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CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: South Dakota Public
Utilities Commission meeting is called to order.
This is an agenda item of an Ad Hoc Commission meeting. It is July 10, 2018, at 1:30 Central Daylight Time. We are again in Room 414 in the Capitol Building in Pierre, South Dakota. This afternoon all three Commissioners are in the Meeting Room 414, and we have brought Commissioner Hanson out of quarantine since this morning.

We have one docket in front of us. It's an electric Docket, EL18-003, In the Matter of the Application of Dakota Range I, LLC and Dakota Range II, LLC for a Permit of the Wind Energy Facility in Grant and Codington Counties in South Dakota for the Dakota Range Wind Project.

The question before the Commission this afternoon is shall the Commission grant, deny, or grant with conditions a permit for the construction of a wind energy facility to Dakota Range pursuant to South Dakota Codified Law 49-41B-25? Or how shall the Commission proceed?

In our last order that we signed we are going to allow oral arguments for five minutes for each party. And, Dakota Range, if you would like to go first, we have you first. Or you can certainly go last. Whatever your choice is.

MS. SMITH: I would go last, if that's all right.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Okay. So Ms. Kaaz, and then we'll go to Ms. Mogen and then Staff and Dakota Range.

So this is an opportunity for your final
comments, oral arguments, for five minutes. And $I$ guess we don't even have a timer, but $I$ do have one on my phone.

MS. KAAZ: I've practiced some.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: You've practiced some. Well, also there may be a tiny bit of leeway.

Okay. Go ahead.
MS. KAAZ: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you in advance for allowing me my five minutes. No one can object at this time to what $I$ have to say or try to sway my mind today. I take this responsibility wholeheartedly.

I have tried with all my knowledge to show all of you, my Commissioners, the facts as they will affect me. When residents purchased their property in Codington and Grant Counties, as well as every place in South Dakota, they all had rules and regulations to follow. They have followed them. When permits were applied for to do improvements there were also rules and regulations to follow. Those rules were also followed. Then came the wind industry, presenting themselves, Apex, as good neighbors only to those they chose. Apex has proven in countless places throughout the U.S., Canada, and even the world that the environment, social and economics conditions of the inhabitants or expected inhabitants does not matter. Codington and Grant Counties will be changed forever.

It will no longer be the beautiful rolling hills and endless fields of pasture, hay, and farmland anymore. It will be littered by 500-foot turbines, transmission lines, access roads, flashing red lights polluting the night's sky for up to 50 miles away. The towers and everything that follows them will change our region for as long as most of us will live and the next two generations, if not longer.

To Apex we are just a speck on the map, a place to put as many and as large of turbines as possible. You, our Commissioners, are our leaders who are here to make sure the rules are followed. Some of these rules are outdated and should not be taken advantage of by Apex.

Many more wind projects are slated to invade Codington and Grant Counties. You have the duty to make sure this is done fairly to all residents, including
myself. These companies are only driven by one thing: Money, which came from the South Dakota and U.S. taxpayers.

By keeping information filed confidentially such as good neighbor agreements, safety manuals, and leases you as the Commissioners, are you willing to take full responsibility that South Dakota Range I and II will not cause harm to my residence or any other person living in close proximity to the 500-foot turbines? With the current setbacks are you willing to guarantee that our safety will not -- will be protected? I live amongst the turbines. I should have the right to view this information.

Are you positive that you understand the cumulative effects, what they will be, and this will not change the development in Codington and Grant Counties adversely? Will municipalities be able to grow?

Concerning property values, Mr. MaRous, hired by Apex as an expert, has provided testimony in the transcript of the hearing pages 173 to 75 . He stated that he viewed my two appraisals and they were done for lending purposes. He shared this information publicly, and it was put on the record.

The information he provided was in error. I am requesting today that this testimony be stricken from the
record. I request that he show proof of reviewing my appraisals and/or he admit that he did not review them.

I have received e-mail confirmation that my appraisal was not shared by the appraiser and was told by my lending agent without prior consent by myself or my husband they did not share this information.

In his testimony he stated that it would not affect home values, but the selling price of a home is affected by the surrounding environment. An example being beautiful tree lines and rolling hills uninvaded during the sunset or sunrises, and now let's change this to spinning turbines towering over the tree line or turbines lining the rolling hills casting shadow flicker up to 50 hours a year across property. Added noise levels both inside and outside of a home not just periodically but whenever the wind blows. Do you really believe that this annoyance will not affect the selling price of a property?

Offer myself, as many others, a property value guarantee. If Apex is so sure that this project will not affect my property, be a good neighbor and prove it.

As far as Brenna Gunderson committing to the Dakota Range that they would only use three out of four turbine locations around my property, why not remove them all? Am I going to negotiate now with Apex choosing
which one to be removed? I have never agreed to that. I want all of them gone that will trespass onto my property with flicker and noise.

There is many errors that have been brought to light in the maps that have been used for sound and flicker studies. These need to be corrected and double-checked for accuracy before approval. Prove to Codington and Grant that their health, safety, and welfare is more important than wind.

Make all the required studies be completed correctly, fully, and verified. Make sure that Apex has every possible scenario covered. At this time it is too early to be asking for this Application to be approved with or without stipulations.

I am requesting that this Docket EL18-003 be denied.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
MS. KAAZ: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: For the record, if you could state your name.

MS. MOGEN: Good afternoon. Kristi Mogen.
Hi, Commissioners. It's kind of ironic one of the first things $I$ was going to talk about today was recommended Condition No. 40, and I ended up being hurt in an ice storm this morning at the hail on my property.

Recommended Condition No. 40, it says, When the blades become imbalanced or create vibration due to ice accumulation. When you're driving down the road at 55 miles an hour and your wheel is unbalanced we used to have weights and they'd fly off and they'd go through windshields and things like that. That's 55 miles an hour and a little tire.

Now we're looking at 446 feet of spinning wingspan on a 296-foot tower. It is just a little over 50 feet off the ground. The ice throw is going to go quite a ways. And this has not been addressed, and this is a safety issue to people living in the area. There has not been enough information provided by Dakota Range to prove that we will be safe living among the turbines and ice throw.

The imbalance is going to make our lives miserable. It's going to be noisy. I mean, we know what a car sounds like. This is massive compared to that. This is a 747 with an imbalanced wing.

While I appreciate a lot of the conditions that the Staff has asked for, I am very concerned about the Applicant's recommendations, permit conditions.

No. 4, "The Applicant shall provide each landowner whose property the project is to be constructed." These people that were here live 12 miles
away. It details safety information describing, "Reasonable safety precautions for existing activities on or near the project, known activities or uses that are presently prohibited near the project." These were not presented. They did not prove or tell us what is safe or not safe during the hearing. It was their job.

Teresa Kaaz is going to live -- her property is going to be 1,200 feet, but yet nobody's given her safety information? Nobody's telling the public? Where are the signs that are going to warn us about driving through these areas with ice throw?

It's a real thing. There's comments in the docket, three or four of them, about ice throw and legitimate concerns. They have not proven it's safe. They have not committed to using good technology. They have not proven the safety of this and living among the turbines.

I'm concerned about misrepresentation. If you looked at my Brief, there was quite a few things that $I$ pointed out about misrepresentation. One of the things that bothers me the most is in their Facts and Findings -- $I$ can go back if $I$ have enough time on my Brief, but $I$ want to address their Facts and Findings No. 67.

It says, "Ms. Mogen and Ms. Kaaz presented a
two-mile setback from nonparticipating land." We said, all of us, including Mr. Kaaz, with a waiver. It wasn't that we were being unreasonable. We were saying come to our door, let us negotiate whether we feel this is safe or not, and let us set the parameters whether we can live in this or not.

We asked for property value guarantees. That's nowhere in these conditions. That hurts the economics. This has not been proven to be safe, or it could be a detriment to our community.

Throughout my Brief I pointed out that they misrepresented the size of the turbine during testimony. The Epilepsy Foundation was a website, not a peer reviewed report. How does a website prove that?

We have been knocked down as Intervenors of not being knowledgeable and not using the correct type of research or reports, and we have tried very hard to use peer reviewed information or direct testimony.

