:4,	300:10, 312:1,	161:18, 223:21,
141:15, 167:17,	89:4, 89:7, 89:11,	90:15, 146:5	312:3, 313:6, 313:7,	225:15, 248:6,
186:13, 248:7,	89:17, 89:24, 90:5,	projected [3] - 51:1,	313:10, 316:11,	263:4, 313:22
248:25	90:9, 92:9, 93:2,	290:23, 290:24		providing [4] - 21:24,
produced [8] - 25:17,	96:12, 96:14, 96:15,	projecting [1] - 291:11	316:14, 316:16,	• • • • •
26:2, 55:10, 70:13,	97:19, 97:23, 98:4,	projection [2] -	319:9, 319:17,	209:20, 225:9, 268:4
			319:21, 319:24,	province [1] - 256:3
137:25, 167:12,	98:13, 98:16, 98:21,	290:17, 291:3	320:3	<b>provisions</b> [2] - 123:6,
276:21, 281:3	99:15, 101:6,	projects [56] - 48:1,	proportional [2] -	123 :7
produces [4] - 55:12,	101:10, 101:12,	57:19, 57:22, 58:17,	163:24, 213:15	pry [1] - 303:11
139:17, 201:5, 213:8	101:25, 102:17,	59:6, 59:20, 59:23,	proposal [2] - 62:25,	<b>PSC</b> [7] - 179:1, 179:2,
producing [2] -	102:21, 103:12,	60:9, 61:14, 61:22,	311:13	179:6, 179:8,
168:20, 284:14	111:25, 114:17,	66:2,66:12,66:20,	propose [2] - 20:24,	179:12, 179:14,
production [3] -	117:6, 117:24,	66:25, 68:25, 71:2,	172:20	179:15
284:24, 298:21,	120:15, 120:18,	74:8, 74:11, 77:1,	Proposed [1] - 76:3	<b>pseudo</b> [3] - 140:14,
298:23	121:9, 122:6, 122:7,	77:16, 81:6, 82:3,	proposed [20] - 3:22,	175:1, 175:4
products [6] - 276:21,	122:8, 125:6,	83:21, 83:22, 84:3,		
284:14, 284:15,	125:12, 125:15,	99:20, 101:4, 117:8,	6:9, 62:24, 67:5, 67:0, 70:0, 82:47	psychological [1] -
285:13, 285:16	125:16, 125:22,	120:16, 120:20,	67:8, 76:2, 83:17,	261:3
profession [1] -	127:11, 127:12,	121:14, 123:21,	112:2, 132:6,	psychologist [2] -
	131:18, 131:22,	123:23, 123:25,	153:15, 153:16,	160:5, 171:13
160:15			193:11, 252:10,	psychology [3] -
professional [3] -	131:23, 132:11,	132:5, 132:6,	260:8, 260:25,	159:20, 159:23,
145:24,233:15,	144:22, 144:25,	136:10, 136:11,	262:5, 266:17,	160:1
251:3	145:18, 146:3,	144:15, 148:10,	271:17, 312:4,	<b>Public</b> [7] - 86:13,
professionals [1] -	146:6, 146:24,	148:13, 150:9,	318:23	86:23, 87:3, 87:22,
145:2	147:25, 148:2,	150:15, 151:4,	proposes [1] - 311:7	178:14, 250:5,
professor [1] - 56:21	148:6, 148:9,	151:5, 151:12,	proposition [1] -	256:16
				200.10

<b>public</b> [50] - 8:15,	191:20, 213:9,	207:12,207:22,	198:24, 208:8,	railroad [2] - 118:9, 33
15:1, 15:2, 15:11,	248:22	237:5, 243:9,	208:12, 212:17,	119:2
			217:17, 218:8,	
15:12, 15:17, 15:18,	pump [1] - 204:20	243:15, 243:22,		<b>raise</b> [4] - 111:19,
15:21, 18:1, 18:10,	<b>Punch</b> [23] - 56:5,	247:17,247:19	223:22, 224:2,	148:3, 204:11,
20:3, 20:25, 21:19,	56:7, 155:5, 218:16,	qualified [10] - 171:10,	224:3, 226:18,	283:16
21:21, 21:25, 22:3,	218:17, 219:6,	192:6, 206:25,	232:16, 247:15,	raised [3] - 134:19,
22:16, 22:19, 23:17,	219:23, 223:5,	207:5, 207:16,	252:15, 253:2,	135:1, 149:23
30:9, 36:16, 37:13,	225:3, 232:18,	207:20,233:24,	253:4, 253:6, 253:8,	raising [1] - 156:19
37:24, 39:15, 42:10,	232:21, 233:2,	248:24, 249:6,	254:4, 256:24,	rambling [1] - 223:4
43:24, 44:24, 49:11,	243:16, 243:19,	251:18	264:8, 264:11,	<b>Rand</b> [2] - 178:19,
50:7, 51:23, 52:2,	247:22, 248:6,	<b>qualify</b> [3] - 133:25,	271:6, 271:7,	179:11
53:1, 54:5, 151:19,	249:12, 252:21,	134 :5, 237 :8	271:16, 272:20,	Randall [1] - 276:24
234:4, 256:12,	253:9, 253:10,	quantify [2] - 110:7,	272:22, 273:9,	
263:20, 265:10,	254:6, 257:9	220:9	277:21, 283:1,	range [9] - 116:2,
265:20, 265:21,			287:2, 287:4,	147:8, 155:13,
	<b>Punch 's</b> [4] - 243:15,	<b>quantity</b> [2] - 123:17,		175:9, 187:6,
269:22, 278:5,	243:22,245:12,	186:12	304:12, 314:1,	190:12, 191:22,
281:1, 281:4,	247 :16	quarter [13] - 45:11,	314:3, 316:19,	241:10, 313:23
281:15, 295:18,	purchased [1] -	149:16, 183:19,	316:21, 316:24,	Range [1] - 67:17
296:8	259:16	184:2, 184:25,	317:7, 317:13,	ranges [1] - 65:5
PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:9	purely [1] - 65:5	197:8, 211:18,	318:21, 318:24,	ranging [2] - 136:10,
published [6] - 95:1,	<b>PURPA</b> [2] - 11:2, 11:6	211:25, 212:4,	319:9, 320:20	147:4
168:16, 201:22,	<b>purpose</b> [9] - 85:1,	212:12, 213:23,	quibble [1] - 145:25	rapid [1] - 189:18
222:18, 237:25,	92:22, 93:8, 94:12,	215:2, 318:12	<b>quick</b> [4] - 31:18,	• • • •
253:15	157:18, 161:12,	quarters [4] - 271:23,	103:23, 283:1,	rapidly [1] - 231:2
<b>PUC</b> [19] - 11:2, 13:17,		•	291:18	rare [5] - 74:9, 116:22,
	265:9, 301:25,	283:8, 289:15,	<b>quickly</b> [6] - 112:8,	117:10, 202:4
14:17, 19:16, 28:18,	310:15	289:17	• • • • •	ratchet [1] - 200:25
134:20, 135:1,	purposes [7] - 22:25,	quasi [1] - 282:23	153:17, 181:19,	rate [2] - 199:4, 213:12
135:7, 178:9,	23:14, 75:4, 143:21,	quasi -judicial [1] -	274:18, 274:19,	rated [1] - 188:13
223:22, 224:4,	160:12, 201:16,	282:23	275:19	rates [1] - 212:2
276:4, 282:21,	310:18	questioning [5] -	<b>quiet</b> [22] - 61:11,	rather [9] - 10:2,
298:3, 304:25,	pursue [1] - 152:1	19:25, 156:10,	62:8, 78:2, 78:17,	77:20, 113:14,
305:4, 307:23,	<b>push</b> [4] - 60:6, 155:7,	299:22, 304:6,	79:24, 80:4, 132:9,	141:9, 227:18,
311:11, 319:18	285:15	304 :10	145:15, 145:16,	
<b>PUC 's</b> [2] - 10:3,	pushback [2] - 255:25	questions [111] -	145:22, 146:4,	232:7, 249:11,
153:11	put [37] - 10:25, 18:7,	14:10, 17:3, 17:7,	146:5, 146:19,	249:13, 250:6
puffing [1] - 307 :8		18:11, 19:9, 19:21,	147:22, 149:20,	rationale [2] - 228:9,
<b>pull</b> [7] - 9:24, 101:24,	27:1, 27:6, 40:3,		149:21, 149:24,	265:1
	44:12, 44:20, 56:13,	20:11, 20:23, 22:12,	150:18, 156:14,	rattling [1] - 128:1
107:24, 127:18,	69:4, 80:22, 80:23,	25:1, 28:16, 28:20,		<b>re</b> [1] - 148:16
153:13, 208:1,	85:2, 102:24,	29:3, 29:6, 29:9,	180:20, 216:20,	re-analyze [1] - 148:16
315:22	105:25, 109:11,	31:10, 31:12, 31:18,	216:22	reached [1] - 35:21
pulled [2] - 304:25,	110:9, 121:2,	32:1, 33:12, 33:14,	quietest [1] - 215:11	reaching [1] - 203:23
305:2	149:21, 175:5,	33:15, 33:16, 34:2,	<b>quite</b> [15] - 4:14,	
pulsations [12] -	183:24, 186:1,	42:3, 42:22, 43:3,	13:14, 28:25, 30:2,	reaction [4] - 54:5,
54:24, 55:10, 70:13,	200:18, 204:13,	46:3, 46:25, 47:8,	45:9, 68:7, 71:20,	173:17, 201:20,
104:21, 114:18,	204:14, 204:23,	47:11, 48:7, 49:4,	116:22, 141:23,	240:25
121:3, 141:7, 179:3,	235:13, 264:21,	50:12, 50:14, 51:11,	142:5, 184:24,	read [74] - 7:19, 11:3,
180:21, 201:24,	266:13, 266:14,	63:7, 70:7, 75:8,	223:2, 247:5,	11:9, 12:11, 12:14,
			269:21, 270:16	12:16, 12:18, 12:22,
202:4, 212:9	272:1, 290:19,	96:17, 97:16,		20:2, 21:6, 21:11,
<b>pulse</b> [14] - 55:12,	303:25, 305:5,	103:22, 113:1,	<b>quote</b> [3] - 110:4,	22:10, 23:22, 24:1,
138:2, 142:18,	306:24, 310:15,	113:4, 113:5,	197:1, 207:7	24:4, 24:8, 24:19,
144:11, 189:19,	318:11, 319:25	113:18, 121:8,	_	24:22, 26:20, 27:24,
191:24, 192:15,	puts [1] - 229:4	121:18, 122:17,	R	28:6, 29:22, 29:24,
192:17, 192:18,	putting [8] - 30:10,	124:7, 126:23,	<b>D</b> 4 m 407 45 470 4	31:23, 37:5, 39:24,
192:21, 192:24,	56:3, 106:21,	128:20, 129:14,	<b>R-1</b> [2] - 137:15, 179:4	
199:23, 216:20,	125:25, 180:20,	133:13, 134:19,	race [1] - 234:4	41:21, 53:14, 56:20,
216:23	186:20, 233:7, 307:1	135:1, 135:5, 135:7,	radiate [1] - 104:12	60:2, 68:15, 69:5,
pulsed [1] - 141:8	100.20, 200.7, 007.1	153:4, 158:19,	radiating [2] - 215:8,	71:11, 71:15, 74:24,
pulses [9] - 107:13,		161:17, 165:7,	215:9	107:17, 107:21,
• • • •	Q		radio [1] - 76:16	107:23, 134:5,
133:8, 142:1,	qualifications [8] -	165:13, 180:2,	radius [2] - 151:17,	153:17, 155:8,
142:23, 143:23,	quannuations [8] -	180:5, 198:2,		160:11, 163:11,
			201:11	. ,