A website doesn't cut it, and there is no peer reviewed report about epilepsy and flicker. I have looked and looked and looked. I have contacted the Epilepsy Foundation. They have not proven their case that these are safe to live in.

I ask that you deny this. Because if you allow this at this point with the sloppiness of this
presentation that they gave in the hearing -- they did not provide the letter from Xcel early enough. They could have done that in the hearing. It did not allow the board to review the purchase and sale agreement. You are missing facts in this case that you need to approve it. So I ask for a denial.

We will be living with this for 50 years, and that's a long time. That will be long past I'm gone. My daughter will have to deal with it. And it's not -- I do not believe -- I testified to that earlier. It's not safe for my family. And there are going to be other families that are going to have to abandon homes too.

So I ask for a denial, please.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
Staff.
MS. REISS: Thank you. This is Amanda Reiss for Staff.

Staff filed their comments in the final Brief as well as our additional filing with a -- regarding the confidential treatment of the conditions.

Staff would note that on Findings of Fact 34 we do believe that that is repetitive and unnecessary. And we would just rely on our comments previously filed today.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Dakota Range. I will give you latitude up to 5 minutes and 40 seconds. That was the longest five-minute speech today. So you'll get 40 extra seconds.

MS. SMITH: All right. Thank you, Chairman and Commissioners. I hope $I$ don't need all of that.

I would just say that we likewise --
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: If you could identify yourself.

MS. SMITH: Mollie Smith with Fredrikson \& Byron. I'm here on behalf of Dakota Range I and Dakota Range II, LLC, the Applicant in this matter.

As Staff, we also addressed the majority of our thoughts in briefing and through the Findings of Fact and the conditions that have been proposed. We're happy to address questions on that. We do have a couple of points just to focus on issues that were not previously raised.

The first was there were references in both Ms. Kaaz and Ms. Mogen's Briefs to Mr. MaRous reviewing Ms. Kaaz's appraisals. Those appraisals were provided by Ms. Kaaz in response to data requests on June 7, 2018 . That's how we have -- had copies of them. They were provided to Mr. MaRous to review. If you need documentation, we're happy to provide it, but they were
not solicited from a third party.
The second is there were some questions in Ms. Mogen's -- or some comments in Ms. Mogen's Brief about potentially missed homes. And so although that is outside of the record, we -- Dakota Range wanted to ensure that everyone was identified. So we did look through those.

We can confirm just -- there was a question about participation. David Loren [phonetic] is a participant. He may have been shown at one time as not a participant because he wasn't always a participant. His status changed over time.

Ruth Meyer Trust is a nonparticipant. There was reference to a missing receptor near turbine 31. We did confirm there is only one residence there. There are two mail boxes, but they have one residence.

The next one was a statement about a missing receptor near turbines 2, 3, and 4. There is -- there are two trailer homes 40 feet apart side by side. Two brothers live there. There is a dot there representing those mobile homes. They are approximately over 3,000 feet away from a turbine there. So that dot is sufficient to identify those receptors.

Lonnie Qualy [phonetic] -- I believe I'm saying his last name right -- his residence is not on the map
but he is outside of the project area to the north and he is approximately a mile from the closest turbine, over 5,280 feet. So while we certainly could add him to the list, he is not within the area that would be affected as far as shadow flicker, noise, setbacks, so he is on the list.

I think there were a couple of issues that were just brought up in the last piece. I just want to make sure that we are covering all of those. We would say that there isn't support in the record for a property value guarantee. That has been determined also in the Crocker Docket as well. But the testimony does not support a property value guarantee, and that's noted in the Findings as well.

And we have one item that is not technically an issue with the briefing but we believe we should raise it with the Commission at this time because we have identified one location where notice was not provided to the resident and we have an explanation for how it occurred.

James Waldren is the person. His home is shown on the maps, but originally his parcel was owned by a gentleman named Prinz [phonetic] and Prinz subdivided and sold a portion of the property, the majority of the property, to the Brennans. Brennans did receive notice.

And Mr. Waldren purchased a nine-acre parcel. And it was identified during wetland delineations that that parcel had been carved out so it was noted in the records that that should be removed as what is identified as the Brennan's lease. They're a leased landowner.

And so that was done so, but in doing so the participant status was left blank. And what that did is when the mailing was pulled it was pulled pulling all participants/nonparticipants in this broader area, and that person was not pulled into the records.

Our land agent had talked to the Waldren family about a year ago to see if they wanted to participate in the project. The Waldren family owns another parcel. The Waldren -- the father and some brothers live on that parcel. They did receive a notice. They also -- later David Lau also spoke with -- more recently he spoke with James Waldren. He actually talked to him this morning, and James Waldren would be willing to provide documentation that he has -- he's aware of the project. He's known about it. He's gotten mailings.

Actually the mailings were directed to Prinz, but then somebody had marked it out at the post office and put Waldren's name. It just didn't get updated all the way back.

So we believe given the intent of the statute is
substantial compliance with the notice requirements, in this case we do know the landowner is aware of the project. We can provide documentation if necessary.

There were a published notice that was provided. We think it would not serve the intent of the statute to invalidate the notice for everyone else that received notice because of one mistake. It would also lead to Applicants not self-reporting or not attempting to ensure they've identified everyone, and we believe that that's in the best to ensure that everyone is notified.

This was identified by Mr. Lau as we were just looking at this. This isn't something that -- we were pinning all of this down this morning. We just realized that this had occurred.

So I can make further arguments of this. And I would have informed Staff had $I$ known before this morning and had the facts so we could address it. So I will leave it to the Commission how you would prefer to address that issue.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
We will now go to Commission questions and/or motions.

Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: For Ms. Kaaz, if you would come back.

In your presentation today you made reference to -- and I've got this quoted, I think, accurately -"Many errors in the sound and flicker studies."

Are you referring to the items that Ms. Smith just reviewed? Is that what you were referring to? Or something else?

MS. KAAZ: No. That is correct.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: And were you satisfied with her explanations?

MS. KAAZ: Yes. I still have questions concerning if those errors were not pointed out to her, those errors would have gone unnoticed, and that concerns all of us as far as the accuracy of the studies.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. I want to go now to your Posthearing Brief. On the top of page 4 where you're talking about road use agreements, and I'm going to quote the first bullet point, you said, "My argument is all road use agreements, including all township agreements, must be completed before PUC agrees to accept Application."

Okay. That's not an argument. That's a statement of what you believe. I want to know what your argument is. Why do you think that would be important?

MS. KAAZ: Well, I was just under the understanding of there was at that time -- and I'd have
to ask Kristi. At the time $I$ wrote that it was either due to Grant or Codington. There was a township, I believe. What $I$ meant was the township agreements were not all completed.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. But I guess my question is why do you think they would need to be completed before we issue our permit as opposed to before there's actually going to be some use of the roads?

MS. KAAZ: Oh. I was thinking along the lines that if -- because of the fact that our county has given the conditional use permit, that once you approve it there could maybe be no other way to get those, that there would be no other way to make sure that those were completed.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I appreciate that because $I$ wasn't sure quite what you were getting at.

I will just say, though, that in the permit conditions that the Applicant has suggested -- we haven't adopted them yet, but the very first one is that the Applicant must obtain all governmental permits from everybody before they can do any work. It would seem to me that would cover it.

MS. KAAZ: Okay.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. I just wanted to make sure $I$ wasn't missing something.

MS. KAAZ: No.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: The last question I've got for you -- and 1 think this was page 5 of your Brief -you said you're requesting to review with your attorney the Good Neighbor Agreement.

Obviously, we've reviewed the confidential version so $I$ know what the compensation would be for your small parcel. I can tell you I don't think you would be interested in it.

Do you think you -- I mean, is this really important to you that you able to review that and have an opportunity to sign it?

MS. KAAZ: No. It's just that they had stated that I had already seen it and that I had been offered it, but I've never seen it. And that's why I said let me see it if that's the case. Because you're stating about it without showing it to me.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. And I appreciate that. And part of the reason that $I$ wanted to see it, I'm trying to think, I mean, is this something that could help you through this difficult thing? And when I looked at the compensation that's included I can tell you it wouldn't. It wouldn't for me anyway.