163:22, 167:11,	227:21,228:12,	86:5, 250:2	redirect [9] - 34:4,	refuted [1] - 306:15 34
169:25, 172:16,	228:18, 229:2,	recommend [8] - 60:8,	49:7, 119:25,	regard [3] - 54:12,
196:15, 202:13,	229:6, 231:20,	87:21,94:13,	120:10, 206:11,	113:19, 316:12
225:14, 226:24,	234:1, 235:11,	125:19, 177:25,	217:6, 257:2,	regarding [22] - 12:13,
230:12, 244:2,	238:1, 250:10,	188:18, 229:11,	286:25, 321:2	68:20, 69:2, 69:13,
244:11, 244:16,	250:13, 269:24,	229:22	<b>REDIRECT</b> [3] - 49:9,	77:16, 84:2, 157:19,
244:22, 244:23,	314:13, 314:18	recommendation [9] -	120:12, 206:12	160:8, 165:19,
245:16, 245:18,	reason [18] - 57:14,	60:1, 66:8, 86:11,	redressed [1] - 276:13	166:22, 170:7,
248:17, 251:10,	77:24, 78:16, 85:24,	86:15, 163:4,	reduced [5] - 145:21,	170:15, 172:2,
251:14, 278:3,	99:25, 100:5,	232:11, 315:11,	186:2, 266:21,	236:9, 237:6,
280:23, 295:10,	107:17, 120:22,	315:12, 316:12	313:6, 313:8	247:18, 247:19,
298:15, 308:20,	139:2, 151:14,	recommendations [6]	reduces [1] - 214:4	249:6, 250:21,
310:4, 312:19,	153:24, 158:10,	- 164:19, 165:17,	reduction [2] - 185:21,	265:2, 285:23,
313:11, 320:11	180:19, 244:7,	165:18,228:10,	214:15	291:23
readily [1] - 173:20	245:18,290:18,	246:5, 316:4	<b>Reece</b> [8] - 1:16, 3:8,	regardless [1] - 65:22
reading [11] - 6:7,	291:12, 305:2	recommended [12] -	30:8, 119:23,	regards [2] - 45:6,
18:20, 145:3,	reasonable [4] - 66:4,	60:13, 87:5, 94:9,	251:13, 257:19,	269:5
169:17, 169:20,	68:2, 68:4, 68:7	105:15, 111:25,	264:10, 283:3	regular [3] - 44:25,
169:22, 194:6,	reasonably [2] - 66:2,	178:18, 188:16,	refer [9] - 13:5, 17:6,	46:7, 193:6
245:17, 251:21,	148:19	228:3, 229:19,	145:8, 178:3,	regularly [1] - 45:2
311:23, 317:3	reasoned [1] - 124:25	230:2, 231:17, 232:3	235:25, 236:2,	regulate [1] - 26:21
readings [3] - 188:2,	reasons [6] - 239:17,	recommending [3] -	266:4, 303:19,	regulation [2] - 90:21,
190:24, 194:21	239:19, 243:1,	56:7,87:23,88:9	317:10	106:16
reads [3] - 20:18,	244:12,277:25,	recommends [3] -	reference [9] - 40:24,	regulations [13] -
91:14, 134:1	282:10	88:2, 229:4, 229:24	106:17, 136:21,	30:24, 38:10, 45:6,
<b>ready</b> [4] - 218:19,	<b>Rebuttal</b> [4] - 55:23,	reconvene [2] - 321:7,	167:9, 169:1, 207:3,	67:13,83:17,85:2,
218:20, 242:13,	56:20, 107:22,	321:21	239:4, 243:24,	85:4,96:2,96:12,
321:25	107:25	record [16] - 16:18,	256:10	210:1, 262:21,
real [11] - 36:14,	rebuttal [1] - 53:10	16:24, 17:2, 21:11,	referenced [12] - 4:8,	264:23, 265:2
49:23, 72:21,	rebutted [1] - 56:4	22:11, 22:22, 52:23,	42:10, 45:16, 68:20,	regulatory [5] - 65:17,
116:23, 116:24, 124:24, 231:12,	recalling [1] - 99:22	62:23, 81:13,	91:18, 143:13,	85:22, 92:25, 106:1,
255:24, 255:25,	recap [2] - 133:2, 218:25	100:21, 165:4, 207:3, 220:3,	154:22, 155:5, 162:7, 168:2	180:18
284:10, 288:22	<b>receive</b> [5] - 23:17,	232:24, 257:18,	162:7, 168:3, 252:21, 269:6	<b>Reiss</b> [8] - 1:23, 39:8,
<b>Real</b> [2] - 311:23,	166:13, 267:4,	308:10	references [1] - 246:1	91:11, 130:10, 133:14, 217:6,
311:25	267:6, 281:4	recorded [2] - 54:25,	referencing [4] -	271:5, 303:11
realize [1] - 229:4	received [5] - 5:17,	296:10	166:11, 237:13,	<b>REISS</b> [13] - 14:7,
realized [1] - 257:15	192:24, 258:14,	recording [1] - 58:11	244:17, 245:23	31:14, 31:16, 33:12,
really [65] - 7:18,	265:19, 284:5	recordings [1] -	referrals [1] - 235:24	47:3, 47:5, 48:7,
20:15, 31:7, 35:12,	receiver [1] - 186:17	188:13	referred [4] - 168:5,	277:19, 301:22,
36:2, 40:23, 44:13,	receives [2] - 21:19,	records [4] - 7:24,	235:20, 269:3, 280:7	314:25, 315:2,
55:10, 62:5, 62:12,	50:24	19:1, 161:2, 294:17	referring [20] - 8:23,	315:15, 316:19
64:23,65:17,69:4,	receiving [4] - 59:11,	recounting [1] - 263:6	13:9, 16:7, 16:11,	reiterate [1] - 117:3
69:25, 72:5, 73:17,	59:17, 268:4, 300:20	recreation [2] - 259:1,	17:18, 36:9, 39:4,	relate [2] - 7:21, 311:2
74:3, 82:5, 87:23,	recent [1] - 100:1	259:2	45:20, 45:22, 54:14,	related [17] - 5:24,
87:24,97:7,99:14,	recently [3] - 54:21,	recross [4] - 50:13,	57:5, 71:12, 102:2,	104:25, 105:2,
101:15, 103:16,	69:8, 229:21	120:10, 122:18,	136:25, 137:3,	132:15, 142:9,
109:18, 112:25,	receptive [1] - 266 :1	257 :5	137:4, 248:4, 255:5,	149:12, 157:2,
116:7, 118:11,	receptor [1] - 122:4	<b>RECROSS</b> [7] - 50:16,	256:21,315:23	211:13, 234:22,
118:19, 118:20,	receptors [1] - 112:7	122:22, 124:9,	reflected [2] - 215:23,	236:5, 240:11,
118:23, 126:11, 126:16, 132:19	recess [10] - 51:19,	127:1, 129:1,	215:24	240:13, 247:23,
126:16, 132:19, 139:14, 140:15,	63:9, 63:12, 130:5,	208:20, 217:14	reflecting [1] - 216:7	248:3, 251:16,
139.14, 140.15, 140:22, 142:7,	198:3, 206:5, 206:6,	RECROSS -	reflection [1] - 82:21	297:18, 316:16
140.22, 142.7, 150:17, 175:13,	218:13, 224:24,	EXAMINATION [7] -	reflective [1] - 109:10	relates [5] - 41:18,
181:17, 185:11,	288:6	50:16, 122:22, 124:0, 127:1, 120:1	refracts [1] - 79:4	55:24, 142:10, 300:3, 300:16
195:4, 197:25,	recessed [1] - 308:12	124:9, 127:1, 129:1, 208:20, 217:14	refresh [4] - 28:3,	309:3, 309:16
201:14, 203:21,	recipient [1] - 151:7	208:20, 217:14	86:4, 98:20, 127:16	relating [1] - 309:15
219:10, 219:25,	recitation [1] - 164:7	red [3] - 138:18, 298:25, 305:11	refreshed [2] - 29:25,	relation [2] - 196:25, 198:7
227:4, 227:7,	recite [1] - 261:21	redaction [1] - 252:11	308:4	relationship [9] -
. ,	recollection [3] - 28:4,	10000000 [1] - 202.11	refuse [2] - 282:11	

163:25, 171:9,	reminded [1] - 98:3	268:15	resident [1] - 319:10	restated [1] - 66:1 3
227:13, 243:25,	remotely [2] - 259:9,	represented [1] - 86:1	residential [3] - 146:2,	restraint [3] - 20:5,
245:7, 245:14,	259:10	representing [2] -	186:2, 197:19	23:24, 24:6
251:22, 284:12,	remove [2] - 105:3,	266:16, 268:22	residents [6] - 241:4,	restriction [1] - 25:10
304:1	186:25	represents [4] -	263:18, 266:23,	restrictions [1] - 27:23
relationships [12] -	rendered [1] - 255:1	137:14, 177:15,	267:23, 268:6,	restrictive [2] -
164:6, 185:5,	rendering [1] - 172:2	183:7, 183:23	304:21	198:11, 265:3
227:21, 227:24,	renewable [1] -	reputable [1] - 168:16	resistance [1] - 66:19	result [7] - 139:14,
227:25, 270:20,	193:25	request [4] - 19:8,	resolved [1] - 150:6	141:19, 145:21,
278:19, 278:22,	<b>Renewable</b> [1] - 196:4	134:20, 300:8,	resource [1] - 28:18	146:9, 146:15,
281:19, 281:20,	renewables [1] -	310:19	resources [5] - 32:21,	167:14, 222:21
282:1, 285:24	98:25	requested [5] -	33:7, 40:13, 275:21,	results [5] - 108:6,
relatively [3] - 79:24,	Renewables [1] -	266:22, 267:1,	275:22	168:14, 176:5,
189:1, 211:14	103:11	267:5, 315:17,	respect [10] - 42:15,	203:9, 235:13
releasing [1] - 138 1	renovating [1] -	315:19	68:19, 225:14,	resume [6] - 97:17,
relevance [3] - 54:21,	259:18	requests [8] - 30:12,	231:24, 235:25,	98:3, 100:2, 127:15,
160:22, 304:6	rented [3] - 222:1,	53:13, 58:15,	246:8, 256:6,	251:6, 320:19
relevancy [1] - 276:6	288:24	208:25, 224:1,	268:11, 271:25,	resumed [1] - 288:7
relevant [4] - 19:16,	repattable [1] - 215:15	224:5, 265:18, 266:2	311:13	retained [4] - 157 :6,
21:12, 51:6, 65:11	repeat [2] - 91:12,	require [3] - 126:5,	respectable [1] -	165:24, 241:14,
reliable [4] - 169:11,	244:24	185:21, 226:6	232:7	242:18
189:1, 210:5, 225:8	repeated [6] - 20:14,	required [4] - 35:12,	respond [12] - 21:14,	retire [2] - 283:17,
relied [7] - 14:17,	59:21, 104:21,	89:24, 275:7, 309:20	89:11, 134:19,	293:9
27:13, 157:11,	143:8, 168:13,	requirement [2] -	150:1, 150:2, 151:3,	retired [3] - 18:6,
157:16, 158:6,	279:25	64:7, 82:14	151:21, 170:17,	219:18, 234:9
253:19, 253:21	rephrase [4] - 16:21,	requirements [2] -	192:14, 209:3, 249:2	retirement [1] - 132:3
relief [1] - 70:25	75:16, 92:1, 315:15	83:8, 83:11	responded [5] - 32:1,	retiring [1] - 221:12
<b>relies</b> [3] - 126:17,	replaced [1] - 134:4	requires [1] - 177:5	75:11, 209:19,	return [1] - 181:7
172:10, 227:16	replicated [1] - 55:1	rescinded [4] -	226:7, 265:17	returned [1] - 258:21
rely [6] - 40:6, 40:21,	report [12] - 86:3,	217:24, 218:4,	responding [3] -	returns [1] - 62:11
53:15, 161:5,	86:8, 87:15, 93:1,	218:5, 218:7	264:20, 310:19,	revenue [1] - 284:5
177:16, 227:12	93:6, 103:4, 128:5,	research [26] - 72:7,	312:20	reversible [1] - 129:20
relying [7] - 157:25,	141:1, 179:12,	100:7, 143:8,	responds [2] - 20:12,	review [17] - 19:6,
158:2, 161:9,	201:19, 222:17,	143:22, 164:18,	92:9	33:7, 75:5, 75:18,
161:10, 167:23,	240:21	164:21, 165:16,	response [30] - 14:14,	98:8, 99:16, 101:16,
171:14, 238:16	reported [4] - 118:18,	165:18, 181:20,	31:25, 35:25, 47:11,	102:16, 127:13,
remarks [1] - 113:8	164:23, 180:9,	181:21, 182:11,	47:20, 89:7, 89:17,	140:2, 168:17,
remember [51] - 13:2,	211:12	182:15, 182:19,	90:9, 92:15, 92:16,	169:5, 179:2,
13:4, 21:2, 23:19,	<b>Reported</b> [1] - 1:24	188:23, 197:15,	121:8, 121:18,	179:12, 179:18,
28:24, 30:1, 30:9,	reporter [6] - 63:10,	220:7, 220:8, 226:9,	135:1, 140:10,	225:4, 230:18
30:12, 30:15, 30:18,	91:14, 165:11,	226:18, 227:2,	144:22, 145:5,	reviewed [19] - 14:9,
31:1, 31:7, 32:3,	219:5, 225:1, 243:14	227:3,227:20,	159:2, 192:22,	14:10, 53:7, 53:12,
45:5, 45:10, 45:15,	Reporter [1] - 20:18	248:1, 254:25,	207:21,209:16,	57:1,93:9,99:10,
45:19, 46:6, 46:9,	reporting [2] - 139:3,	265:4, 298:4	210:16, 217:17,	99:12, 101:7, 122:4,
46:19,46:21,66:22,	212:1	researched [1] - 100:3	225:12,227:6,	127:14, 161:2,
87:23, 89:7, 98:3,	Reporting [1] - 1:25	researcher [1] -	246:14, 274:10,	227:15,227:17,
98:10,98:15,98:17,	reports [7] - 93:7,	219:15	300:6, 308:24,	227:18, 227:20,
99:14,99:24,101:6,	102:23, 157:17,	reservation [1] - 48:18	310:5, 315:21	265:4, 266:18,
101:10, 101:20,	161:7, 165:19,	residence [13] - 41:11,	<b>responses</b> [7] - 53:12,	271:17
101:21, 101:25,	235:13, 251:18	79:22, 113:12,	134:25, 135:3,	reviewing [3] - 19:19,
102:21, 103:8,	represent [7] - 137:11,	289:4, 289:8,	223:21, 223:25,	252:23, 301:4
103:13, 103:16,	138:23, 169:11,	308:19, 311:15,	224:4, 309:12	revised [2] - 112:9,
103:17, 152:16,	223:24, 267:2,	313:21, 316:1,	responsibility [1] -	112:16
167:25, 183:6,	298:24, 306:1	316:10, 319:16,	170:21	revisit [1] - 224:12
190:6, 192:15,	representation [1] -	320:3, 320:5	responsible [2] -	Richard [3] - 55:24,
207:25,210:15,	297:24	residences [10] -	172:5, 306:23	131:2, 207:9
216:20, 317:19,	representative [3] -	25:11, 25:21, 26:4,	<b>rest</b> [3] - 36:15, 71:4,	<b>Rick</b> [11] - 130:12,
317:21	264:1, 264:18,	66:3, 67:21, 99:7,	260:16	131:2, 131:3,
remembering [1] -	293:19	262:10,265:23,	restate [3] - 246:13,	220:18, 220:23,
100 :25	representatives [1] -	266:16,267:8	272:10, 273:20	220:25, 221:5,