MS. KAAZ: Okay.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: So I appreciate having
that discussion.
For Ms. Smith, the issue that you ended with, James Waldren. First of all, appreciate you pointing that out, being palms up about that.

Can you tell me -- I've got the map. Can you tell me where -- which turbine his residence is closest to?

MS. SMITH: Okay. That's a good question. Do you remember?

MS. GUNDERSON: It's west of 50 .
MS. SMITH: West of 50 .
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So I'm seeing -I'm seeing a pink dot that is to the northwest of 50 . Is that the one that we're talking about?

MS. SMITH: Yes. That's it.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: And do you know how far that is from 50 or 48?

MS. SMITH: We looked at it. It was --
MS. GUNDERSON: It was about 1,800 feet, I
believe, from the house.
MS. SMITH: So I'll just repeat it for the record. 1,800 feet and over 2,000 for the other turbine location is my recollection.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. The other question that I've got -- and I dearly wish this would have
clicked with me before we had the hearing but it didn't and so I'm going to ask you and we'll see where we can go with this.

As $I$ was reviewing everything in preparation for today, it struck me as being really unusual the combination of tower hub height and rotor diameter that you've chosen for this project, the hub height being 82 meters, the rotor diameter being 136 meters.

And Ms. Mogen just alluded to it that these blades are going to be about 45 to 50 feet off the ground. Very, very low compared to the typical wind turbine in South Dakota where the blades are 100 to 150 feet off the ground.

And so my question -- I mean, you get that thing spinning 45 feet over your head -- well, 40 feet over your head, that's pretty scary in my mind. And so my question is why has the company chosen this very, very short tower for this project as opposed to what is normally used?

MS. SMITH: So I'm going to take a stab at this, and then Brenna can tell me. And $I$ will admit I am speaking a bit off the cuff.

But my understanding is that turbine technology is evolving and so that there is -- the future of turbines is having a longer turbine blade. That's part
of the efficiency and the ability to get to a 4.2 megawatt turbine.

And so having -- you don't necessarily increase the hub height. If you increase the hub height, then you would maybe be over 500 feet. This one is not over 500 feet and so, therefore, naturally there is a reduced area, a blade height clearance I guess is what you would call it.

At the county level the blade height clearance requirement is 25 feet, and so there is compliance with the county's requirement on blade height clearance. There isn't anything specified obviously at the state level.

My understanding is that turbine manufacturers are cognizant of safety as well as potential liability, and so they are designing these to ensure that there is sufficient clearance. And, again, this is my understanding, and Brenna can certainly add to that if needed.

MS. GUNDERSON: I think you've captured it.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: And I appreciate that.
So I guess the follow-up questions, you talked about the county requirements. So do both of these counties have that requirement?

MS. SMITH: Yes. 25 feet is the blade height
clearance. And that's fairly typical from what I've seen in South Dakota in the ordinances.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so I know that Vestas has, at least from what $I$ could tell, four kind of standard heights for their towers. And this project is using the shortest one.

What's the thought process?
MS. SMITH: The only thing that $I$ can say is that $I$ do know that there are somewhat different FAA requirements once you get above 500 feet. So that is, I believe, a consideration. But I also can't tell you specifics unless Brenna can add to that.

Brenna, do you have more?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: And, again, I apologize because I know this isn't your area, but I need to have this conversation before we can move through today.

MS. GUNDERSON: Brenna Gunderson with Dakota Range.

That is correct. There would be an FAA -- you know, getting beyond 500 feet would require additional scrutiny, you know, on the wind turbine, on the air space.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: So as far as whether or not they would even permit construction? Is that what you're getting at? Or what kind of scrutiny are you talking about?

MS. GUNDERSON: Not necessarily. But it's about availability of turbines. It's going to be about, you know, what would work with the wind resource at this particular site in combination of permitting requirements.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. Well, I appreciate that. It just -- go ahead.

MS. GUNDERSON: This is a turbine that Xcel also has chosen to use for the project. So --

COMMISSIONER NELSON: So it's Xcel's fault?
MS. GUNDERSON: No, not at all. Not at fault.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I thought maybe we ought to call up the Xcel representative and he can defend that choice.

I appreciate that. And, you know, we've obviously got wind farms around South Dakota, and so we're kind of used to what they look like and what the configurations are. Obviously, we know that the rotor diameters are getting bigger because the generators are getting bigger. But all the sudden what that means is that instead of that blade 150 feet over your head it's 40 feet over your head, and that's just a whole different context.

The fact that the counties -- and I give great
deference to what counties believe is appropriate in their county, and if the county believes 25 feet is sufficient in their county, I'm not going to quibble with that. But $I$ appreciate your explanation of that.

I think that's all the questions I've got at this point.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I have a quick question of Staff.

On the National Registry of Historical Places why didn't -- you know, we worked on Crocker on that one, and we have the Commission being notified, I believe. I'm kind of having all my --

Yes. Is there any reason why that's not included in this condition? And I'll -- I think your number is 11, but $I$ have so many papers right here, I should have waited and had Commissioner Hanson ask a question before $I$ got my papers organized.

Yes. It is 11 on Dakota Range. And it doesn't include that the Commission should be notified, that $I$ see, but the previous Crocker Docket we did add that.

MS. REISS: Thank you, Commissioner.
I believe we did discuss this with the Applicant, and there was an agreement made between the SHPO office and the Applicant regarding a Cultural Resource Plan and the Applicant requested that the
condition match that plan and if the Applicant would like to follow up with that, they can.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: If you could just re-identify yourself.

MS. SMITH: Certainly. This is Mollie Smith again for Dakota Range.

Ms. Reiss is correct. The language that is used in Condition 11 is from the CRMMP, the reference just below Cultural Resources Monitoring and Management Plan for the project. And so it was requested within Dakota Range that it match exactly what SHPO had agreed to, and so that's why the language was proposed here.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. The Commission certainly can add language, although you guys do agree that -- to be notified.

Thank you.
Other Commission questions.
Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
My first question is for Staff on the statement that on -- item 34, felt was redundant. I was wishing to -- I was considering an edit to that, and I'm curious where you find it redundant.

I know that there's a lot of information pertaining to that subject, but $I$ was curious on the redundancy.

MS. REISS: Thank you. This is Amanda Reiss for Staff.

Regarding Findings of Fact 34, Staff would just note that we did not request a condition regarding compensatory mitigation in this docket and do not believe anyone has requested that. So we feel like that's just unnecessary.

And then the previous Findings of Fact from 28 through 33 cover environmental impacts so we just felt like this was unnecessary regarding this Application.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Thank you. It takes just a little piece of my heart when you're looking at that. Birds and bats are --

Oh, you're looking at Findings of Facts. All right. I was looking at permit conditions. Oh, thank you.

I feel much better now. It's just like a -- an Advil or something. Thank you.

Then my next question would be for Ms. Smith. On item 34 on the recommended permit conditions I've debated and argued with myself a bit here.

When $I$ look at the avian mortality and the study that was done for the Application, it just didn't seem like a real strong study to me. It was bits and pieces
here and there. Certainly was a study. It just wasn't as thorough as I thought it should be.

And I'm concerned when $I$ look at this particular condition it states that you agree -- the Applicant agrees to undertake a one-year independently conducted postconstruction --

I just -- that seems lacking for me. It would seem that two years would be absolute minimum we would want to be examining something of this nature. What opposition would you have to having that a two-year agreement instead of a one-year study?

MS. SMITH: Certainly, Commissioner. The intent in that provision 34 is not to not do two years. It is to commit to one year and then determine the need for and scope of additional years. So a second year based on the information that's provided from the first year's mortality study.

My understanding is that the goal is to ensure that a second year study, if it's needed, is considered in coordination with U.S. Fish \& Wildlife Service and Game \& Fish. And so it's not that they wouldn't do it but they would determine what is needed and then they maybe wouldn't do just a broad all-species study but they would do -- if the information was indicating a particular species that it would be more appropriate to
do a focused study on, that's the scope piece, and that would be determined.