35

222:15, 225:20,	rough -in [2] - 259:20,	269:24, 275:12	219:24, 224:1,	<b>60</b> :10, 132:23, 30
229:3, 255:9	259:21	SCADA [1] - 194:19	224:5, 225:17,	171:15, 280:4
<b>ridge</b> [1] - 136:10	roughly [6] - 35:8,	scale [6] - 105:19,	254:18, 254:20,	seek [1] - 132:16
<b>Ridge</b> [2] - 97:23,	138:21, 194:1,	113:23, 114:1,	254:21, 254:23,	seeking [1] - 239:20
103:11	199:14, 211:24,	132:22, 191:5, 191:7	294:9, 294:13,	seem [5] - 144:17,
right -hand [5] -	290:1	Scandinavia [1] -	295:7, 301:13,	145:24, 202:12,
138:11, 167:4,	round [1] - 206:10	222:8	305:9, 310:10,	227:16, 236:1
191:8, 191:16, 243:5	routinely [1] - 145:24	scary [1] - 66:21	312:14	segments [1] - 255:2
rights [5] - 158:24,	row [2] - 36:10, 90:13	scatter [1] - 138:18	seconds [2] - 51:15,	seldom [1] - 294:11
159:7, 202:18,	<b>RPM</b> [2] - 138:7,	scenario [2] - 79:22,	292:21	selected [1] - 178:16
203:12, 303:24	190:19	80:1	<b>Section</b> [18] - 10:24,	<b>self</b> [6] - 106:13,
ring [1] - 101:23		scheduled [2] - 45:3,	11:1, 11:5, 11:10,	109:15, 137:9,
ringing [1] - 211:20	<b>RPMs</b> [1] - 190:23 <b>RPR</b> [1] - 1:24	52:13	11:11, 11:13, 11:14,	284:21, 284:25,
rings [1] - 266:16		Schoenfelder [12] -	11:24, 12:1, 12:2,	285:14
riot [1] - 286:8	<b>rule</b> [3] - 239:25,	1:17, 257:23, 258:1,	12:4, 12:6, 12:11,	
ripple [1] - 189:11	240:11, 240:13	258:7, 271:8,	12:12, 25:16, 26:1,	self -explanatory [1] - 137:9
	ruled [1] - 255:20	271:16, 272:22,	26:18, 164:18	
ripples [1] - 189:15	rules [2] - 250:18,	272:25, 277:23,	section [7] - 11:2,	self -generated [2] -
<b>rise</b> [6] - 144:9,	272:15		11:6, 41:1, 97:18,	106:13, 109:15
144:10, 155:4,	ruling [4] - 15:6,	285:21, 287:6	146:17, 165:16,	<b>sell</b> [2] - 284:22, 285:5
189:22, 192:17,	247:22,250:25,	Schomer [10] - 88:5,	248:17	seller [1] - 312:3
195:19	251:25	163:4, 165:1,	sections [1] - 264 : 14	semantics [1] - 203:12
rises [1] - 155:2	run [2] - 79:7, 104:6	169:10, 169:23, 178:19, 179:11,	<b>see</b> [86] - 10:10, 26:19,	semi [1] - 132:3
<b>risk</b> [3] - 175:21,	running [4] - 155:18,		33:14, 39:2, 41:1,	seminar [1] - 221:3
240:5, 252:7	155:19, 155:20,	229:20, 229:21, 245:5	51:16, 60:23, 61:6,	<b>send</b> [3] - 166:7,
<b>Rislov</b> [1] - 1:13	194:3	Schomer 's [3] -	66:17, 78:5, 82:1,	242:3, 242:7
road [5] - 35:14,	rural [13] - 80:6,	141:13, 169:5,	85:2, 88:1, 89:25,	sending [1] - 166:10
35:23, 228:22,	117:25, 132:9,	244:18	90:8, 93:2, 95:21,	sensation [1] - 221:22
270:9, 302:19	145:15, 145:22,	school [2] - 115:2,	96:1, 101:17, 107:9,	sensations [8] -
<b>Roberts</b> [4] - 57:5,	146:1, 147:11,	279:12	109:3, 109:6,	132:24, 141:11,
57:6, 84:24, 225:22	147:16, 149:11,	213.12	,	141:16, 175:19,
Dehemte le un 107.00	150,11 100,00	science (4) - 188.23	109:20.119:3.	
<b>Roberts 's</b> [4] - 107:22,	150:11, 180:20, 186:2, 302:2	<b>science</b> [4] - 188:23,	109:20, 119:3, 119:19, 130:13,	180:25, 201:19,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7	186:2, 302:2	197:10, 219:2,	109:20, 119:3, 119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24	186:2, 302:2 Russell [1] - 196:3	197:10, 219:2, 219:11	119:19, 130:13,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24,	186:2, 302:2	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 <b>sciences</b> [1] - 219:12	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4	186:2, 302:2 Russell [1] - 196:3 rustle [1] - 194:4	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4,	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22,	186:2, 302:2 Russell [1] - 196:3	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14,	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18,	186:2, 302:2 Russell [1] - 196:3 rustle [1] - 194:4	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11,	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17,	186:2, 302:2 Russell [1] - 196:3 rustle [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] -	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21,	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12,	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19, 160:22, 161:24,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14,	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19, 160:22, 161:24, 162:5, 167:5, 167:8,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18,	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19, 160:22, 161:24, 162:5, 167:5, 167:8, 167:19, 169:2,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4,	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22 <b>safety</b> [4] - 186:3,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24,	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19, 160:22, 161:24, 162:5, 167:5, 167:8, 167:19, 169:2, 175:12, 187:3,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22 <b>safety</b> [4] - 186:3, 197:7, 286:2, 305:11	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19, 160:22, 161:24, 162:5, 167:5, 167:8, 167:19, 169:2, 175:12, 187:3, 189:11, 191:15,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S</b> -5 [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22 <b>safety</b> [4] - 186:3, 197:7, 286:2, 305:11 <b>sake</b> [2] - 12:23, 165:5	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19, 160:22, 161:24, 162:5, 167:5, 167:8, 167:19, 169:2, 175:12, 187:3, 189:11, 191:15, 191:16, 192:12,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4,	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \textbf{S}\\ \hline \\ \textbf{S-5} \ [1] - 208:22\\ \textbf{safe} \ [8] - 158:25,\\ 184:20,\ 209:20,\\ 212:5,\ 294:13,\\ 306:22\\ \textbf{safety} \ [4] - 186:3,\\ 197:7,\ 286:2,\ 305:11\\ \textbf{sake} \ [2] - 12:23,\ 165:5\\ \textbf{Salt} \ [2] - 245:9,\\ \end{array}$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25,	119:19, 130:13, 137:23, 138:5, 138:6, 138:13, 138:16, 138:22, 139:7, 147:12, 148:2, 148:18, 150:19, 154:9, 156:18, 156:19, 160:22, 161:24, 162:5, 167:5, 167:8, 167:19, 169:2, 175:12, 187:3, 189:11, 191:15, 191:16, 192:12, 196:2, 200:10,	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20 <b>sensitive</b> [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8	186:2, 302:2 Russell [1] - 196:3 rustle [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22 <b>safety</b> [4] - 186:3, 197:7, 286:2, 305:11 <b>sake</b> [2] - 12:23, 165:5 <b>Salt</b> [2] - 245:9, 245:12	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\1000000000000000000000000000000000000$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20 <b>sensitive</b> [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22 <b>safety</b> [4] - 186:3, 197:7, 286:2, 305:11 <b>sake</b> [2] - 12:23, 165:5 <b>Salt</b> [2] - 245:9, 245:12 <b>samples</b> [2] - 191:14,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\1000000000000000000000000000000000000$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20 <b>sensitive</b> [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4,	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \textbf{S}\\ \hline \\ \textbf{S-5} \ [1] - 208:22\\ \textbf{safe} \ [8] - 158:25,\\ 184:20,\ 209:20,\\ 212:5,\ 294:13,\\ 306:22\\ \textbf{safety} \ [4] - 186:3,\\ 197:7,\ 286:2,\ 305:11\\ \textbf{sake} \ [2] - 12:23,\ 165:5\\ \textbf{Salt} \ [2] - 245:9,\\ 245:12\\ \textbf{samples} \ [2] - 191:14,\\ 230:5\\ \end{array}$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scote [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\137:13, 138:13, \\138:13, 138:14, \\137:14, 135, \\157:14, 123, \\157:14, \\137:14, \\137:14, \\143:15, \\157:14, \\143:15, \\157:14, \\143:15, \\157:14, \\143:15, \\157:14, \\143:15, \\157:14, $	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20 <b>sensitive</b> [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17,	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22 <b>safety</b> [4] - 186:3, 197:7, 286:2, 305:11 <b>sake</b> [2] - 12:23, 165:5 <b>Salt</b> [2] - 245:9, 245:12 <b>samples</b> [2] - 191:14, 230:5 <b>sat</b> [6] - 28:24, 31:4,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20,	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\ \end{array}$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 sensitivities [3] -
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4,	186:2, 302:2 <b>Russell</b> [1] - 196:3 <b>rustle</b> [1] - 194:4 <b>S</b> <b>S-5</b> [1] - 208:22 <b>safe</b> [8] - 158:25, 184:20, 209:20, 212:5, 294:13, 306:22 <b>safety</b> [4] - 186:3, 197:7, 286:2, 305:11 <b>sake</b> [2] - 12:23, 165:5 <b>Salt</b> [2] - 245:9, 245:12 <b>samples</b> [2] - 191:14, 230:5 <b>sat</b> [6] - 28:24, 31:4, 72:21, 114:2, 114:3,	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\138:13, 138:13, 138:13, 138:13, 138:14, \\130:14, 130:15, \\140:14, 130:15, 140:15, \\140:14, 130:15, 140:15, \\140:14, 140:15, 140:15, 140:15, 140:15, 140:15, 140:15$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 sensitivities [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4, 103:14, 156:21,	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22 search [1] - 222:13	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\270:22, 270:23, \\ \end{bmatrix}$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 sensitivities [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2 sensitivity [18] - 55:9,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4, 103:14, 156:21, 197:25, 233:2,	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\270:22, 270:23, \\274:9, 277:4, 289:6, \\ \end{cases}$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 sensitivities [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2 sensitivity [18] - 55:9, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4, 103:14, 156:21, 197:25, 233:2, 244:9, 307:8, 307:10	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \textbf{S}\\ \hline \\ \textbf{S-5} \ [1] - 208:22\\ \textbf{safe} \ [8] - 158:25,\\ 184:20,\ 209:20,\\ 212:5,\ 294:13,\\ 306:22\\ \textbf{safety} \ [4] - 186:3,\\ 197:7,\ 286:2,\ 305:11\\ \textbf{sake} \ [2] - 12:23,\ 165:5\\ \textbf{Salt} \ [2] - 245:9,\\ 245:12\\ \textbf{samples} \ [2] - 191:14,\\ 230:5\\ \textbf{sat} \ [6] - 28:24,\ 31:4,\\ 72:21,\ 114:2,\ 114:3,\\ 181:6\\ \textbf{satisfaction} \ [1] - 273:22\\ \hline \end{array}$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22 search [1] - 222:13 season [2] - 127:24,	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\270:22, 270:23, \\274:9, 277:4, 289:6, \\289:11, 294:6, \\137:13, 138:13, \\187:14, 294:6, \\137:14, 133, 138:14, \\1437:14, 214:14, \\1439:15, \\251:14, 244:6, \\137:14, 244:6, \\137:14, 214:16, \\137:140, 214:16, \\137$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20 <b>sensitive</b> [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 <b>sensitivities</b> [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2 <b>sensitivity</b> [18] - 55:9, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1, 97:4, 97:5, 97:9,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4, 103:14, 156:21, 197:25, 233:2, 244:9, 307:8, 307:10 root [1] - 154:12	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \textbf{S}\\ \hline \\ \textbf{S-5} \ [1] - 208:22\\ \textbf{safe} \ [8] - 158:25,\\ 184:20,\ 209:20,\\ 212:5,\ 294:13,\\ 306:22\\ \textbf{safety} \ [4] - 186:3,\\ 197:7,\ 286:2,\ 305:11\\ \textbf{sake} \ [2] - 12:23,\ 165:5\\ \textbf{Salt} \ [2] - 245:9,\\ 245:12\\ \textbf{samples} \ [2] - 191:14,\\ 230:5\\ \textbf{sat} \ [6] - 28:24,\ 31:4,\\ 72:21,\ 114:2,\ 114:3,\\ 181:6\\ \textbf{satisfaction} \ [1] -\\ 273:22\\ \textbf{satisfy} \ [5] - 65:18,\\ \end{array}$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22 search [1] - 222:13 season [2] - 127:24, 196:8 seasonal [1] - 79:17	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\270:22, 270:23, \\274:9, 277:4, 289:6, \\289:11, 294:6, \\299:23, 300:6, \\1338:13, 133, 133, 133, 133, 133, 130, 123, 123, 123, 123, 123, 123, 123, 123$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 sensitivities [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2 sensitivity [18] - 55:9, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4, 103:14, 156:21, 197:25, 233:2, 244:9, 307:8, 307:10 root [1] - 154:12 rotating [1] - 201:4	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22 search [1] - 222:13 season [2] - 127:24, 196:8 seasonal [1] - 79:17 seated [1] - 219:7	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\270:22, 270:23, \\274:9, 277:4, 289:6, \\289:11, 294:6, \\299:23, 300:6, \\300:12, 309:1, \\ \end{bmatrix}$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20 <b>sensitive</b> [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 <b>sensitivities</b> [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2 <b>sensitivity</b> [18] - 55:9, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1, 97:4, 97:5, 97:9, 114:17, 117:10,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4, 103:14, 156:21, 197:25, 233:2, 244:9, 307:8, 307:10 root [1] - 154:12 rotating [1] - 201:4 rotation [1] - 191:2	$\begin{array}{c} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \textbf{S}\\ \hline \\ \textbf{S-5} \ [1] - 208:22\\ \textbf{safe} \ [8] - 158:25,\\ 184:20,\ 209:20,\\ 212:5,\ 294:13,\\ 306:22\\ \textbf{safety} \ [4] - 186:3,\\ 197:7,\ 286:2,\ 305:11\\ \textbf{sake} \ [2] - 12:23,\ 165:5\\ \textbf{Salt} \ [2] - 245:9,\\ 245:12\\ \textbf{samples} \ [2] - 191:14,\\ 230:5\\ \textbf{sat} \ [6] - 28:24,\ 31:4,\\ 72:21,\ 114:2,\ 114:3,\\ 181:6\\ \textbf{satisfaction} \ [1] - 273:22\\ \textbf{satisfy} \ [5] - 65:18,\\ 98:18,\ 104:23,\\ 105:16,\ 184:19\\ \hline \end{array}$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22 search [1] - 222:13 season [2] - 127:24, 196:8 seasonal [1] - 79:17 seated [1] - 219:7 sec [1] - 62:19	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\270:22, 270:23, \\274:9, 277:4, 289:6, \\289:11, 294:6, \\299:23, 300:6, \\300:12, 309:1, \\309:5, 312:24$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 sense [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 senses [1] - 177:7 sensing [1] - 114:20 sensitive [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 sensitivities [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2 sensitivity [18] - 55:9, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1, 97:4, 97:5, 97:9, 114:17, 117:10, 129:6, 141:12,
140:3, 225:4, 225:7 rock [1] - 279:24 rocking [2] - 104:24, 130:4 Roland [10] - 15:22, 16:4, 17:14, 18:18, 20:3, 23:7, 23:17, 61:9, 290:10, 293:4 role [5] - 121:21, 121:24, 127:12, 127:13, 221:7 roles [1] - 4:12 rolling [2] - 277:4, 277:11 Ron [1] - 290:8 Ronnie [2] - 293:4, 313:8 roof [1] - 286:11 room [14] - 29:4, 31:21, 43:17, 55:17, 60:25, 81:20, 82:4, 103:14, 156:21, 197:25, 233:2, 244:9, 307:8, 307:10 root [1] - 154:12 rotating [1] - 201:4	$\begin{array}{r} 186:2,\ 302:2\\ \textbf{Russell} \ [1] - 196:3\\ \textbf{rustle} \ [1] - 194:4\\ \hline \\ \hline$	197:10, 219:2, 219:11 sciences [1] - 219:12 scientific [6] - 73:4, 168:10, 168:14, 168:16, 169:11, 244:1 scientifically [1] - 209:19 scoot [1] - 17:9 scope [8] - 83:14, 84:2, 84:7, 84:18, 123:11, 152:24, 157:5, 160:15 Scotland [1] - 296:23 scratch [3] - 9:25, 10:2, 10:11 scratched [1] - 134:3 screen [1] - 109:11 se [5] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22, 227:17, 249:22 search [1] - 222:13 season [2] - 127:24, 196:8 seasonal [1] - 79:17 seated [1] - 219:7	$119:19, 130:13, \\137:23, 138:5, \\138:6, 138:13, \\138:16, 138:22, \\139:7, 147:12, \\148:2, 148:18, \\150:19, 154:9, \\156:18, 156:19, \\160:22, 161:24, \\162:5, 167:5, 167:8, \\167:19, 169:2, \\175:12, 187:3, \\189:11, 191:15, \\191:16, 192:12, \\196:2, 200:10, \\203:22, 208:24, \\209:18, 212:14, \\214:13, 219:25, \\232:22, 236:24, \\243:9, 243:15, \\251:13, 258:20, \\265:13, 267:7, \\270:22, 270:23, \\274:9, 277:4, 289:6, \\289:11, 294:6, \\299:23, 300:6, \\300:12, 309:1, \\ \end{bmatrix}$	180:25, 201:19, 215:2, 216:23 <b>sense</b> [16] - 13:15, 13:18, 19:25, 56:10, 201:16, 202:4, 203:21, 214:7, 226:5, 235:6, 237:8, 246:10, 251:14, 263:16, 268:2, 269:15 <b>senses</b> [1] - 177:7 <b>sensing</b> [1] - 114:20 <b>sensitive</b> [17] - 55:8, 97:3, 104:23, 115:8, 116:18, 129:4, 137:16, 150:17, 175:3, 188:1, 192:13, 193:2, 201:14, 201:19, 215:3, 317:5 <b>sensitivities</b> [3] - 54:23, 55:2, 74:2 <b>sensitivity</b> [18] - 55:9, 70:16, 72:24, 73:1, 97:4, 97:5, 97:9, 114:17, 117:10, 129:6, 141:12, 150:25, 189:20,