So the intent is that if an additional year is needed with discussions with U.S. Fish \& Wildiffe Service and Game \& Fish, it would be conducted. It's just specifying some latitude in working with the agencies on what that should look like.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.
I understood that, that it was a one year in order to determine whether a second year -- my concern was that one year just did not sound -- appear with the history of the survey, the previous survey, that one year would be sufficient in order to basically gauge that baseline that I'm not confident with, that two years would make much more sense.

Do you have an objection to having two year instead of a one year?

MS. SMITH: I'll defer to Ms. Gunderson in a second.

I will say I didn't note during the hearing that there were particular concerns with the study work so I'm somewhat surprised about the comment and concerned that we weren't able to address your concerns during the hearing. We would have hoped that we could do that or have that opportunity.

And so I think, Ms. Gunderson, do you have any objections if it was changed to two years at this point? Other than what I've already stated?

MS. GUNDERSON: No. I don't think we have an objection.

MS. SMITH: So yeah. I think the rationale behind how it was written is still valid, but if the determination is made that it should just simply state two years, then that would be what we will abide by.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I appreciate that.
And your comments preceding the question to Ms. Gunderson, I would just like you to understand that I rarely come forth with a strong objection to presentations when they're being made during evidentiary hearing. I simply ask questions in an effort to ascertain information.

I would like to say and have on record that I appreciate the extent and information that you have on -throughout the entire presentation pertaining to not only the work that -- the mitigation processes and the extensive information that you have. I think it's one of the better ones that $I$ have seen for wind farms certainly. And I appreciated that very much and the information that your -- his name slips right now.

MS. SMITH: Mr. Phillips.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: That's correct. Who did an excellent job of presentation and information. I appreciated it very, very much.

And thank you for that answer.
On item 2 of recommended permit conditions what concerns would you have with an addition, item 7 there? If we were to insert -- add, excuse me, "and Applicant's testimony during the evidentiary hearing." Or it could state, "evidence presented by the Applicant at the evidentiary hearing."

MS. SMITH: In looking at that, I think that that probably is intended. So I don't think that there would be a concern.

Yeah. No. That wouldn't be a problem with us.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you very much.
Appreciate that.
Madam Chair, I believe that's -- oh, one other, I guess, timely question.

Ms. Gunderson did state during the testimony that it would be highly unlikely that the Applicant would need or that Xcel would need A26, turbine A26. And I believe that's a direct quote. So I'm curious why -- and I do very much appreciate that that was one of the four that was offered from the standpoint that you proffered that it would likely not be used at all and that one of
those four would not be used.
Considering the testimony and the good will that it would expand for your project, which I think has been presented very well, why not just simply state this one we're not going to use?

MS. SMITH: I believe the reason is simply flexibility. But the intent is to only use three of the four. So we understand your thought. I think it seems to accomplish the same goal to commit to three of the four versus omitting A26. I guess that was the intent.

It wasn't trying to be not addressing your concern. It was trying to address your concern but leave a little flexibility, I guess.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you very much.
Thank you, Ms. Gunderson.
Thank you, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: This might be just questions
like popcorn questions where we all take a minute and find our stuff.

I'm going to go to shadow flicker, and I'm going to ask the Staff first.

So help me understand Condition No. 28 and 29 that are presented. Because when I read 28, which I don't necessarily like that word "reasonable" steps because that's always in the interpretation of a lawyer,
and I'd rather have that in interpretation of the Commission so $I$ might ask that that be deleted.

So in Crocker when we looked at that -- and I know Crocker is different, but it is all residents. So in item 28 it looks like it's all residents. But then when $I$ read No. 29 it looks like only nonparticipating residents.

Can you help me understand that?
And, of course, if we remember right, Crocker was all residents. Nonparticipating and participating resident was my understanding of 30 hours or plus per year.

MS. REISS: Thank you.
Commissioner, this was just the language agreed to between Staff and the Applicant. However, we would have no concern from Staff's perspective if you remove the nonparticipating and just leave it at residences from 29.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Then all homes in that area would be protected with the 30 -hour shadow flicker, unless there was a waiver that was obtained; correct?

MS. REISS: Correct.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
We are down to committee questions and/or action.

MS. SMITH: May I respond to the comment that was made by Staff? Because at this point the commitment regarding 30 hours of shadow flicker or less was at nonparticipating. There are some participants that are currently over 30 hours, as we discussed at the hearing.

So the project could not comply with a
requirement if it were changed to all residences. There would be some over. They are participating. And as we discussed in testimony, they were made aware of the shadow flicker levels. So $I$ just want to make sure that was clear on the record.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: But they can sign a waiver; correct?

MS. SMITH: I suppose that could be requested but that was not the proposal that was made or agreed to with Staff and so, therefore, we didn't discuss anything along those lines at the hearing.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Sure. Yeah. Thank you.
Just to my fellow Commissioners, I'm always committed to protecting as many people as we can, and they can certainly get waivers signed.

Other Commission questions and/or action.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Go ahead.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: It doesn't matter. Mine might take a while because of this. So I'm going to make
a few amendments probably.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I've got some written ones so why don't we --

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: If you have a written one -because mine would be kind of line item, and I would verbally say it.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, Madam Chair, would you like to just start out with the recommended permit conditions by the Applicant and then go from there with making it a better piece of product --

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Right. I will take a motion to grant, deny, or grant with conditions, and then $I$ believe if it is with conditions, those will be presented by you or Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Or all of us.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Or all of us. And we'll start amending them.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Correct.
Well, then, Madam Chair, in Docket EL18-003 I move that the Commission grant the recommended permit conditions.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Grant the permit with conditions. Okay. Great.

Is there discussion on that Motion?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I should say grant the
recommended permit conditions as presented under Exhibit A18. And then we can make amendments to that. Does that work?

I'm looking at attorneys, and they're looking off to see -- is that a good starting point?

Karen?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: If I could recommend if we would start with the permit conditions that were recommended by the Applicant in their Posthearing Brief, that would be the most current version.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Oh, in their Posthearing Brief.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yes. And the reason I'm asking that is because that's what my amendments are based on, and I'm going to be really screwed up if we don't start there.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. So in deference to my fellow Commissioner and his ability to present his amendments, $I$ would correct my Motion.

I would change my Motion to allude to the posthearing recommended permit conditions, yes.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: By the Applicant.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Correct.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Is there discussion on that Motion? Or amendments?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: I will -- well, I'll first say that $I$ would concur with the Motion that Commissioner Hanson has made. I think we all understand that state law lays out the criteria in which a permit can be granted or must be granted, and I believe that this project has met that burden.

I appreciate the work that Staff and the Applicant has done on the recommended conditions. As I have said in Crocker, it's a very good start. But I do have some amendments. And I'm going to pass some -- I'll pass some this way; I'll pass some this way.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Will they be available online?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: And, as we speak, Tina is posting them online, e-mailing them to the Service List and --

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: We'll be at ease.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: If anybody in the audience wants a copy, we've got copies here.

We're just going to give it a minute to make sure this all gets out to the folks that might be out and about listening.

Okay. I'm told that it is posted and it is out there.

So what $I$ have done is come up with eight
particular amendments. And actually I'm going to offer a verbal ninth one after some of the testimony today.

The first one, obviously, is just a grammatical change.

The second one deals with deleting a section that is not included in what we did in Crocker and $I$ think goes beyond what we need to there.

And number three is in the same vein. I want to keep those -- the sound level monitoring the same as what we did with Crocker. I'm comfortable with that.

Number four, again, would bring it into compliance with what we did with Crocker in that the information needs to be posted on the Commission website.

Section 38. And this deals with the
decommissioning. And $I$ want to say to the Applicant, first of all, $I$ greatly appreciate kind of the creative solution that you came up with for your language. And $I$ agree that provided this all ends up in Xcel's hands, we have an adequate control of the decommissioning process and payment to make sure it all gets done. And so I appreciate what you've provided there.

But I'd also recommend that that be amended so that in the slight chance that the deal with Xcel falls through that the decommissioning escrow account would be established under the same provisions that we used in

Crocker. And so that's just kind of the -- in case things fall through.

Section 40 was the one -- and way before Staff objected to that $I$ read through that, and I said obviously we understand that Condition 40 was based on information that came from our confidential discussion, but the only way a condition can be of any use to anybody is if the public knows what it is and so the public can make sure that that condition is, in fact, enforced. So Section 40 will not be a confidential condition.

In addition, I'm proposing that we add one sentence to Section 40, and that be that, "The project owner will pay for any documented damage caused by ice thrown from a turbine."

Now I'd love to elaborate on why I've chosen that, but $I$ think if $I$ do, $I{ }^{\prime} m$ going to dive right back into the confidential information that we talked about during the hearing. And so I'm not going to say anymore about that other than $I$ think it is only right that if there is ever any documented damage from ice thrown by a turbine, that the project owner pay for that.

Number 8, I believe that Ms. Kaaz made a very credible case that an aircraft detection lighting system ought to be used. It's one of the few things that $I$ think that we can do to try to make this a more livable
situation for her and her family. And it will not only be for her but for everybody in that area will benefit by being able to see the night sky as opposed to red blinking lights.

The FAA obviously considers this to be a technology that is usable, and $I$ think this is something that we can do to try to make this project if only slightly more palatable for the folks that are living there.

And then $I$ would add a ninth one that just -- I think it was Ms. Mogen raised today. And that would be an amendment to Condition 4 where current Condition 4 says, "The Applicant shall provide each landowner on whose property the project is to be constructed the following information." I would simply change that to say each landowner in the project footprint. I don't see any reason why they shouldn't have all of that same information. That would make good sense to me.

And so I would move to amend the Motion in that fashion.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Would you accept any friendly amendments possibly, or would you like to vote on this amendment first and then --

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Are they changes to things that I've talked about, or are they new issues?

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: One of them is the same. Some of them are new.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. I mean, if they're new ones, I'd do that separately. But if there's minor wording changes to this, $I$ can certainly accept that.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: The only minor wording in Section 11 was that also the Commission is notified, just like in Crocker.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. Let's just put that in. Yeah. I'm good with that. In the very first one, Section 11, add that the Commission would be notified also.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: On the National Register of Historical Places is what we're talking about if you're online and not seeing Section 11.

Other discussion on the amendments?
I am supporting your amendments, Commissioner
Nelson. The Applicant that shall utilize an aircraft detection lighting system was extremely important to me. And, just like you stated, $I$ believe it's something we can do to help the community.

Other discussion on the amended conditions? The amendment?

Hearing none, all in favor of the amendment to the conditions say aye.

Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

Motion carries.
Are there other amendments?
And the other amendment $I$ would offer is I move that we amend -- in No. 28 take out the word "reasonable" and on item 29 take out the word "non-" on item C. So C shall read, "A shadow flicker analysis showing anticipated shadow flicker levels will not exceed the Applicant's voluntary commitment of 30 hours per year at any" -- oops. Not non. It's nonparticipating. I'm deleting nonparticipating. Any resident.

I'm going to -- you know what? I'm going to change that amendment. Sorry about that. At the end of C, and my attorneys can help me over here, I'm going to leave that and say something to the impact of securing waivers from participating landowners if it is over 30 hours.

I think that will make more sense. And that you can secure waivers and those people have been notified already. And so the amendment is on 28 take out
"reasonable" on C and 29 add "and receive a waiver from participating residents if over 30 hours."

And my attorneys can draft that more appropriately if needed.

And my concern is $I$ just want to make sure that shadow flicker is an important level and that even our landowners that are participants can sign waivers and absolutely understand that shadow flicker will be over 30 hours.

Other comments on the amendment?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm going to ask -- if I could ask you a question and then I'd like to ask the Applicant a question. So what if they don't sign the waiver?

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Then they might not get a tower.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: But they've already signed an easement granting permission to put a tower.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I don't know the confidentiality of a -- you know, I don't know the easement and the confidentiality of that.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. So that was going to be the question -- I want to ask the Applicant two questions.

Is the issue that Commissioner Fiegen's concerned about in the easement language, is this issue already covered?

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So my goal is to make sure participating landowners do not have to put up with over 30 hours of shadow flicker unless agreed upon, which I understand that those people that you shared during the hearing are aware of that.

All my other amendments were taken care of by Commissioner Nelson. That is the last amendment I wanted to work on.

So if you are listening online, the Applicant is looking at their lease agreements as to look at the participating landowners that have shadow flicker over 30 hours and what that agreement looks like. So we are at ease.
(Pause.)
MS. SMITH: So we have not -- this is Mollie Smith for Dakota Range. We have not combed through each and every sentence. Shadow flicker isn't specifically addressed so if that is what would be required, we can say that shadow flicker isn't specifically address.

There may be other provisions that generally address the effects of turbine placement.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Follow-up question.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Yeah. And then $I$ have one
question for you after Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: So in trying to get at the concern that Commissioner Fiegen has, isn't that what Section 28 is about, where you talk about the Applicant will take reasonable steps to mitigate shadow flicker concerns at the -- at all residences that are more than 30 hours?

MS. SMITH: Yes. So if a landowner has -- at this point the only landowners that have been modeled as having potential at greenhouse -- this is greenhouse levels of shadow flicker above 30 hours would be participants.

So that is correct. That particular provision is really geared towards the participants that may potentially be over 30 hours. And the reason
"reasonable" was in there is omitting -- removing a turbine would not necessarily be reachable, but putting in shades, putting in trees, those sorts of measures, would be the typical measures that are typically taken to address shadow flicker concerns.

So, yes. You're correct, Commissioner. That is the intent of that provision and that's why $I$ believe Staff had requested it originally and that's where we came to on the agreement.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: And, Ms. Smith, I can't remember during the testimony. Were there only a couple of homes that you predicted that would be over 30? I remember there was a chart, and I just can't remember the number.

MS. SMITH: I honestly don't remember the specific number, Commissioner. It was around maybe six homes if I --

MS. GUNDERSON: It's 10 .
MS. SMITH: 10. 10 that are over. Again, this is in greenhouse mode is my recollection and if it wasn't, it hadn't done all the site-specific modeling yet.

I believe the comment originally made was site-specific modeling could be done if there was a concern from the landowners. But it was discussed with the landowners, each of them. None of them had concerns, and so there wasn't site-specific modeling conducted.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So those 10 that you talked about, they're aware of it?

MS. SMITH: Yes. And that was in the testimony, I believe, that they had each been -- the results had been presented to them and each of them Dakota Range had discussed with them if they had concerns and they indicated they would not.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So how hard would it be to get a waiver from those 10?

MS. SMITH: I think that this is a matter between the Commissioners so we would leave it to them. I would just say at this point that wasn't discussed during the hearing, but we would leave it to the Commissioners how best to dress your particular Motion.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Right. Because it's kind of hard to figure out how do you protect all the landowners except those six or 10 , like you said, that have already agreed to.

So how can $I$ as a Commissioner protect the other landowners that -- during our testimony they're participating but were unaware that the shadow flicker could be more than 30 hours?

So those 10, you showed us those. You've talked to them. It sounds like you have their agreement. Just to protect the other ones that may possibly come up. That would probably not happen.

MS. SMITH: So I guess it sounds like you're asking for some sort of solution here. And so perhaps if you didn't want to offer a waiver -- or require a waiver at this time, given that there was testimony to support it and your concern is about the future, it would be something to address through the shift provision in 22 so
that if there were shadow flicker above 30 hours per year, then you're obtaining a waiver? Is that what your -- is that getting to the concern that you have, Commissioner?

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Right. And I just want to make sure the participating landowners except those six or 10 are protected.

MS. SMITH: The other way to do it -- I guess if you're concerned about it -- would be in 29. So 28 would govern -- the reason this was changed, as $I$ understand it, to the residences is to ensure that if anyone was over 30, they are receiving the same treatment in the mitigation.