sensor [2] - 264:19,	12:4, 12:7, 12:9,	88:16, 89:4, 104:15,	side [9] - 10:25,	<b>Sioux</b> [2] - 296:3, 37
265:16	12:13, 25:1, 33:1,	106:23, 107:6,	113:23, 121:2,	318:9
sensory [1] - 235:11	38:20, 40:3, 40:11,	109:20, 123:2,	138:11, 191:8,	<b>sip</b> [1] - 280:4
sent [5] - 18:21,	45:18, 61:13, 81:5,	123:20, 127:3,	197:6, 243:5, 284:18	sister [1] - 270:2
241:23, 241:25,	81:18, 83:14, 83:24,	133:10, 137:15,	sides [3] - 8:14,	sister -in-law [1] -
296:10, 311:22	185:11, 212:15,	142:2, 151:17,	272:11, 285:25	270:2
	262:7, 262:9,	151:20, 178:4,	sideways [2] - 17:10,	-
sentence [7] - 12:18,	262:22, 262:24,	188:8, 199:12,	17:12	<b>sit</b> [8] - 4:19, 13:3,
163:22, 168:18, 248:18, 254:21,	265:12, 265:13,	211:8, 217:17,		17:12, 30:14, 65:19,
248.18, 254.21, 317:3	265:22, 265:23,	255:16, 256:11	<b>sight</b> [2] - 139:10, 284:22	117:12, 175:18, 285:9
	266:11, 266:16,	<b>shoot</b> [2] - 60:14,	sign [9] - 44:2, 240:19,	
sentences [1] - 167:7	266:21, 266:25,	60:23	0	<b>site</b> [29] - 50:10, 55:3,
separate [7] - 4:13,	272:14, 294:14,	<b>short</b> [13] - 51:19,	290:3, 290:5, 290:7,	56:13, 65:4, 71:8,
10:21, 73:24, 81:23,	294:22, 305:18,	57:16, 63:12, 77:2,	291:13, 292:5, 292:22, 299:15	77:10, 79:21, 86:17,
112:11, 186:4, 228:3	309:4, 309:17,	139:13, 154:6,		86:18, 87:9, 87:25,
separating [3] - 58:8,	309:21, 310:5	155:23, 206:6,	signal [4] - 87:8,	101:14, 101:17,
139:9, 213:23 September [5] -	setting [2] - 55:2,	216:21, 218:13,	87:10, 106:10, 175:8	102:17, 102:19, 102:23, 102:24,
	180:18	224:24, 288:3, 288:6	signal 's [1] - 80:11	
268:14, 268:17,	settings [2] - 219:15,	<b>short -term</b> [3] - 154:6,	signaling [1] - 173:8	102:25, 157:9, 157:13, 157:25
269:1, 311:24	219:16	155:23, 216:21	signature [2] - 88:11,	157:13, 157:25, 177:6, 184:18,
sequentially [1] -	<b>seven</b> [4] - 59:10,	shortcoming [1] -	119:17	235:7, 241:8, 259:6,
167:3	72:2, 168:11, 309:16	103:7	signed [6] - 5:23,	
serendipity [1] - 182:2	several [16] - 8:18,	shortcomings [2] -	38:18, 269:3, 291:4,	259:17, 285:5, 285:6 site -specific [1] -
serious [3] - 131:25,	152:17, 200:3,	99:13, 168:11	305:3, 305:6	157:25
146:22, 192:13	260:5, 260:8, 260:9,	shorter [1] - 264:11	significance [2] -	sited [1] - 63:6
seriously [1] - 187:4	262:16, 262:19,	shortly [2] - 132:3,	141:4, 147:6	
serve [1] - 60:15	262:23, 265:11,	261:11	significant [18] -	sites [8] - 71:22,
service [1] - 78:21	266:6, 266:19,	shoulder [2] - 289:3,	57:22, 60:23, 65:6,	72:11, 81:19, 116:22, 117:8,
<b>Service</b> [7] - 86:13,	268:21, 279:25,	300:15	72:16, 116:3, 149:5,	121:17, 147:15,
86:23, 87:3, 87:22,	294:17	<b>shouting</b> [2] - 278:10,	168:10, 170:4,	164:15
178:14, 250:5,	severe [1] - 40:12	278:13	183:21, 193:6,	sits [1] - 4:17
256:17	severely [1] - 181:3		201:17, 205:22,	
<b>session</b> [6] - 63:13,	shadow [13] - 26:18,	<b>show</b> [16] - 24:15, 99:19, 102:23,	213:24, 214:14, 215:1, 245:7, 248:5	sitting [7] - 7:14,
130:8, 206:7,	26:22, 26:24, 27:4,	102:24, 139:25,	215:1, 245:7, 248:5, 278:1	21:17, 30:4, 31:23, 109:5, 143:24,
218:14, 224:25,	260:13, 305:11,	146:8, 172:12,		320:21
308:13	305:18, 308:18,	186:1, 191:1,	significantly [3] -	
<b>set</b> [22] - 13:25, 14:21,	315:6, 315:8,	231:20, 266:22,	148:1, 266:21, 284:7	situate [1] - 285:11 situation [4] - 66:15,
59:12, 65:23, 82:23,	315:12, 316:13,	295:15, 305:5,	silence [1] - 150:7 similar [17] - 43:21,	82:25, 89:21, 99:22
109:14, 111:16,	316:16	306:6, 306:7, 321:24		situations [2] -
120:4, 164:5,	shaking [1] - 275:18	showed [8] - 49:18,	47:22, 67:10, 98:11, 117:17, 118:2,	
184:20, 195:6,	shall [2] - 26:3, 290:16	64:6, 196:7, 199:12,		145:11, 180:11
198:11, 199:21,	shame [1] - 292:18	200:2, 266:14,	142:16, 143:17,	<b>six</b> [6] - 35:8, 72:1,
203:8, 210:4, 210:6, 224:1, 224:5	share [1] - 285:16	299:3, 306:15	148:10, 158:5, 176:15, 177:19,	134:13, 134:14, 220:25, 304:19
224:1, 224:5, 232:11, 264:23,	sharecrop [1] - 284:4	shower [1] - 259:21	182:10, 190:23,	size [2] - 55:11, 98:15
232.11, 204.23, 295:13, 318:13	sharing [1] - 282:14	showing [8] - 178:24,	250:25, 295:5	<b>skewed</b> [1] - 123:6
setback [34] - 25:4,	shed [1] - 283:22	179:3, 194:12,	simple [2] - 139:16,	skewed [1] - 123.0 skip [1] - 168:18
45:12, 45:13, 45:23,	sheer [1] - 120:18	204:8, 207:11,	194:23	skipped [1] - 217:11
49:18, 49:22, 80:12,	sheet [1] - 67:6	299:13, 300:24,	simpler [3] - 76:24,	Skipped [1] - 217.11 Skype [1] - 130:14
81:10, 81:15, 81:23,	sheets [1] - 10:21	301:7	89:21, 184:4	
81:24, 82:7, 82:9,	Sherman [4] - 1:18,	shown [1] - 301:21	simplicity [1] - 139:20	<b>sleep</b> [19] - 78:1, 99:8, 116:7, 118:9,
82:14, 82:20, 82:25,	36:13, 45:24, 299:9	<b>shows</b> [5] - 137:17,	simple [8] - 54:7, 66:9,	146:13, 146:19,
83:5, 83:8, 83:11,	<b>shift</b> [2] - 193:10,	138:6, 138:20,	68:12, 71:5, 79:12,	154:12, 220:21,
83:18, 83:19, 83:20,	232:22	138:25, 245:6	117:15, 207:20,	221:18, 231:14,
231:17, 231:18,	shifting [3] - 85:21,	<b>shut</b> [2] - 229:11,	275:4	239:10, 241:5,
231:17, 295:2,	93:9, 110:25	275:4	simultaneous [1] -	239.10, 241.5, 248:8, 249:1,
296:11, 311:14,	<b>Shirley</b> [35] - 69:16,	<b>shutting</b> [2] - 185:15,	58:11	248.8, 249.1, 251:16, 251:22,
315:4, 315:10,	70:18, 72:1, 72:9,	229:13	single [4] - 33:19,	251:10, 251:22, 251:23, 307:2
315:17, 315:19,	72:15, 85:21, 85:23,	<b>sic</b> [2] - 7:3, 15:22	149:4, 165:10,	sleeplessness [1] -
318:23	86:10, 86:12, 86:17,	sick [2] - 104:24,	200:15	168:22
setbacks [39] - 12:3,	86:21, 87:13, 87:16,	144:7	sinks [1] - 195:25	sleeving [1] - 263:20
[00] 12.0,	00.21, 01.10, 01.10,		Sinka [i] - 180.20	SICCVILING [1] - 203.20

slightly [1] - 60:19	solution [1] - 152:5	99:3, 99:9, 101:16,	295:6	<b>227:22,228:20</b> , 38
slim [1] - 291:8	someone [11] - 56:11,	102:5, 102:15,	<b>sounds</b> [26] - 56:10,	246:20, 246:21,
<b>slow</b> [2] - 209:3, 219:4	65:22, 154:24,	102:16, 103:4,	73:20, 74:21, 76:19,	247:9
slowly [1] - 209:5	189:11, 220:12,	104:2, 104:10,	77:10, 78:18, 86:20,	specifically [17] -
small [20] - 59:22,	239:17, 239:20,	105:15, 105:16,	91:10, 100:10,	7:21, 26:1, 30:18,
68:23, 69:11, 69:25,	246:9, 251:10,	106:9, 110:25,	129:22, 138:10,	31:7, 72:17, 74:17,
71:20, 98:17,	302:12	111:1, 111:3, 111:9,	149:13, 149:17,	76:3, 77:6, 136:4,
101:12, 107:10,	someplace [1] -	111:19, 111:22,	189:21, 191:9,	137:12, 138:9,
116:21, 116:22,	290:20	112:8, 112:9,	191:11, 199:5,	165:13, 167:25,
116:23, 121:9,	something 's [2] -	112:16, 113:17,	204:10, 204:21,	170:25, 181:11,
151:1, 184:12,	69:21, 141:18	114:10, 114:16,	210:1, 213:10,	223:25,248:3
211:13, 211:14,	sometime [3] - 8:1,	115:13, 116:1,	216:3, 245:11,	<b>specifics</b> [3] - 30:9,
285:8, 291:9, 291:14	221:5, 310:25	117:16, 121:22,	247:25, 250:8	45:5, 98:15
smaller [1] - 264:14	sometimes [5] -	124:21, 125:9,	<b>source</b> [16] - 104:12,	spectrogram [1] -
smell [1] - 33:1	78:12, 78:15, 196:1,	125:24, 126:9,	104:14, 105:6,	191:18
<b>Smith</b> [6] - 1:15,	235:25	126:10, 127:13,	142:24, 145:13,	<b>spectrum</b> [6] - 73:23,
156:18, 165:12,	somewhat [6] - 84:23,	127:14, 127:20,	146:20, 146:22,	106:11, 106:21,
171:6, 171:25,	114:11, 182:8,	127:22, 128:4,	149:21, 149:24,	115:18, 124:24,
321:10	215:22, 221:21,	132:25, 136:5,	149:25, 159:4,	210:3
<b>SMITH</b> [46] - 63:18,	275:9	138:9, 139:19,	177:17, 180:21,	speculate [1] - 263:12
63:20, 70:7, 75:15,	somewhere [4] -	139:25, 140:21,	213:8, 241:8, 241:10	speculating [2] - 97:8,
78:7,84:6,84:17,	110:4, 183:19,	140:22, 141:2,	<b>sources</b> [4] - 168:10,	271:1
88:19,90:17,90:24,	303:4, 303:7	145:12, 147:6,	190:16, 222:14,	speculation [5] -
91:24, 92:2, 92:11,	<b>sonic</b> [3] - 139:21,	147:11, 147:14,	229:22	75:15, 124:3, 263:5,
95:7, 100:9, 122:19,	142:1, 142:18	147:17, 147:24, 149:2, 149:4, 149:6,	<b>South</b> [17] - 1:25, 2:2,	299:17, 302:16
123:10, 124:3,	<b>soon</b> [2] - 130:9,	149:2, 149:4, 149:0,	2:4, 34:22, 52:22,	<b>speech</b> [4] - 199:7,
135:16, 152:22,	306:12	149:20, 153:9,	130:14, 195:11, 105:12, 106:6	219:2, 219:12,
156:14, 156:17,	<b>sorry</b> [21] - 6:8, 88:24,	154:8, 154:25,	195:12, 196:6, 219:8, 258:8, 259:4,	222:19
165:5, 169:18,	101:7, 101:9, 113:2,	155:2, 155:3, 157:9,	259:14, 259:24,	<b>speed</b> [13] - 58:2,
170:14, 171:8,	123:14, 127:3,	157:21, 167:12,	283:16, 288:18,	64:19, 64:20, 65:6,
172:15, 172:24, 173:4, 174:7,	127:16, 223:1,	175:2, 175:4,	311:25	79:4, 128:7, 128:16,
217:10, 217:15,	223:3, 223:11, 236:16, 236:19,	175:24, 176:20,	<b>SOUTH</b> [2] - 1:1, 1:5	128:17, 171:18, 193:16, 194:21,
218:8, 223:1,	230.10, 230.19, 241:22, 254:10,	177:7, 178:4, 183:7,	south [1] - 277:8	195:21, 195:22
224:12, 224:17,	257:14, 258:12,	184:6, 184:8,	southeast [1] - 260:17	speeds [4] - 79:2,
232:21, 233:1,	258:13, 261:25,	185:18, 185:19,	southern [6] - 200:18,	89:24, 90:1, 191:2
247:15, 249:2,	303:6, 313:18	189:21, 191:11,	210:19, 210:20,	spelled [1] - 288:17
250:12, 251:20,	<b>sort</b> [13] - 5:18, 5:23,	192:3, 192:11,	211:3, 266:15, 267:1	<b>spend</b> [2] - 195:6,
252:3, 252:8,	19:24, 27:22, 38:16,	194:10, 194:14,	sparsely [2] - 61:22,	276:4
252:14, 257:6	56:24, 84:1, 105:11,	194:15, 194:18,	67:24	spent [1] - 260:20
<b>smoke</b> [4] - 307:8,	108:15, 161:23,	197:3, 200:6,	speaker [2] - 28:23,	<b>spikes</b> [5] - 93:19,
307:10, 307:20,	226:15, 232:4,	202:20, 202:21,	34:10	93:23, 137:25,
307:21	276:18	202:25, 203:3,	speaking [4] - 30:15,	138:18, 191:17
<b>smooth</b> [2] - 195:20,	sorts [1] - 204:8	203:4, 203:13,	61:17, 62:9, 69:13	spite [1] - 218:6
214:10	<b>Soukup</b> [9] - 3:12,	204:4, 211:6,	speaks [1] - 20:9	<b>split</b> [2] - 121:11,
social [7] - 90:16,	3:13, 3:18, 3:20,	211:12, 212:11,	special [4] - 37:24,	289:21
91:23, 92:10, 92:12,	3:23, 17:8, 28:21,	213:5, 213:14,	45:1, 82:22, 207:18	sporadic [1] - 125:7
269:14,269:15,	28:25, 29:15	213:16, 213:18,	specialist [1] - 236:3	sports [1] - 279:12
285:23	<b>sound</b> [160] - 26:4,	213:19, 215:9, 216:7, 216:21,	specialists [1] -	spotty [1] - 214:1
socialize [1] - 279:11	26:5, 26:9, 26:12,	210.7, 210.21, 221:8, 227:6, 227:7,	235:24	<b>sPower</b> [4] - 298:21,
<b>society</b> [2] - 169:24,	41:13, 54:10, 54:25,	230:4, 230:23,	specialized [3] -	298:22, 299:24,
226:12	55:1, 55:4, 55:14,	231:1, 233:22,	104:16, 106:5, 106:7	303:17
software [1] - 64:4	55:19, 56:13, 57:14,	246:6, 246:20,	<b>specific</b> [22] - 30:12,	<b>spring</b> [9] - 284:19,
solar [1] - 195:16	58:1, 58:3, 59:10,	247:9, 248:22,	30:20, 30:24, 71:4,	290:6, 292:4,
sold [1] - 99:2	59:12, 59:17, 64:18,	260:13, 305:18,	80:22, 105:5,	292:13, 294:4,
<b>solely</b> [5] - 69:3, 70:4,	65:17, 66:14, 73:19, 78:13, 70:4, 70:5	308:19, 315:6,	113:11, 117:8,	294:16,310:25,
157:25, 243:21, 257:5	78:13, 79:4, 79:5, 79:22, 79:23, 80:10,	315:8, 315:12,	138:4, 157:13, 157:25, 158:13	313:1, 313:2
257:5	87:12, 90:25, 93:3,	316:5, 316:16	157:25, 158:13, 158:14, 190:16,	Springfield [1] -
<b>solid</b> [2] - 138:5, 138:12	93:13, 93:16, 98:9,	sound 's [1] - 215:7	191:1, 207:2,	296:23
100.12	,,,,	sounded [2] - 77:13,	101.1, 201.2,	square [1] - 59:7