So I believe there are measures in place that address even those that are not currently contemplated in the layout, if that's your concern. So I think the concern is addressed through 28.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So I'm just going to friendly modify my amendment and only delete the word "reasonable" and not modify C. Because -- and just to state that reasonable sometimes can be up to the interpretation of a lot of attorneys, and $I$ just want to make sure residents are protected. And I believe landowners, if they are participants, they will be reasonable.

Other questions, discussion, on the amendment?
So the amendment is on 28 , only deleting the word "reasonable." No discussion on the amendment.

All in favor say aye; opposed, nay.
Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

Amendment and Motion is carried.
This brings us back to the main Motion. The main Motion has been amended.

Is there other discussion on the main Motion?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I appreciate the work that both of you have worked towards on making this a better product and especially -- well, I won't cover them. We've already passed them, but I have a number of them that have been taken care of as well. And I appreciate that, that we're all thinking along pretty much the same line.

During the questioning $I$ asked two obvious questions, and I'm going to present motions on those two
items at this time.
On the recommended permit conditions, I move that on item 2, number 7 be added so that the word "and" is stricken prior to the number 6 that is in parenthesis, and at the end of that sentence prior to the period we would add "and, (7), evidence presented by the Applicant during the evidentiary hearing."

And this simply provides that -- and must be read in -- consistently with the beginning of that sentence that the Applicant shall construct, operate, maintain the project in a manner consistent with those items that are already presented plus the evidence that was presented by the Applicant. And $I$ would submit that as my Motion.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: There's an amendment to the amended conditions.

Is there other discussion on the Motion?
I would simply say I appreciate your adding this. I'd always assumed that that was the case, but I think spelling it out very clearly is the right thing to do. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I appreciate that comment. Madam Chair, I appreciate that comment. Because assumptions are what get us into trouble.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yep.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: And I thought that as well. And when $I$ read it $I$ thought -- I saw a large opening there and thought we appear to have a good Applicant and would like to just keep us all on the same road.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: The Motion before the Commission is an amendment to the amended conditions.

Other discussion on the Motion.
Hearing none, all in favor say aye; opposed, nay.

Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

Motion carries.
Do you have another Motion, Commissioner Hanson?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I do on the Recommended Permit Conditions, item No. 34. On the first line it states that, The Applicant agrees to undertake one year of independently conducted, et cetera.

It's my desire and my Motion is to strike one year and add two years so that it will read that the

Applicant agrees to undertake two years of independently conducted.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Discussion on your Motion.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe I made remarks
when $I$ was -- when $I$ was asking questions of the Applicant, and that would suffice for me.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other discussions on your
Motion? Or on Commissioner Hanson's Motion?
Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: If $I$ could ask a question.
So your intention would be to leave the last sentence in so that there's a possibility of a third year if conditions warranted it; correct?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Yes. To answer your question, it would be my hope that four or five years is necessary.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, you're starting to lose my vote.

I will simply -- you know, $I$ can go either way on this, but $I$ know Commissioner Hanson feels strongly about it so I'll support you on the deal. Two years.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other discussion on the amended condition to the amended conditions already?

All in favor say aye; opposed, nay.
Commissioner Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

Amendment to the amended conditions passes.
Are there anymore amendments to the conditions?
Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I know where it's -- one beats their head so many times. I know where it's going. No, no.

I have a question, and I'm concerned regarding the -- I want to know where we are specifically on the ability for a turbine to be moved in any particular direction. And I've seen it spelled out, and I've seen the debate and the discussions. Is this every bit as consistent with our last wind turbine as it is -- as if I don't know the answer when I'm asking it?

I'm not going to beat my head against that
again. I know where I'm going to end up.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: So we're back to 325 feet.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, actually --
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: 325 this way and 325
(indicating) --
COMMISSIONER HANSON: And 325 this way, and 325
this way (indicating).
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: That is true.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: That's a huge area, isn't it?

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: That is a big area.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: That is a huge area. I shouldn't use our President as an example, but a huge area, isn't it? Does that gain me a vote?

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Would you like to offer an amendment on the 325 feet?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: You know, I don't have it in front of me right now actually. I had it a second ago, and I've buried it in my --

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: We will be at ease if you'd like to.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: 22.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.
Fellow Commissioner has just offered it to me,
which I'm sure is indicative of his support.
Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Go ahead.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm looking for a compromise on this. And $I$ recognize that -- well, I can't speak to the Motion until I make the Motion.

On line 22 I move that the Applicant may make
turbine adjustments of 200 feet -- excuse me. I believe I was pushing for 250 feet, was I, at the last one? 150. See, I'm getting more liberal in my old age going to 200 .

I would like to strike the footage and submit 200 feet.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Discussion on your Motion. Or amendment.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm looking for some -some more -- a more sensible distance. A more rational examination. And $I$ don't mean to infer that anyone is not being rational.

350 feet added to 350 -- I mean, this is a huge area. We're talking about all of these turbines. You're basically talking about the entire area where turbines can be moved. It's like not even having a map of where the turbines are going to be, almost, when you start looking at 700-feet distances. They can end up in a lot of different areas.

You know, the turbines right now that people are very concerned about, distances can be moved from within -- and I understand. Within the scope of distances from property lines, et cetera.

But if we really as a Commission want to have a -- have an idea of where these are going to be located,
as we did in a -- not this very last one but in the -well, we did in the -- in our previous decision where we said there are just too many layouts, too many options for where turbines were going to be located. That's generally what $I$ feel that we're doing when we say such a spacious area, such a huge footprint.

And so I think we need to -- we're dealing with professionals. We have the folks that have the ability to practically pinpoint where a turbine is going to be. So why not provide that they give us a better idea of where those turbines are going to be.

When we look at the map we are looking at where homes are. We're examining where structures are. It just simply makes sense when we're looking at -- and if 200 feet is not the right number, then 250 feet would have to be a much better number.

So I'll submit the 200 feet, and I've made my remarks. I'll go from there.

Thank you, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
I'm going to ask Staff because, you know, Staff, this will be on your plate.

It appears to me that you have a condition, of course, from Crocker and again here that are similar. The 325 feet were kind of pulled out. I always kind of
wondered why 325. And maybe 200 feet is better. Because there's still a process to be able to move those turbines. They would need to come to you. It looks like you would review it. You're going to do it within 10 business days, is it?

Do you have any comments or concerns with if we would just give you a little bit more things to review to protect our citizens of the State of South Dakota?

MS. EDWARDS: The 325, if you go back to where it originally came from, was just a number pitched by Crocker in its reconsideration Application so we never had a record to support that, and it just became a negotiating basis. So that's the only place we got it from.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Because they originally had a thousand; right?

MS. EDWARDS: And we certainly always welcome more work, especially if it protects the citizens of the state.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: That's what I thought.
Other Commission comments.
We're in Commission time. If a Commissioner has a question for you, they can certainly ask anyone a question.

Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: On comments?
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Yes.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I understand your passion. In your pitch you used the word "rational." And Commissioner Fiegen I think got at it. We don't really have a rational answer for any of these numbers.

I mean, there's not a scientific reason for 325. There's not a scientific reason for 200 . And so $I$ would simply say we've settled on 325 in the last docket. I think there is some wisdom in consistency from one docket to the next, and so for that reason $I$ would stick with the 325.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other Commission discussion.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Madam Chair, I appreciate with -- consistency and precedent, and I think that's an excellent argument.

At the same time $I$ would say, you know, if you make a mistake once, you don't want to make it twice.

I'm not -- I haven't concluded remarks. I recognize that the only person I'm speaking to here is Commissioner Fiegen, and so I needed to have her attention.

Commissioner Fiegen, if $I$ could just --
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: You know, because what I'm trying to grasp is 1,000 feet was way too much. And 325
feet came to us. I don't know for sure if I liked 325. And we're going to have more wind in front of us. So here's an opportunity for us to look at it one more time before more wind comes in front of us.

And that 325, was that perfect? I don't know. So I'm trying to figure out if 200's the number, 250? And then $I$ want to try to stay within that parameter in future dockets.

So I do not think 325 was absolutely perfect. It was a negotiating tool down from 1,000. And so I'm still trying to figure out if 200 or 250 is a better number.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Commissioner Fiegen.