squared [1] - 225:1	276:17, 307:8,	92:3, 164:5, 225:8,	strictly [1] - 38:3	<b>121:2, 121:19</b> , 39
squishing [1] - 73:20	308:7, 321:22	293:12	<b>strike</b> [17] - 41:15,	122:2, 127:13,
	,			
stable [6] - 78:20,	started [19] - 19:1,	statistical [6] - 56:9,	53:25, 80:5, 170:15,	127:14, 127:20,
78:24, 79:1, 79:3,	28:11, 75:10, 89:5,	57:8,85:7,125:13,	171:7, 172:5, 172:7,	127:21, 127:22,
193:23, 196:15	95:20, 131:8, 132:4,	245:7, 245:13	172:21, 173:2,	128:4, 133:10,
stacked [1] - 306:8	141:1, 180:20,	statistically [1] - 210:5	224:15,247:16,	140:3, 141:22,
Staff [35] - 1:23, 3:9,	182:6, 184:10,	status [1] - 249:19	263:4, 263:10,	142:1, 142:7,
14:7, 29:5, 31:13,	209:25, 223:3,	statute [1] - 92:5	271:4, 293:25,	142:14, 150:3,
47:2, 52:16, 53:1,	261:10, 284:2,	stay [3] - 168:2,	299:19, 299:20	164:22, 168:10,
67:16, 67:21, 95:5,	285:1, 292:18,	232:14, 294:14	striking [1] - 252:11	168:16, 168:18,
100:12, 134:20,	294:15,319:11	steady [3] - 94:8,	string [1] - 191:14	169:1, 169:5, 169:6,
135:1, 135:7,	starting [7] - 10:2,	125:8	strokes [1] - 292:12	174:22, 178:4,
	99:3, 232:3, 232:19,			178:8, 178:13,
135:13, 170:18,		<b>step</b> [3] - 34:6, 52:10,	strong [7] - 79:9, 87:8,	178:14, 178:21,
171:17, 174:16,	237:4, 277:21,	89:4	158:23, 199:23,	
178:9,208:18,	316:21	stepped [2] - 49:21,	202:17, 203:11,	179:19, 179:20,
208:22, 208:24,	starts [10] - 25:7,	52:1	278:12	188:7, 190:4, 190:6,
223:22, 224:4,	85:10, 117:18,	stepping [1] - 266 : 12	stronger [1] - 78:25	191:23, 196:4,
224:20, 253:7,	214:8,236:25,	Steve [4] - 142:1,	strongest [1] - 179:4	211:17, 220:5,
257:7,267:16,	254:21, 307:1,	165:2, 182:12,	strongly [1] - 80:13	222:18, 227:23,
267:22,277:18,	309:3, 312:25, 313:1	191:22	struck [3] - 262:20,	228:18, 242:1,
287:22, 314:23,	state [30] - 12:25,	<b>Steven</b> [6] - 54:17,	277:11, 299:4	244:12,244:17,
318:24, 319:9	13:1, 13:3, 13:5,	54:19, 68:20, 85:16,	student [1] - 222:16	245:6, 245:21,
<b>STAFF</b> [1] - 1:12	13:8, 14:17, 20:8,			246:2, 251:8,
	40:16, 85:6, 98:11,	141:22, 141:24	studied [13] - 71:21,	275:10, 280:19,
Staff 's [5] - 52:12,		sticker [1] - 6:6	74:3, 74:4, 85:1,	305:18
52:15, 224:1, 224:4,	102:5, 116:20,	<b>still</b> [30] - 63:16, 67:6,	85:22, 115:21,	
318:21	151:11, 183:5,	72:1, 79:11, 99:18,	116:12, 123:3,	<b>Study</b> [5] - 74:22,
stage [1] - 121:15	183:13, 195:12,	104:4, 105:3, 119:3,	151:4, 158:4,	163:6, 175:23,
stake [1] - 272:4	222:23, 229:10,	122:13, 138:24,	180:22, 253:15	176:4, 212:1
stand [5] - 22:7,	236:8, 241:3, 250:4,	180:17, 195:8,	studies [27] - 40:13,	study 's [1] - 103:25
52:15, 63:14, 206:8,	294:24,295:13,	195:10, 197:13,	65:3, 72:25, 73:6,	studying [3] - 85:16,
247:22	297:25,298:1,	198:17, 198:20,	73:14, 74:18, 74:24,	167:12, 251:5
standard [24] - 13:1,	298:2, 298:9,	204:17, 206:9,	75:3, 75:4, 75:7,	stuff [13] - 10:5, 30:1,
13:3, 13:5, 13:8,	298:11, 306:19,	204:17, 200:3, 220:11, 250:24,		75:5, 128:2, 172:13,
	313:5		75:8, 75:18, 90:25,	295:3, 295:10,
14:17, 41:20, 76:23,	<b>State</b> [6] - 2:3, 33:17,	262:15, 275:17,	121:6, 140:25,	296:10, 305:19,
89:18, 144:20,	98:7, 103:9, 219:18,	276:9, 276:10,	142:3, 148:17,	305:25, 310:17,
145:3, 145:6,		276:12,279:18,	157:25, 161:6,	
145:10, 188:4,	221:4	280:21, 281:4,	193:25, 209:20,	319:20
189:16, 203:8,	<b>STATE</b> [1] - 1:1	281:6, 286:10	226:3, 227:4,	style [1] - 146:18
227:20, 250:14,	State 's [1] - 31:20	stimulate [1] - 245:11	227:12,227:15,	styles [1] - 288:2
250:25, 294:25,	statement [14] - 22:8,	stipulated [2] - 19:11,	227:16, 227:22	subject [10] - 63:14,
295:13, 297:25,	143:4, 158:15,	19:12	study [103] - 25:15,	131:12, 168:17,
298:2, 298:3	159:5, 161:1, 164:8,	stop [5] - 30:21,	54:6, 54:13, 54:15,	189:2, 210:17,
standards [10] -	164:25, 169:17,	170:13, 200:4,	54:25, 64:18, 67:12,	211:5, 232:19,
89:15, 145:1,	169:20, 171:6,		69:17, 69:22, 70:17,	253:10, 264:25,
145:24, 150:17,	185:25, 196:25,	229:6, 231:5	74:22, 75:1, 84:10,	265:5
	241:8, 312:1	stopped [2] - 151:13,		subjective [1] - 64:12
204:5, 230:19, 224:2, 250:16		252:9	84:11, 84:12, 84:14,	
234:2, 250:16,	statement 's [1] -	strained [2] - 282:2,	84:16, 84:21, 84:22,	subjects [2] - 168:12,
252:23, 298:11	169:16	285:24	84:25,86:10,86:14,	248:16
<b>standing</b> [5] - 15:4,	statements [5] - 44:5,	strains [1] - 270:19	86:15, 86:22, 87:6,	<b>submit</b> [4] - 18:10,
119:10, 176:24,	69:2, 160:7, 171:16,	strange [1] - 221:23	87:16, 90:4, 90:7,	21:21, 53:3, 166:25
205:18	172:8	strategy [1] - 285:13	90:8, 98:12, 99:9,	submittals [1] - 68:15
standpoint [3] - 116:8,	States [6] - 95:14,	stratify [1] - 79:2	99:10, 99:11, 99:16,	submitted [11] - 22:3,
260:19, 278:10	101:4, 159:7,	street [2] - 203:17,	101:16, 101:17,	22:16, 53:7, 167:22,
stands [1] - 282:9	166:16, 180:11,	258:8	101:19, 102:15,	179:2, 190:3,
start [18] - 9:24, 13:18,	206:15		102:16, 102:22,	252:12, 274:12,
37:3, 73:7, 80:14,	states [6] - 95:17,	streets [2] - 121:12,	103:7, 104:16,	275:11, 275:13,
	136:13, 194:1,	286:6	108:17, 112:8,	280:20
120:4, 174:1, 193:3,		stress [1] - 229:4		
193:5, 200:15,	196:7, 234:18,	stretching [1] - 277 :7	112:9, 112:16,	subpoenaed [1] -
245:3, 261:14,	309:14	stricken [3] - 172:8,	113:13, 119:3,	48:13
264:7, 271:11,	stating [5] - 61:7,	172:22, 277:10	120:23, 120:25,	subsection [1] -

243:10
subsequent [1] -
188:14
substance [2] -
103:14, 250:11
substantial [1] -
228:16
substantially [2] -
11:18, 125:23 substantive [1] -
134:9
subtlety [1] - 286:4
subtract [1] - 125:11
subtracting [1] -
106:22
Suburban [2] -
145:20, 146:21
success [1] - 152:10
successful [2] - 100:24, 312:8
sue [1] - 313:8
suffer [4] - 117:1,
150:7, 239:18, 255:2
suffering [1] - 139:4
sufficient [4] - 141:3,
191:22, 200:6,
244:19
sufficiently [1] - 199:23
suggest [2] - 118:14,
140:7
suggested [8] - 20:4,
76:9, 81:14, 118:24,
193:13, 267:11,
267:12, 267:16
suggesting [3] - 23:8,
23:18, 82:17 suggestion [5] - 61:4,
82:5, 82:12, 178:13,
298:8
summarize [2] -
101:1, 320:2
summarized [1] -
67:12
summarizes [1] -
147:4
summarizing [1] - 263:15
summary [2] - 292:12,
310:6
summer [6] - 13:12,
16:1, 45:2, 222:20,
294:16, 313:2
summertime [1] -
128:1
<b>sun</b> [2] - 195:18, 195:23
superintendents [1] -
35:14
supplemented [1] -

58:10 support [13] - 83:22, 83:23, 113:25, 158:13, 158:15, 159:4, 168:19, 172:17, 227:24, 243:23, 244:13, 251:6, 282:4 supporter [2] -158:23, 202:17 supporters [1] - 16:3 supporting [1] -166:25 supportive [1] -171:14 supports [1] - 245:9 suppose [3] - 5:15, 18:5, 44:13 supposed [5] - 7:7, 26:7, 102:22, 103:1, 307:18 surface [2] - 109:10, 214:21 surgical [1] - 236:1 **surprise** [4] - 43:13, 253:16, 253:22, 253:23 surprised [7] - 116:15, 116:16, 262:6, 262:9, 274:10, 275:9, 320:18 **surprising** [3] - 104:8, 111:15, 140:17 survey [10] - 75:1, 75:7, 87:12, 88:15, 89:23, 101:22, 128:10, 128:17, 176:21, 280:22 surveys [3] - 58:19, 80:23, 157:13 susceptible [5] -68:24,69:10, 117:21, 211:2, 211:7 sustain [2] - 92:6, 173:1 sustained [1] - 83:15 swear [1] - 130:18 swearing [1] - 218:19 Sweden [1] - 75:7 Swinbanks [1] -201:22 swinging [1] - 113:8 switch [2] - 4:11, 144:18 switched [1] - 108:9 swore [1] - 321:14 sworn [6] - 3:14, 34:16, 52:18, 130:20, 258:2, 288:11

symptom [1] - 239:23 symptoms [15] -68:25, 71:13, 122:25, 132:23, 150:23, 192:1, 207:17,211:13, 212:7, 239:6, 239:12, 239:21, 240:11, 240:13, 243:21 syndrome [2] - 144:8, 245:22 system [10] - 4:15, 25:12, 26:3, 28:23, 82:13.141:10. 141:14, 149:18, 306:3 systems [3] - 9:15, 25:21, 129:20 Т tab [1] - 18:15 table [13] - 95:10, 95:14, 96:5, 112:18, 147:3, 147:12, 207:11, 290:22, 290:25, 300:24, 301:4, 301:7, 310:15 Tabor [1] - 296:23 tags [1] - 18:16 takeaways [1] -227:10 talks [5] - 12:9, 153:5, 170:25, 229:3, 251:17 target [1] - 94:14 task [2] - 229:9, 229:11 tax [2] - 35:13, 51:1 taxed [1] - 51:4

taxes [3] - 50:20,

50:22, 313:7

teach [1] - 221:1

teacher [1] - 219:14

team [2] - 133:10,

tease [1] - 58:21

techniques [1] -

technology [2] -

103:10, 238:2

temperature [1] -

tend [1] - 164:22

tended [1] - 212:3

teenage [1] - 221:17

telephonic [1] - 120:3

technical [2] - 53:2,

179:19

237:17

178:25

78:12

## tender [3] - 29:1, 63:8, 232:16 tends [1] - 141:15 tenor [1] - 266:8 tenth [1] - 60:22 tenths [1] - 60:22 term [19] - 57:12, 58:9, 58:21, 84:5, 94:4, 145:5, 146:12, 152:21, 154:5, 154:6, 154:7, 154:14, 155:23, 175:1, 216:21, 217:22,260:14, 318:8, 318:9 terms [14] - 9:5, 47:18, 56:9, 77:15, 87:22, 89:6, 106:23, 110:12, 147:1, 171:22, 222:11, 234:1, 251:12, 304:7 terrain [3] - 124:15, 231:22, 246:24 terribly [1] - 110:3 test [28] - 28:5, 76:10, 76:13, 76:16, 86:24, 94:3, 94:5, 143:8, 165:21, 178:18, 178:22, 178:23, 179:2, 179:10, 181:7, 188:7, 188:23, 190:11, 193:19, 193:20, 193:21, 194:23, 194:24, 196:5, 196:11, 249:4 tested [2] - 143:9, 181:5 testers [1] - 179:25 testified [19] - 3:15, 10:14, 34:17, 52:19, 53:5, 67:1, 67:16, 83:17,83:21, 101:13, 111:11, 178:9, 180:9, 196:10, 210:15, 211:1, 258:3, 288:12,295:5 testifier [1] - 173:25 testifies [1] - 305:2 testify [12] - 71:16, 83:14, 92:12, 100:1, 108:18, 174:3, 206:15,237:5, 247:23, 247:24, 250:20, 251:12 testifying [20] - 20:21, 34:7, 77:5, 84:18, 90:23, 92:14, 100:10, 103:8,

159:11, 159:17, 40 159:20, 166:21, 166:23, 170:7, 172:1, 236:8, 237:20,238:4, 270:6, 271:8 Testimony [17] -55:24, 56:20, 65:2, 84:2, 97:17, 105:14, 107:22, 107:25, 112:20, 140:4, 152:25, 153:2, 170:20, 178:3, 178:10,246:1 testimony [137] -14:16, 31:19, 49:1, 52:10, 53:3, 53:7, 53:18, 53:23, 54:2, 55:7, 55:24, 56:4, 57:2, 57:4, 60:2, 61:1, 63:23, 65:16, 65:25, 66:18, 66:19, 66:22, 71:9, 71:12, 77:8, 81:4, 81:7, 84:7,84:18,89:8, 94:16, 97:2, 100:20, 103:15, 107:6, 119:6, 120:19, 121:7, 123:11, 130:1, 133:16, 133:18, 133:20, 133:22, 134:8, 134:10, 135:6, 135:18, 142:6, 144:20, 144:23, 146:8, 151:1, 153:8, 154:22, 157:18, 157:19, 158:7, 158:14, 158:15, 158:16, 158:17, 160:7, 160:14, 161:18, 161:23, 162:9, 168:4, 168:6, 170:3, 170:15, 171:1, 171:11, 172:20, 172:21, 174:1, 176:5, 183:4, 187:15, 198:4, 198:5, 217:9, 218:9, 220:13, 223:8, 223:15, 223:17, 224:3, 224:23, 225:4, 225:8, 225:19,228:2, 233:5, 234:21, 235:19,236:8, 236:13, 236:19, 237:4, 237:10, 238:15,239:5, 240:18, 241:3, 241:9, 241:13,

242:19, 242:22,	184:3, 185:4,	180:16	three -quarter -of-a-	<b>200</b> : <b>7</b> , <b>200</b> : <b>10</b> , 41
242:24, 243:1,	185:17, 186:14,	theory [4] - 110:13,	<b>mile</b> [1] - 45:11	200:19, 210:23
243:23, 244:8,	186:18, 187:2,	124:17, 164:13,	three -quarters [2] -	took [13] - 10:1, 15:1,
245:25,246:9,	187:11, 187:16,	245:10	271:23, 283:8	19:22, 37:22, 68:14,
246:17,247:17,	187:21, 188:11,	thereafter [2] - 132:3,	three -week [1] - 58:19	69:20, 261:15,
248:17,249:16,	188:19, 189:7,	261:11	threshold [6] - 107:12,	263:9, 291:25,
249:24, 250:7,	189:10, 190:9,	therefore [5] - 146:6,	141:3, 142:23,	295:9, 297:9, 305:7,
252:6, 252:11,	190:13, 190:18,	177:10,215:10,	143:10,228:15,	307 :5
254:12,257:10,	191:7, 192:11,	243:22, 249:5	228 :25	tool [3] - 139:20,
263:4, 263:11,	193:1, 193:17,	thermal [1] - 79:3	thresholds [2] - 143:5,	148:23, 188:20
267:17,271:1,	195:5, 195:16,	they 've [8] - 75:19,	157 :20	tools [4] - 139:14,
271:4, 280:8, 314:7,	197:5, 198:9,	75:20, 109:4,	throughout [4] -	191:19, 202:7,
315:14, 315:18,	198:17, 199:2,	210:14, 251:10,	128:16, 171:1,	274:16
315:19, 321:3	200:22, 201:2,	270:24,284:10,	203:18, 261:10	top [21] - 6:17, 6:20,
testing [13] - 57:19,	203:2, 203:24,	306 :17	throw [3] - 129:17,	64:19,69:13,95:10,
98:9, 179:23, 188:8,	205:13, 205:19,	thinking [11] - 69:15,	319:19	96:6,99:8,136:10,
188:9, 188:12,	206:4, 208:10,	72:13, 77:11, 97:8,	thumb [1] - 220:19	137:10, 137:13,
188:22, 190:16,	212:21, 213:4,	103:25, 153:1,	thump [3] - 144:2,	137:17, 137:23,
196:16, 196:18,	213:14, 213:19, 214:6, 214:8	221:7, 221:12,	144:3	138:6, 175:5, 196:2,
220:8, 235:8, 235:21	214:6, 214:8,	221:19, 221:25,	thumping [1] - 71:5	243:19, 290:22,
tests [7] - 58:24,	214:20, 215:6, 215:15, 216:11,	255:15	thunderstorm [1] -	290:25, 300:16,
77:10, 140:17,	216:14, 216:19,	<b>third</b> [12] - 5:21, 88:1,	118:10	310:12, 316:6
190:13, 213:22, 235:17, 249:4	217:3, 218:20,	90:13, 183:20,	ticking [1] - 118:11	<b>topic</b> [3] - 262:18,
<b>THE</b> [200] - 1:1, 1:1,	249:15, 249:18,	184:3, 185:2, 185:9,	tiers [1] - 270:23	266:11, 279:13
1:2, 1:5, 1:9, 28:22,	249:21, 249:25,	186:11, 245:9, 259:13, 295:8	ties [1] - 144:25	topics [3] - 14:22, 144:18, 298:17
33:20, 33:22, 34:8,	250:8, 253:21,	<b>thirds</b> [4] - 185:10,	timetable [1] - 310:12	tore [1] - 68:16
48:11, 48:14, 48:20,	253:25, 254:10,	185:15, 186:10,	tinnitus [5] - 132:23,	Toronto [1] - 210:21
48:24, 50:10, 51:6,	254:13, 254:15,	187:1	142:16, 211:20,	tossed [1] - 160:2
52:8, 84:23, 96:18,	254:19, 254:23,	thorough [1] - 64:17	211:23, 212:8	total [4] - 244:15,
97:12, 104:7,	255:6, 256:13,	Thorstad [1] - 266:5	title [2] - 12:2, 62:22	283:11, 289:20,
104:11, 104:15,	256:16, 256:22,	thoughts [2] - 114:23,	titled [4] - 12:6, 87:11, 95:11, 109:4	291:2
105:5, 105:9,	256:25, 261:24,	202:11	titles [1] - 162:3	totally [6] - 72:5,
105:12, 105:22,	263:14,264:16,	thousand [4] - 56:15,	today [32] - 3:7, 3:9,	73:24, 296:14,
106:20, 107:4,	271:9, 278:12,	73:19, 215:16,	17:19, 21:8, 24:23,	306:2, 306:9
107:9, 107:20,	278:17, 278:23,	215:17	29:10, 31:18, 31:19,	tough [2] - 34:9,
107:23, 108:3,	279:2, 279:6,	threat [2] - 286:1,	42:9, 48:13, 52:13,	282:14
108:21, 108:24,	279:15, 280:6,	286:4	55:17, 56:13, 63:1,	toward [1] - 222:4
109:3, 109:8, 110:1,	280:10, 280:13,	threatened [1] - 286:7	67:1, 108:15,	towards [10] - 32:2,
110:8, 110:19,	280:17, 281:12,	threats [1] - 313:13	108:18, 135:8,	32:21,66:7,122:13,
110:22, 111:3,	281:16, 281:22, 281:25, 282:5,	three [49] - 3:5, 3:7,	153:8, 168:6,	168:8, 205:11,
111:8, 111:15,	282:17, 282:25,	4:12, 13:12, 15:19,	205:23,218:19,	213:22,260:16,
111:21, 112:4, 112:13, 112:17	283:4, 283:11,	18:6, 21:3, 23:20,	222:18, 224:6,	277:9, 282:4
112:13, 112:17, 113:2, 114:5, 114:9,	283:14, 283:18,	24:15, 25:15, 25:23,	237:12,257:10,	tower [7] - 104:18,
114:16, 114:24,	284:1, 286:3, 286:7,	27:19, 28:10, 28:12,	292:14, 296:1,	119:19, 138:1,
115:6, 115:12,	286:9, 286:12,	28:24, 30:1, 30:15,	312:15, 315:20,	142:19, 190:20,
115:23, 115:25,	286:16, 286:21,	30:20, 32:7, 45:11,	316:6, 321:7	215:12, 283:2
116:10, 116:14,	287:19, 293:15,	49:24, 58:19, 59:5,	today 's [1] - 153:3	towers [7] - 43:12,
116:18, 117:2,	297:13, 302:10,	98:23, 99:6, 104:18,	together [10] - 84:14,	44:22, 46:23, 49:22,
117:24, 118:2,	308:2, 317:2,	118:8, 136:23,	85:1, 210:8, 258:13,	64:19, 296:25, 297:2
118:7, 118:16,	317:12, 317:20,	137:1, 179:3, 182:9,	266:13, 266:14,	town [6] - 98:4,
119:1, 119:8,	317:24, 318:2,	183:16, 185:22, 104:1, 106:7, 202:3	289:25, 290:2,	151:25, 278:19, 203:8, 206:21
119:16, 119:22,	318:7, 319:4, 319:7,	194:1, 196:7, 202:3, 202:6, 211:10,	290:19, 310:15	293:8, 296:21, 296:22
123:16, 124:4,	319:11, 320:6,	202.0, 211.10, 221:24, 225:13,	toilet [1] - 259:20	296:22 township [1] - 268:15
128:22, 156:8,	320:10, 320:13,	259:23, 259:25,	tomorrow [3] -	-
156:13, 165:15,	320:17, 320:23,	262:17, 271:23,	172:22, 308:5, 308:8	townships [2] - 268:22, 272:12
180:3, 180:13,	321:4	283:8, 299:13,	tone [1] - 215:17	trace [3] - 138:8,
180:17, 181:11,	themselves [1] -	305:19, 308:6, 315:9	tones [9] - 137:25,	138:9, 216:1
181:25, 182:24,	172:19	three -page [1] - 137:1	138:17, 138:24, 143:14, 192:12	traces [1] - 191:18
183:1, 183:18,	theories [2] - 73:10,		143:14, 192:12,	

track [3] - 31:3,	159:18, 159:21,	93:24,95:11,95:18,	143:9, 147:20,	<b>244</b> : <b>4</b> , <b>271</b> : <b>11</b> , 42
100:17, 118:9	160:9, 160:14,	99:19, 108:9, 111:7,	147:22, 154:2,	277:3, 300:15,
tracked [1] - 182:5	160:21, 160:22,	111:13, 111:14,	154:4, 155:9,	303:23, 308:22,
tracks [1] - 234:4	161:12, 165:22,	111:18, 119:11,	155:12, 158:5,	311:19, 312:11
traditional [1] - 250:16	166:3, 166:17,	124:17, 129:4,	159:2, 160:8,	turned [4] - 77:12,
traffic [1] - 228:22	167:24, 168:4,	132:13, 134:2,	166:22, 166:24,	184:11, 194:6,
train [1] - 220:14	209:23, 217:21,	134:6, 136:3, 136:4,	167:13, 167:16,	194 : 14
trained [2] - 159:23,	233:16,233:17,	136:19, 137:25,	170:16, 170:23,	turning [7] - 17:10,
160:11	234:24, 234:25,	138:9, 138:24,	171:9, 180:20,	77:1, 183:13, 185:2,
training [6] - 55:15,	235:4, 236:6, 236:7,	139:12, 139:19,	182:1, 183:14,	185:8, 185:9, 185:22
167:15, 234:6,	236:11, 237:6,	139:25, 140:20,	183:24, 184:4,	turns [1] - 94:10
240:10, 248:1, 259:8	237:9, 237:18,	140:21, 146:3,	186:1, 186:21,	<b>TV</b> [1] - 130:14
Transcript [1] - 1:6	237:23, 238:5,	153:24, 154:24,	190:19, 191:2,	tweet [1] - 279:14
transcript [3] - 2:1,	238:17, 239:1,	155:17, 157:21,	193:15, 193:22,	twice [2] - 29:25,
172:7, 252:12	239:15, 239:18,	162:12, 163:25,	194:3, 194:6,	30:17
transform [1] - 191:13	239:23, 239:24, 240:1, 241:1, 241:6	168:19, 175:12, 176:9, 177:17,	194:10, 196:18,	<b>two</b> [86] - 4:6, 10:21,
travel [6] - 79:5, 85:16,	240:1, 241:1, 241:6,	177:20, 184:18,	196:21, 197:14, 107:10, 200:5	15:19, 16:16, 29:22,
108:24, 109:19,	241:14, 245:22, 245:24, 246:7,	177.20, 184.18, 189:19, 192:16,	197:19, 200:5, 200:12, 200:13,	31:5, 31:20, 38:2,
110:16, 136:19	245.24, 246.7, 246:12, 246:21,	193:20, 194:14,	202:21, 204:16,	48:1, 49:23, 53:6,
travels [4] - 85:17,	250:1, 252:22,	193:20, 194:14, 194:14, 194:16, 194:25,	204:17, 204:22,	57:20, 57:25, 58:9,
108:19, 108:23,	252:25	200:12, 200:19,	205:13, 205:22,	58:19, 59:6, 60:22, 63:5, 67:15, 68:10,
110:8	truly [1] - 79:1	204:13, 204:19,	207:18, 210:22,	73:17, 76:5, 80:24,
treads [1] - 170:5	Trump 's [1] - 279:13	207:15, 215:5,	210:24, 211:14,	82:25, 108:14,
treated [2] - 282:6,	trust [5] - 48:20,	215:6, 215:9,	211:25, 214:25,	112:2, 112:10,
282:7 treatment [6] - 82:22,	48:21, 50:18, 50:22,	215:11, 216:3,	220:16, 221:21,	118:17, 125:11,
83:1, 234:23, 236:1,	51:4	216:10, 219:21,	222:7, 227:14,	131:11, 137:10,
239:20	truth [1] - 25:22	220:22, 225:24,	239:1, 239:14,	137:21, 145:17,
treatments [1] - 236:1	try [17] - 8:20, 20:22,	228:19, 228:20,	240:21,242:20,	152:19, 153:25,
trees [5] - 62:8, 77:14,	23:15, 57:20, 69:17,	228:24, 230:22,	247:10,248:7,	154:17, 155:17,
117:16, 127:25,	82:20, 106:8, 125:5,	231:23, 237:6,	248:25, 252:24,	162:1, 162:13,
196:2	125:12, 145:2,	237:11, 237:24, 245:7, 245:14,	253:17, 256:6, 260:8, 260:17,	167:7, 177:4,
tremendous [1] -	161:22, 175:6,	245:22, 247:20,	260:24, 261:4,	184:11, 185:10,
278:7	212:22, 223:5, 230:8, 275:2, 302:19	254:8, 255:3, 256:1,	265:2, 270:5,	185:15, 185:22,
tremendously [1] -	trying [38] - 32:24,	266:17, 271:21,	270:12, 277:6,	186:10, 187:1, 102:12, 104:1
77:11	78:1, 92:15, 101:7,	291:1, 291:20,	277:7, 277:12,	193:13, 194:1, 195:1, 195:8, 196:7,
trends [1] - 147:12	101:8, 107:16,	300:9, 300:11,	290:24, 290:25,	197:8, 215:3, 219:1,
trespass [6] - 198:6,	107:18, 108:15,	300:25, 301:7,	291:11, 291:14,	221:17, 223:17,
198:8, 202:24,	110:20, 113:25,	301:8, 312:7, 313:20	293:22, 297:24,	228:3, 228:9,
203:3, 203:5, 203:21	124:11, 146:17,	turbine 's [1] - 79:11	300:22, 300:25,	246:23, 250:23,
trial [2] - 303:12,	152:8, 154:3, 155:3,	turbines [148] - 41:9,	301:10, 301:14,	258:24, 262:17,
303:14 <b>tried</b> [6] - 81:14,	155:25, 184:14,	41:13, 41:22, 42:15,	302:4, 302:6,	262:23, 265:12,
101:22, 113:22,	186:19, 203:21,	44:16, 54:24, 55:10,	302:16, 303:16,	266:25, 279:1,
259:3, 306:15, 319:4	213:6, 229:6,	65:8, 70:14, 71:25,	303:25, 304:2,	281:9, 283:1,
trigger [1] - 215:1	230:12,232:5,	74:16, 76:17, 77:1,	304:3, 304:8,	285:25, 290:1,
triggered [1] - 141:14	248:19, 260:21,	77:7, 77:12, 79:7,	309:16, 312:7, 216:9, 216:0	295:2, 295:4,
triggering [2] -	262:14, 273:21,	80:10, 80:15, 84:13, 84:15, 86:17, 89:19,	316:8, 316:9, 319:20, 319:25	296:10, 296:11,
192:21, 201:7	276:16, 276:18,	98:23, 103:1, 104:1,	turbines '[1] - 206:16	296:13, 298:22,
triggers [1] - 201:20	279:2, 285:10, 293:15, 303:2,	104:4, 104:5, 105:3,	turbulent [1] - 94:1	305:7, 311:5, 317:18, 319:2,
trip [3] - 44:19, 219:8,	303:23, 305:12,	108:8, 108:13,	turn [31] - 18:14, 25:4,	319:12, 321:10
299:3	306:20, 309:25,	109:9, 109:21,	29:3, 38:22, 47:9,	two -thirds [4] -
trouble [1] - 125:21	311:25	115:10, 115:21,	76:16, 87:19, 95:9,	185:10, 185:15,
truck [4] - 139:23,	tsunami [1] - 188:24	117:17, 123:8,	104:3, 156:3, 156:5,	186:10, 187:1
149:3, 149:6, 149:9	Tuesday [1] - 7:25	123:24, 126:7,	163:17, 164:12,	two-week [3] - 76:5,
trucks [1] - 136:6	turbine [96] - 61:8,	128:6, 132:20,	167:2, 168:25,	112:2, 154:17
true [56] - 61:11,	64:20,66:24,69:23,	133:8, 136:8, 138:7,	184:7, 185:16,	Tyndall [5] - 3:21,
64:13, 65:16, 66:23, 67:22, 68:25, 69:14	77:16, 79:10, 80:10,	138:13, 138:15,	190:19, 192:2,	30:15, 30:16, 31:2,
67:22, 68:25, 69:14, 75:19, 159:12,	80:25, 81:1, 89:20,	139:4, 139:7, 139:9,	207:6, 208:22,	296:23
13.13, 133.12,		140:18, 142:15,	218:11,236:12,	

	8			8
<b>type</b> [12] - 38:6, 48:3,	153:19, 212:23,	62:6, 66:16, 69:21,	194:3, 195:20	<b>Vernon</b> [1] - 280:4 43
85:15, 90:4, 90:8,	228:19, 246:17,	70:11, 73:9, 78:22,	upright [1] - 292:23	version [1] - 87:17
118:13, 133:11,	276:8	78:25, 80:1, 93:23,	upset [4] - 59:2,	versions [1] - 161:22
		98:18, 99:20, 99:25,	59:22, 119:3, 256:5	
145:8, 172:13,	unequivocal [2] -	100:5, 102:5,	, ,	versus [5] - 16:19,
192:8, 274:4, 296:3	69:7, 76:25	, ,	urban [2] - 146:21,	81:24, 166:5,
<b>types</b> [9] - 72:8, 73:6,	unfair [1] - 28:5	106:13, 107:1,	210:10	241:16, 248:13
132:14, 136:5,	unfamiliar [1] - 22:9	109:14, 109:18,	<b>useful</b> [2] - 110:23,	<b>vertigo</b> [6] - 68:24,
174:23, 178:24,	unfortunately [2] -	114:25, 117:2,	225:23	70:24,74:12,75:23,
194:25, 210:8,	100:10, 163:23	118:8, 119:1, 119:3,	<b>uses</b> [4] - 149:18,	116:7, 239:11
239:12	unfounded [1] - 67:2	120:4, 128:2,	201:23, 227:12,	vestibular [3] -
typical [5] - 95:11,	unhappy [1] - 82:18	129:23, 130:13,	227 :15	141:10, 141:14,
114:11, 115:7,	uniform [1] - 213:12	133:13, 141:10,	usual [1] - 95:18	141:17
189:6, 207:22	uniformly [1] - 213:1	141:11, 141:17,	<b>UTILITIES</b> [2] - 1:1,	<b>via</b> [1] - 134:20
typically [8] - 65:1,	unique [3] - 86:24,	142:8, 143:7,	1:9	viable [6] - 61:15,
73:15, 78:25, 81:18,	111:19, 182:8	145:14, 149:14,	utilities [3] - 53:1,	81:6, 81:10, 81:18,
114:14, 115:18,	uniqueness [1] -	153:13, 159:6,	98:8, 103:10	81:22, 152:6
127:23, 216:13	276:18	166:14, 180:6,	utility [2] - 152:2,	vibration [1] - 260:13
typing [1] - 9:24	unit [1] - 203:14	182:22, 184:8,	202:23	Vice [2] - 182:22,
	<b>United</b> [6] - 95:14,	187:3, 189:20,	utilize [3] - 10:3, 48:4,	254:3
U	101:4, 159:7,	191:21, 191:24,	298:11	VICE [1] - 1:10
	166:15, 180:11,	193:7, 195:6,	utilized [1] - 294:25	vicinity [1] - 320:15
<b>U.S</b> [6] - 95:21,	206:15	195:10, 195:22,		Vickie [1] - 306:14
136:10, 181:16,	units [2] - 125:25,	195:24,200:17,	v	video [1] - 156:10
181:21, 199:20,	128:10	200:18, 204:11,	-	Vietnam [1] - 144:5
201:24	university [1] - 219:13	205:25,208:1,	vacant [1] - 181:6	<b>view</b> [3] - 181:2,
ultimate [4] - 91:2,	University [3] -	208:24, 209:2,	vague [8] - 16:15,	227:24, 285:12
91:3, 91:4, 105:18	219:14, 219:18,	210:9, 210:18,	78:7, 91:22, 98:21,	views [1] - 87:1
ultimately [5] - 24:13,	221:4	212:18, 215:7,	103:4, 169:15,	violation [3] - 41:25,
38:5, 87:21, 110:15,	unkind [1] - 101:8	216:15, 220:1,	170:21, 269:18	309:17, 310:5
281:15	unknown [1] - 276:9	222:15, 229:21,	valid [2] - 209:20,	Virginia [1] - 136:12
ultrasound [1] -	unknowns [1] -	230:10,242:12,	281:11	vision [1] - 260:24
115:13	262:13	243:19, 247:2,	valley [1] - 139:8	visit [1] - 267 :16
unacceptable [1] -	unless [11] - 12:14,	250:20, 253:14,	valleys [3] - 124:15,	
227 :18	104:6, 133:3, 141:2,	256:6,258:19,	230:21, 231:11	visited [2] - 127:4,
unanswered [1] -	142:22, 179:18,	260:23, 261:12,	valuation [1] - 313:8	260:11
153 :4	186:2, 202:22,	262:18, 263:11,	value [2] - 124:18,	visiting [1] - 238:19
unaware [1] - 28:9	208:3, 229:12,	264:13,266:11,	124 :21	visual [1] - 136:21
unbalanced [1] -	318:19	273:4, 276:13,	values [2] - 96:7,	visually [1] - 170:10
152:9	unlikely [1] - 291:13	276:23, 276:24,	313:7	<b>Voigt</b> [3] - 297 :4,
unbearable [1] - 205:2	-	277:12,277:13,	valve [1] - 186:3	297:5, 297:7
uncompensated [2] -	unobserved [1] -	281:18, 284:25,	Van [1] - 15:16	<b>voir</b> [2] - 248:2, 249:8
203:6, 203:9	177:4	285:21, 286:3,	Vanderbilt [2] - 219:3,	<b>volume</b> [2] - 117:17,
under [25] - 3:15,	unpack [1] - 109:2	288:23,289:17,	219:12	120:18
18:15, 34:17, 52:19,	unrealistic [1] -	289:19,289:21,	variable [2] - 93:25,	Volume [1] - 1:8
55:12, 63:16, 64:21,	203:20	290:3, 290:5, 290:7,	215:25	volumes [2] - 295:9
66:4, 79:22, 81:3,	unrelated [1] - 125:16	290:25, 291:4,	variant [1] - 189:16	voluntary [1] - 67:14
89:25, 94:14,	unstudied [3] - 181:1,	292:5, 292:22,	variations [1] - 247:1	<b>vote</b> [2] - 297:20,
109:19, 163:21,	197:1, 197:4	293:10, 294:16,		317:11
163:22, 164:21,	unusual [1] - 85:11	294:21, 295:13,	varied [1] - 45:9	voted [2] - 36:25,
165:16, 197:16,	unwanted [1] - 203:4	299:8, 299:9,	varies [1] - 57:15	297:18
103.10.197.10			<b>variety</b> [4] - 18:13,	
	unworkable [1] -	299:15, 299:23,		
206:9, 243:9, 258:3,	unworkable [1] - 203 :20	299:15, 299:23, 301:14, 302:2,	183:10, 263:7, 311:1	W
206:9, 243:9, 258:3, 265:24, 286:10,			various [5] - 16:16,	
206 :9, 243 :9, 258 :3, 265 :24, 286 :10, 288 :12, 289 :6	203:20 <b>up</b> [151] - 7:14, 9:12, 9:21, 12:19, 13:22,	301:14, 302:2,	<b>various</b> [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11,	Wagner [2] - 258:8,
206 :9, 243 :9, 258 :3, 265 :24, 286 :10, 288 :12, 289 :6 underlying [1] - 125 :8	203:20 <b>up</b> [151] - 7:14, 9:12,	301:14, 302:2, 304:22, 305:3,	<b>various</b> [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11, 227:8, 289:12	Wagner [2] - 258:8, 275:12
206:9, 243:9, 258:3, 265:24, 286:10, 288:12, 289:6 underlying [1] - 125:8 underserved [1] -	203:20 <b>up</b> [151] - 7:14, 9:12, 9:21, 12:19, 13:22,	301:14, 302:2, 304:22, 305:3, 305:6, 306:2, 306:6,	various [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11, 227:8, 289:12 vary [4] - 57:22, 64:25,	Wagner [2] - 258:8,
206:9, 243:9, 258:3, 265:24, 286:10, 288:12, 289:6 underlying [1] - 125:8 underserved [1] - 210:2	203:20 <b>up</b> [151] - 7:14, 9:12, 9:21, 12:19, 13:22, 16:24, 17:10, 27:18,	301:14, 302:2, 304:22, 305:3, 305:6, 306:2, 306:6, 306:7, 306:15,	various [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11, 227:8, 289:12 vary [4] - 57:22, 64:25, 94:8, 215:19	Wagner [2] - 258:8, 275:12
206:9, 243:9, 258:3, 265:24, 286:10, 288:12, 289:6 underlying [1] - 125:8 underserved [1] - 210:2 understandable [1] -	203:20 <b>up</b> [151] - 7:14, 9:12, 9:21, 12:19, 13:22, 16:24, 17:10, 27:18, 27:19, 27:24, 28:11,	301:14, 302:2, 304:22, 305:3, 305:6, 306:2, 306:6, 306:7, 306:15, 307:7, 307:21,	various [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11, 227:8, 289:12 vary [4] - 57:22, 64:25, 94:8, 215:19 vasforia [1] - 191:12	Wagner [2] - 258:8, 275:12 wait [1] - 202:15
206:9, 243:9, 258:3, 265:24, 286:10, 288:12, 289:6 underlying [1] - 125:8 underserved [1] - 210:2 understandable [1] - 277:23	203:20 up [151] - 7:14, 9:12, 9:21, 12:19, 13:22, 16:24, 17:10, 27:18, 27:19, 27:24, 28:11, 32:5, 32:11, 32:12,	301:14, 302:2, 304:22, 305:3, 305:6, 306:2, 306:6, 306:7, 306:15, 307:7, 307:21, 312:12, 315:22,	various [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11, 227:8, 289:12 vary [4] - 57:22, 64:25, 94:8, 215:19 vasforia [1] - 191:12 vast [2] - 295:19,	Wagner [2] - 258:8, 275:12 wait [1] - 202:15 waiting [5] - 29:24,
206:9, 243:9, 258:3, 265:24, 286:10, 288:12, 289:6 underlying [1] - 125:8 underserved [1] - 210:2 understandable [1] - 277:23 understood [9] - 63:2,	203:20 up [151] - 7:14, 9:12, 9:21, 12:19, 13:22, 16:24, 17:10, 27:18, 27:19, 27:24, 28:11, 32:5, 32:11, 32:12, 33:10, 37:6, 37:10,	301:14, 302:2, 304:22, 305:3, 305:6, 306:2, 306:6, 306:7, 306:15, 307:7, 307:21, 312:12, 315:22, 321:24	<pre>various [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11, 227:8, 289:12 vary [4] - 57:22, 64:25, 94:8, 215:19 vasforia [1] - 191:12 vast [2] - 295:19, 295:21</pre>	Wagner [2] - 258:8, 275:12 wait [1] - 202:15 waiting [5] - 29:24, 173:7, 195:7,
206:9, 243:9, 258:3, 265:24, 286:10, 288:12, 289:6 underlying [1] - 125:8 underserved [1] - 210:2 understandable [1] - 277:23	203:20 up [151] - 7:14, 9:12, 9:21, 12:19, 13:22, 16:24, 17:10, 27:18, 27:19, 27:24, 28:11, 32:5, 32:11, 32:12, 33:10, 37:6, 37:10, 38:4, 38:11, 40:4,	301:14, 302:2, 304:22, 305:3, 305:6, 306:2, 306:6, 306:7, 306:15, 307:7, 307:21, 312:12, 315:22, 321:24 <b>upper</b> [3] - 191:16,	various [5] - 16:16, 42:10, 190:11, 227:8, 289:12 vary [4] - 57:22, 64:25, 94:8, 215:19 vasforia [1] - 191:12 vast [2] - 295:19,	Wagner [2] - 258:8, 275:12 wait [1] - 202:15 waiting [5] - 29:24, 173:7, 195:7, 232:21, 280:21

waived [1] - 83:7	177:5, 193:13,	147:23, 154:25,	69:23, 70:14, 71:24,	<b>177</b> : <b>17</b> , <b>177</b> : <b>20</b> , 44
waiver [5] - 82:13,	303:6, 303:18,	155:3	72:9, 73:14, 74:3,	177:24, 180:12,
83:3, 83:4, 240:20,	304 :25	wide [1] - 18:13	74:16, 76:7, 76:14,	180:20, 181:17,
318 19	weeks [12] - 29:22,	widespread [1] -	77:6, 77:16, 78:24,	182:1, 182:3, 182:6,
waivers [6] - 83:1,	57:13, 57:20, 57:25,	95:20	79:2, 79:10, 79:23,	182:17, 183:10,
311:7, 311:14,	64:18, 146:15,	wife [12] - 15:14,	79:24, 83:10, 84:3,	183:14, 183:24,
311:15, 315:23,	152:17, 153:25,	114:7, 114:22,	84:13, 84:15, 85:1,	184:4, 184:18,
316:1	155:17, 195:1,	126:16, 258:13,	85:5,86:16,87:4,	185:18, 185:19,
waives [1] - 104:22	195:8, 307:5	258:19, 258:20,	89:19, 89:24, 89:25,	186:1, 186:21,
wake [1] - 260:23	weigh [3] - 100:14,	259:2, 259:7,	93:24,94:10,95:11,	189:19, 190:19,
walk [2] - 149:15,	249:7, 278:7	294:17, 317:1,	95:18,96:1,97:23,	190:22, 191:2,
294 :2	weighed [3] - 63:1,	317 :23	98:13, 99:19, 104:1,	192:16, 193:11,
walker [2] - 178:19,	272:12, 272:17	wife 's [5] - 258:14,	104:2, 104:5, 104:9,	193:20, 193:22,
179:11	weight [8] - 20:12,	273:3, 274:7, 288:1,	104:11, 104:13,	193:23, 194:3,
wall [2] - 118:11,	113:23, 171:19,	289:6	105:2, 105:4, 105:6,	194:5, 194:10,
306:7	206:1, 250:6,	wiggling [1] - 196:2	106:9, 106:25,	194:14, 194:16,
Walworth [1] - 45:22	250:10, 250:17,	<b>Williams</b> [3] - 166:5,	108:8, 108:13,	194:24, 195:11,
wants [5] - 16:24,	264 :21	241:16, 248:13	109:9, 109:11,	195:14, 195:21,
152:13, 302:14,	weighted [8] - 26:3,	Williams '[1] - 243:21	109:15, 109:17,	195:22, 196:14,
306:21, 306:25	26:5, 26:9, 26:13,	willing [5] - 202:23,	109:22, 111:7,	196:18, 196:20,
<b>WAPA</b> [4] - 275:10,	86:2, 86:6, 105:16,	204:24,205:7,	111:13, 111:14, 111:18, 113:24,	196:21, 197:14, 197:19, 198:19,
275:11, 275:14,	209:25	205:8, 278:20		
280:18	weighting [5] - 106:1,	Wind [29] - 1:15, 3:3,	115:10, 115:21, 117:6, 117:16,	200:5, 200:11, 200:12, 200:13,
warm [3] - 195:19,	106:3, 106:21,	8:24, 16:10, 40:2,	117:24, 119:11,	200:12, 200:13, 200:13, 200:19, 201:7,
195:24, 196:8	191:9, 191:10 welcome [5] - 52:22,	42:23, 67:17, 70:18,	123:3, 123:24,	201:12, 202:21,
warmer [2] - 78:21,	113:2, 128:22,	87:13, 87:16, 88:16, 103:11, 127:3,	126:7, 128:6,	204:13, 204:16,
79:3	130:6, 130:14	133:10, 135:15,	128:16, 128:17,	204:17, 204:19,
warms [1] - 195:18 warn [1] - 243:12	well -being [2] - 92:10,	137:15, 148:19,	129:4, 132:5, 132:6,	204:21, 205:13,
wars [1] - 144:5	261:3	151:17, 151:20,	132:13, 132:20,	205:22,206:16,
washing [3] - 73:20,	west [2] - 136:11,	178:4, 188:8,	133:8, 134:1, 134:6,	207:15,207:18,
78:19, 111:8	289:15	199:12, 211:8,	136:3, 136:6, 136:8,	210:22, 210:24,
watch [1] - 86:19	West [1] - 136:12	211:9, 217:17,	136:19, 137:25,	211:14, 211:25,
watches [1] - 13:24	western [2] - 210:20,	255:16, 256:11,	138:6, 138:9,	214:25, 215:9,
watching [1] - 232:23	296:19	272:17	138:13, 138:15,	215:11, 216:3,
water [3] - 118:11,	whatnot [1] - 286:11	<b>WIND</b> [3] - 1:3, 1:3,	138:23, 139:4, 139:7, 139:9,	217:21, 217:25, 219:21, 220:16,
118:14, 173:24	whatsoever [1] -	1:5	139:11, 139:18,	219.21, 220.10, 220:19, 222:3,
Watertown [1] -	154 :16	wind [363] - 3:4, 3:21,	139:25, 140:18,	222:4, 222:7, 222:9,
318:10	whereas [3] - 55:5,	3:22, 5:11, 5:16,	140:20, 140:21,	225:24, 227:14,
wave [1] - 215:20	177:6, 217:3	5:22, 7:22, 8:19, 8:23, 9:15, 9:19,	140:23, 142:15,	228:18, 228:19,
wavelength [1] -	white [4] - 109:5,	15:20, 16:3, 16:5,	142:20, 143:9,	228:24, 229:5,
215:18	137:21, 138:12,	16:6, 16:9, 16:14,	144:15, 146:3,	230:22, 232:6,
waves [1] - 79:5	289:19 White [1] - 103:5	17:15, 17:17, 25:11,	147:18, 147:19,	233:21, 237:6,
ways [2] - 17:11,	<b>WHO</b> [4] - 230:8,	25:12, 25:21, 26:2,	147:20, 147:22,	237:11, 237:24,
89:10	230:19, 231:13,	26:24, 30:5, 30:11,	150:15, 151:11,	239:1, 239:14,
weak [1] - 80:11	251:17	36:7, 36:24, 37:20,	153:23, 154:1,	240:19, 240:20,
weather [6] - 33:19,	whole [18] - 51:7,	37:21, 38:1, 38:4,	154:4, 154:24,	240:24,240:25,
127:24, 188:24, 196:14, 231:23,	72:21, 86:14, 98:21,	40:9, 40:16, 41:9,	155:9, 155:12,	242:19, 245:14,
246:24	102:18, 110:18,	41:22, 42:15, 43:12,	155:17, 157:20,	245:22, 247:9,
web [1] - 153:11	115:15, 143:16,	44:14, 46:10, 46:22,	158:5, 159:1, 160:8,	247:20, 248:7,
website [5] - 10:4,	146:17, 182:13,	48:1, 54:24, 55:1,	162:12, 162:23, 163:14, 163:25	248:25, 249:14, 252:24, 253:17
102:3, 237:23,	185:19, 185:20,	55:10, 56:11, 57:15,	163:14,163:25, 164:15,164:24,	252:24, 253:17, 254:8, 255:3, 260:8,
237:25, 244:10	188:7, 222:11,	58:2, 58:13, 59:20,	166:22, 166:24,	260:10, 260:17,
websites [1] - 66:22	234:15, 251:14,	61:8, 62:1, 62:2, 62:7, 64:10, 64:20	167:13, 167:16,	260:24, 261:4,
week [16] - 18:25,	306:16, 311:23	62:7, 64:19, 64:20,	168:19, 170:16,	262:21, 265:2,
33:20, 33:22, 58:19,	whoomp [3] - 141:8	64:21, 65:1, 65:5, 65:6, 65:8, 65:20	170:23, 171:9,	268:24, 268:25,
76:5, 79:18, 107:15,	whoosh [3] - 119:11,	65:6, 65:8, 65:20, 66:2, 66:20, 66:22,	174:23, 175:6,	269:1, 269:5,
112:2, 152:19,	119:12, 155:1	66:24, 68:25, 69:16,	175:12, 176:9,	270:12, 273:1,
154:17, 176:21,	whooshing [3] -	00.21, 00.20, 00.10,	176:21, 177:9,	277:6, 277:7,

277:11, 277:14,	96:18,97:12,104:7,	255:6, 256:13,	278:15	<b>Y</b> 45
283:2, 293:22,	104:11, 104:15,	256:16, 256:22,	witnesses [6] - 53:8,	
298:9, 306:3,	105:5, 105:9,	256:25, 261:24,	120:3, 120:19,	<b>year</b> [14] - 79:20,
306:18, 306:21,	105:12, 105:22,	263:14, 264:16,	310:1, 321:10	127:4, 127:21,
306:22, 306:23,	106:20, 107:4,	271:9,278:12,	Wittler [1] - 1:24	127:24, 131:13,
309:15, 309:19,	107:9, 107:20,	278:17,278:23,	wives [1] - 114:13	205:8, 230:4, 230:5,
310:3, 312:3, 312:4,	107:23, 108:3,	279:2, 279:6,	woman [1] - 72:20	234:10,246:25,
313:8, 313:14,	108:21, 108:24,	279:15,280:6,	women [1] - 114:15	288:23, 290:23,
313:16, 313:19	109:3, 109:8, 110:1,	280:10,280:13,	wondering [2] - 223:1,	310:21, 310:22
wind 's [1] - 93:25	110:8, 110:19,	280:17,281:12,	275:18	years [64] - 4:2, 4:6,
windmills [2] - 15:23,	110:22, 111:3,	281:16, 281:22,	woodworking [1] -	4:23, 8:18, 9:19,
26:12	111:8, 111:15,	281:25, 282:5,	284:14	13:2, 13:12, 18:6,
window [2] - 138:3,	111:21, 112:4,	282:17,282:25,	word [7] - 13:3, 55:21,	21:3, 23:20, 24:15,
307:2	112:13, 112:17,	283:4, 283:11,	129:15, 240:15,	24:19, 24:24, 25:15,
windows [3] - 78:18,	113:2, 114:5, 114:9,	283:14, 283:18,	279:20, 295:23,	25:24, 27:20, 28:10,
146:19,231:6	114:16, 114:24,	284:1, 286:3, 286:7,	318:7	28:12, 30:1, 30:20,
Winds [29] - 19:16,	115:6, 115:12,	286:9,286:12,	words [6] - 134:3,	32:7, 32:16, 32:18,
29:7, 35:6, 36:19,	115:23, 115:25,	286:16, 286:21,	164:10, 164:11,	57:18, 60:14, 72:2,
38:18, 50:13, 51:25,	116:10, 116:14,	287:19, 293:15,	247:4, 253:18,	75:6, 95:21, 115:4,
63:17, 122:18,	116:18, 117:2,	297:13, 302:10,	278:13	119:4, 131:10, 122:17, 122:10
145:18, 148:18,	117:24, 118:2,	308:2, 317:2,	worker [1] - 144:10	132:17, 132:19,
156:7, 157:3,	118:7, 118:16,	317:12, 317:20,	workers [2] - 131:20,	143:4, 144:14, 151:12, 151:23
232:20, 257:4,	119:1, 119:8, 110:16, 110:22	317:24, 318:2, 218:7, 210:4, 210:7	205:1	151:12, 151:23, 159:25, 181:6,
266:5, 267:16,	119:16, 119:22,	318:7, 319:4, 319:7,	works [11] - 4:16,	181:18, 196:20,
267:22,274:6,	123:16, 124:4, 128:22, 156:8,	319:11, 320:6, 320:10, 320:13,	109:12, 189:5,	201:10, 204:8,
274:9, 281:3, 287:3,	156:13, 165:15,	320:10, 320:13, 320:17, 320:23,	193:13, 259:9,	204:17, 205:23,
290:6, 295:12,	180:3, 180:13,	320:17, 320:23,	259:10, 275:5,	219:10, 219:17,
297:2, 297:8, 303:17, 306:8,	180:17, 181:11,	witness [64] - 3:7, 3:9,	275:9, 281:7, 308:5	220:24, 220:25,
308:14	181:25, 182:24,	3:11, 3:14, 10:13,	world [6] - 72:10,	221:12, 229:10,
winds [6] - 79:10,	183:1, 183:18,	19:6, 19:14, 19:18,	95:19, 199:22,	258:25, 260:21,
147:18, 194:2,	184:3, 185:4,	20:8, 20:12, 21:7,	199:24, 200:1,	277:5, 284:11,
194:3, 195:20,	185:17, 186:14,	21:16, 22:4, 22:18,	203:18 World [6] - 228:12,	291:2, 305:7, 307:5,
298:24	186:18, 187:2,	22:25, 23:10, 23:14,	228:15, 229:19,	311:25, 319:12,
Winds ' [1] - 268 :5	187:11, 187:16,	29:8, 34:11, 34:13,	230:1, 231:7, 252:21	320:11
windy [8] - 58:3, 79:6,	187:21, 188:11,	34:16, 52:11, 52:13,	worldwide [2] - 72:16,	yellow [3] - 18:16,
79:7, 104:6, 105:3,	188:19, 189:7,	52:15, 52:18, 56:21,	95:11	138:18, 289:5
106:9, 195:10,	189:10, 190:9,	57:1,83:16,100:13,	worry [1] - 293:22	yesterday [7] - 3:6,
195:12	190:13, 190:18,	100:23, 130:2,	worse [1] - 125:14	53:23, 61:7, 111:11,
winter [1] - 128:3	191:7, 192:11,	130:11, 152:23,	worth [4] - 145:14,	252:25, 314:7,
wiped [1] - 296:14	193:1, 193:17,	153:5, 156:3,	145:16, 152:17,	317:18
Wisconsin [12] -	195:5, 195:16,	158:18, 165:6,	190:24	<b>York</b> [3] - 136:11,
69:16, 86:13, 87:2,	197:5, 198:9,	165:24, 173:25,	wrapped [1] - 304:17	230:8, 249:13
87:14, 87:21, 114:3,	198:17, 199:2,	183:3, 206:8,	writing [2] - 222:15,	young [1] - 204 :3
136:12, 151:10,	200:22, 201:2,	218:12, 218:15,	222:17	yourself [15] - 3:19,
151:18, 178:5,	203:2,203:24, 205:13,205:19,	236:9, 241:14,	written [16] - 24:11,	11:4, 19:4, 29:15,
182:6, 255:16	206:4, 208:10,	248:3, 249:9, 250:13, 250:17,	37:10, 63:23, 66:18,	34:20, 52:23, 103:3,
<b>wish</b> [4] - 110:22,	212:21, 213:4,	250:13, 250:17, 250:19, 257:11,	71:11, 89:19, 94:9,	130:24, 218:24, 219:5, 258:6,
170:18, 319:2, 319:4	213:14, 213:19,	257:13, 257:20,	160:14, 170:20,	272:13, 288:15,
wishes [1] - 159:1	214:6, 214:8,	258:2, 261:21,	172:20, 198:5,	310:2, 317:22
withdraw [2] - 51:8,	214:20, 215:6,	263:4, 273:17,	202:13, 223:18,	010.2, 017.22
267:2	215:15, 216:11,	288:5, 288:8,	255:17, 295:2,	Z
Witness [7] - 11:8,	216:14, 216:19,	288:11, 293:12,	307:19	<u> </u>
11:15, 12:10, 20:1, 25:18, 62:17, 62:20	217:3, 218:20,	297:11, 306:12,	wrote [7] - 24:9,	Zachary [1] - 259:13
25:18, 62:17, 62:20 WITNESS [194] -	249:15,249:18,	321:5	94:24, 112:19,	<b>zero</b> [4] - 59:5, 201:1,
28:22, 33:20, 33:22,	249:21,249:25,	witness 's [2] - 28:4,	144:7, 165:2,	201:2, 316:14
28.22, 33.20, 33.22, 34:8, 48:11, 48:14,	250:8, 253:21,	301:20	177:23, 230:12	<b>zoned</b> [2] - 35:11, 36:2
48:20, 48:24, 50:10,	253:25,254:10,	witnessed [6] - 101:2,	<b>Wyly</b> [1] - 299:7	<b>Zoning</b> [12] - 4:25,
51:6, 52:8, 84:23,	254:13,254:15,	278:4, 278:8,		5:2, 5:7, 6:11, 6:14,
, -=0, 020,	254:19,254:23,	278:10, 278:12,		6:22, 8:8, 8:10,

21:17, 21:18, 32:20
zoning [76] - 4:1, 4:3,
6:18, 7:1, 7:4, 7:5,
7:20, 11:1, 13:19,
15:5, 18:5, 18:9,
18:19, 21:20, 21:22
21:24, 24:17, 24:23
25:5, 25:24, 28:4,
29:21, 32:2, 32:17,
35:1, 36:4, 36:20,
36:23, 36:24, 36:25
37:4, 37:16, 37:23,
38:3, 38:5, 38:6,
38:10, 38:14, 40:9,
40:10, 40:16, 40:21
41:19, 42:12, 42:19
45:7, 45:15, 237:20
261:8,261:12,
261:13,268:13,
268:16,268:18,
268:19,268:23,
268:24,268:25,
269:1, 269:4, 269:5
271:25, 272:4,
272:12,280:24,
280:25,292:18,
294:15,295:18,
311:2, 311:6,
312:21, 317:7,
317:11, 318:15