And, if $I$ may, $I$ was making some pertinent remarks to fellow Commissioner Nelson who provided an excellent argument that $I$ agreed with pertaining to consistency. And $I$ think that certain precedents are ones that we need to follow.

At the same time, $I$ made a slightly flippant remark that you make a mistake once you don't want to make it a second time. However -- and I don't mean that we made a terrible mistake by any means.

I think that Commissioner Nelson's statements, arguments, as I said, were excellent arguments. And I
don't know that 200 is perfect either.
And your remarks cause me to think regarding -you know, we don't know what is a perfect way. However, having one at 325 at this juncture, we have a perfect opportunity now to have another incubator to look at. Say -- I believe you mentioned 250 feet. And I would at this juncture amend my own Motion from 200 feet to 250 feet so that we would have that opportunity for a second incubator.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: And $I$ want to keep our Staff busy. You know, I'm going to support your Motion today. I was a little bit uncomfortable with the 325 in Crocker, but it certainly came down from 1,000. And it doesn't mean that they can't be shifted. It means the Commission will get to look at your shifts.

So I think Commissioner Hanson has brought a condition today that continues to really help in a community that not everybody sees the benefit so this absolutely gives us the opportunity to have one more condition to protect consumers.

Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: A question and a comment. Just so I'm clear, are we now talking 250 and that's what you were supporting?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Okay. I'm going to oppose it for two reasons. One, I think consistency is good as we go about this process.

But, secondly, understand that we're talking rural areas. Okay. 325, 7.6 acres. 7.6 acres; that's not a lot. 250; that's 4 and a half acres. Neither one are a lot. I mean, when you're building stuff you've got to have flexibility.

And $I$ understand they can come back in, but, you know, between 7 and a half, 7.6 acres, and 4 and a half acres I'm struggling with what the harm is going to be with giving them that extra flexibility of another 3.1 acres.

I'm not understanding what the possible harm is, and so because of that, I can't support the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other discussion on the Motion.

Hearing none, all in favor say aye; opposed, nay.

Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Nay.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

Motion carries.
We're back to the main Motion with the amended conditions that have been approved. Are there other amendments to the conditions?

Are there other comments to the -- so we are back to -- correct, fellow Commissioners? We're back to the main Motion.

You know, the main thing $I$ want to say is thank you for everybody that participated in a hearing that is very emotional in a community. There are people that are proponents, and there are people that are opponents. And that's always difficult as a Commission to try to come up with conditions that are meaningful and that will move the process more smoothly.

I believe, you know, just Commissioner Hanson adding the public liaison officer at the last hearing that we had, facilitates that Dakota Range had also agreed to a public liaison officer that can help with communications in Codington County and Grant County. And I appreciate Dakota Range agreeing to that.

You know, Ms. Kaaz or Ms. Morgan [sic], I can't remember which one, said, you know, we have outdated wind laws. And I would agree with you. We do have outdated wind laws. And I do think some of that needs to be addressed at the state Legislature.

As your three Commissioners, we have to adhere to the law. We have to do everything based on evidence and facts. And if $I$ could move those wind towers so nobody's disappointed, man, wouldn't that be great? But I can't. I can't do that.

So I believe our decisions are based on the facts and the evidence. And we looked at the state law, and the permit adheres to the state law and the criteria that is outlined by the State Legislature.

Other comments?
Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I would concur with Commissioner Fiegen's comments. Obviously our task is to evaluate what has been presented and determine whether it meets the hurdle that is established in state law. And we believe that it does and, therefore, it deserves to have the permit and that's what we're prepared to do.

I think we've put together a very good set of conditions to make sure that this thing is built and operated in a way that maintains what is required in state law so far as health, safety, welfare of the area.

Having said that, $I$ appreciate particularly Ms. Kaaz because you're right in the middle of the deal. I appreciate your entire participation. I appreciate the fact your husband was here last time.

I've wrestled greatly with the concept of what the appropriate setbacks should be from residences. And I will tell you my personal opinion, I don't know that the setbacks that these counties have established are sufficient. But I give great deference to local governments and the decisions that local governments make and so I don't believe it's my job here to tell the County Commissions in either of those counties how to run the business in their county, even if $I$ would probably vote differently if $I$ were in their spot.

The one thing that $I$ would say to any County Commission that's dealing with this issue going forward; you know, greater setbacks eliminate some of the rubs that we see. And $I$ think that's worth -- worth considering.

But in the imminent matter they certainly meet the requirement of statute for a permit.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Madam Chair.
I meant what I said when $I$ stated to Ms. Smith earlier today that $I$ thought it was one of the better -one of the best ones that I've seen. It certainly is one of the best applications that I've seen. I can't speak for the counsel -- for the Commission at this juncture, but certainly you presented it very well.

You did an excellent job yourselves, plus the
standpoint of putting everything together. The evidentiary hearing, it was very, very well done, and $I$ very much appreciate that. It actually places -- it makes it a lot easier for us as we go through this process.

And I do appreciate that you adapted a lot of the items that were on the -- you had the opportunity to go to school, so to speak, on the previous wind farm and that gives you a great benefit, I know but at the same time you could have still fought certain fights that you wanted to get to different directions.

And $I$ appreciate that very much. It makes it easier for the Staff. It makes it easier for the rest of us through this process. So thank you very much for the professional way in which you presented your Application.

Speaking of professional, we have some lay folks that went way out of their way, Ms. Kaaz and Ms. Mogen. You guys did as good of job as anybody that I've seen from the standpoint of coming before us as lay people who do not have legal backgrounds and experiences even in this type of a theater.

And you did an excellent job. Especially on something that was as emotional for you and challenging. And it's on your front porch, not just your backyard.

It's something that's very important to you. And yet you presented your evidence and information to us in a good fashion so that we could understand it.

You didn't belabor points that should not have been labored in the first place, and we appreciate that. You beat up a little bit on your husband, I've got to say. But we understand that as well.

I was very happy to hear Commissioner Nelson just now talking about his concern for setbacks because from the standpoint of setbacks I'm not comfortable certainly with -- we have a menagerie of setbacks across the State of South Dakota, but we do have a responsibility from the standpoint that the counties have the right and the law to establish the setbacks within their counties and we have to give deference to the law certainly and to the counties for what their setbacks are.

I would like to see some -- in some cases what I consider some more sensible setbacks from some that are too far and some that are too short. So perhaps that will work its way out.

Environmental aspects of these wind farms is something that we really wrestle with. And I'm always very concerned from the standpoint of trying to figure out how it's going to affect wildlife. And, again, we
have other institutions that are required to pursue that, and we have to place our trust within their -- within their responsibilities of where they have the -- not only authority but the expertise to determine.

We are not all seeing or all understanding ourselves, by any means. So we place our faith in them that they will do the right thing. And $I$ do very much appreciate my fellow Commissioners for the work that they did and making it -- making a very difficult and trying challenge less so. I admire both of you for the work that you do here at the Commission.

And to Staff. Thank you so very, very much, all of the Staff, for what you have done for us and the information you have presented to us. I feel like I let you down on occasion for the amount of things that you bring to us and the suggestions that you have for us and not accomplishing all of those. But thank you very much for what you do. You do an excellent job.

Thank you, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
I would agree with my fellow Commissioners. And just for Ms. Kaaz, your participation was very impactful in the aircraft detection lighting system. And Commissioner Nelson and Commissioner Hanson have already said that, but $I$ just want to make sure that you're
totally aware of your participation without an attorney made a difference.

Okay. Other discussion before the Commission?
All in favor of the Motion with all the
amendments say aye; opposed, nay.
Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

Motion carries.
Are there other items that shall come before the Commission or public comments?

Hearing none, is there a Motion to adjourn?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Madam Chair, I move to adjourn.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Move to adjourn. All in favor say aye; opposed, nay.

Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

We are adjourned.
(The proceeding is concluded at 3:18 p.m.)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| 45:5, 45:13, 45:19 |  | 37:17, 37:23, 43:2, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46:5, 46:11 | 19:20 govern | 0:15, 50:1 | hours [15] -7:14 | infer [1] - 56:11 |
| flippant [1] - 60:20 | 65: | 19, 53:4, 53:14 | 14, 43:22, 44:2 | 3, 6:22, 6:24, 7 |
| fly | matical [1] - 39:3 | 54:9, 54:2 | 45:5, 45:1 | 3, 10:1, 10:9, |
| focus [1]-13 | GRANT ${ }_{[1]}-1: 5$ | 25, 55:3, 55:6 | :7, 46:11, 46:15 | 18, 27:24, 29: |
| used [1] - 30 | Grant [7] - 3:13, 4: | :11, 55:17, 55:2 | 8:15, 49:1 | 24, 31:16, 31:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { folks }[4]-38: 21,41: 8, \\ & 57: 8,66: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 8,5: 24,6: 16,19: 2 \text {, } \\ & 63: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 9,59: 14,60: 13, \\ & 61: 25,62: 21,65: 18 \end{aligned}$ | house [1]-21:20 <br> hub [4]-22:6, 22 | $\begin{aligned} & : 21,31: 24,32: 2, \\ & : 13,40: 6,40: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { follow }[6]-4: 24,5: 1, \\ & 23: 22,27: 2,45: 24, \\ & 60: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { grant }[8]-3: 17,8: 8, \\ & 36: 12,36: 20,36: 22, \\ & 36: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 16, 69:2 | 迷 | :15, 41:18, 67:2 |
|  |  | Hanson's [1]-53:8 happy [3] - 13:15, | huge [5] - 55:3, 55:6 | 68:14 |
|  |  |  | 56:13, | rmed [1] - 17: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { follow-up [2] - 23:22, } \\ & 45: 24 \end{aligned}$ | granted [2] - 38:5 <br> granting [1]-44:18 | $\begin{gathered} 13: 25,67: 8 \\ \text { hard }[3]-11: 17,48: 1, \end{gathered}$ | hurdle [1] - 64:15 | bitants [2] - 5 |
|  |  |  | hurt [1] - 8:2 | sert [1] - 32:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { followed }[3]-4: 24, \\ & 5: 1,5: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { grasp }[1]-59: 25 \\ & \text { great }[5]-25: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hard [3] - 11:17, 48:1, } \\ & \text { 48:9 } \\ & \text { harm [3] - } 6: 8,62: 11, \end{aligned}$ | hurts [1]-11 | side [1] - 7:15 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { harm }[3]-6: 8,62: 11, \\ & 62: 14 \end{aligned}$ | husband $[3]-7: 6$, <br> 64.25, 67.6 | $\text { instead }[3]-25: 2$ |
| 5:1, 5:20 following [2] - 2:1, 41:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { great [5] - } 25: 25, \\ & 36: 23,64: 4,65: 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 29:11, 30:17 |
| 41:15 <br> follows [1] - 5:14 | greater [1] - 65:13 | hay [1] - 5:10 <br> head [6] - 22:15, <br> 22:16, 25:22, 25:23, |  | ded [1] - 32 |
| footage [1]-56:5 <br> footprint [2]-41:16, 57:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { greatly }[2]-39: 16, \text {, } \\ & 65: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 22:16, 25:22, 25:23, <br> 54:10, 54:19 <br> health [2] - 8:8, 64:21 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ice }[8]-8: 25,9: 2, \\ 9: 10,9: 15,10: 11, \\ 10: 13,40: 13,40: 20 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { intent }[7]-16: 25, \\ & 17: 5,29: 12,30: 3 \\ & 33: 7,33: 10,46: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| FOR [2] - 1:4, 1:5 | 46:10, 47:11 | health [2]-8:8, 64:21 hear [1]-67:8 |  | intention [1] - 53:11 |
|  | Greg [1] - 1:14 ground [3]-9:10 | hearing [23]-6:20 | idea [2] - 56:25, 57:10 <br> identified [6] - 14:6, | interested [1] - 20:9 |
| forth ${ }_{[1]}$ - 31:13 |  | 10:6, 12:1, 12:3, <br> 22:1, 30:20, 30:24, | $\begin{gathered} \text { identified [6] - 14:6, } \\ 15: 18,16: 2,16: 4, \end{gathered}$ | interpretation [3] - |
| fou |  |  | 17:9, 17:11 | 33:25, 34:1, 49:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Foundation }[2] \text { - } \\ & 11: 13,11: 22 \\ & \text { four }[9]-7: 23,10: 13, \end{aligned}$ | guarantee [4] - 6:10, <br> 7:20, 15:11, 15:13 | 35:5, 35:17, 40:18, <br> 42:24, 45:7, 48:6, | identify [3]-13:8, $14: 23,27: 4$ | invade [1] - 5:23 invalidate [1]-17 |
|  | guarantees [1]-11:7 <br> guess [9]-4:7, 19:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 7,52: 9,62: 18, \\ & 63: 9,63: 16,66: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { II }[4]-1: 4,3: 12,6: 7, \\ & 13: 12 \end{aligned}$ | ironic [1] - 8:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { four [9] - } 7: 23,10: 13, \\ & 24: 4,32: 23,33: 1, \\ & 33: 8,33: 10,39: 11, \\ & 53: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  | 63:9, 63:16, 66:2, | imbalance [1] - 9:16 | issue $[8]-9: 12,15: 16$, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 7,23: 22,32: 1 \\ & 33: 10,33: 13,48: \end{aligned}$ | heart [1] - 28:1 | imbalanced [2] - 9:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:19, 19:7, 21:2, } \\ & 44: 25,45: 1,65: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | height $[8]-22: 6,22: 7$ <br> 23:4, 23:7, 23:9, | imminent $[1]-65: 1$ | issues [3]-13:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { friendly }[2]-41: 22, \\ & 49: 19 \end{aligned}$ | Gunderson [7] - 7:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 4,23: 7,23: 9 \\ & 23: 11,23: 25 \end{aligned}$ | impact [1] - 43:20 | $15: 7,41: 25$ |
|  | $31: 12,32: 19,33: 15$ | he | impactful [1] - 68:22 | 2:21, 32:5, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { front }[5]-3: 10,55: 12, \\ 60: 2,60: 4,66: 25 \end{gathered}$ | GUNDERSON ${ }^{\text {[9] }}$ - | held [1] - $2: 2$ | impacts [1] - 28:10 | 34:5, 36: |
| full ${ }_{[1]}-6: 6$fully $[1]-8: 11$ | $21: 10,21: 19,23: 20$,$24: 17,25: 2,25: 9$ | help [7]-20:21, 33:22, | important [6]-8:9, | 51:3, 52 |
|  |  |  | 18:23, 20:11, 42:19, | items [5]-18:4, 51:1, |
| fully $[1]-8: 11$ future $[3]-22: 2$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 24:17, 25:2, 25:9, } \\ \text { 25:12, } 31: 4,47: 9 \\ \text { guys }[2]-27: 14,66: 19 \end{gathered}$ | 61:17, 63:18 <br> HEREBY ${ }_{[1]}-71: 8$ | 44:6, 67:1 <br> mprovements [1] - | 51:12, 66:7, 69:13 |
| 48:24, 60:8 |  | HEREBY [1] - 71:8 <br> hi ${ }_{[1]}-8: 22$ | improvements [1] - <br> 4:25 <br> IN [2] - 1:3, 1:4 | J |
| G |  | highly ${ }_{[1]}-32: 20$ <br> hills [3] - 5:9, 7:10 | include [1] - 26:19 |  |
| gain ${ }_{[1]}-55: 8$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hills }[3]-5: 9,7: 10, \\ & 7: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { included }[3]-20: 22, \\ & 26: 14,39: 6 \end{aligned}$ | James [4] - 15:21, 16:17, 16:18, 21:3 |
| Game [2]-29:21, 30:5 | [3]-62:6, 62:14 | hired ${ }^{11]}$ - 6:18 <br> historical ${ }_{[2]}$ - 26:9, 42:14 |  | job [7]-10:6, 32:2, 65:7, 65:25, 66:19, |
| GARY $_{[1]}$ - 1:11 | hands [1] - 39:18 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { including }[3]-5: 25, \\ 11: 2,18: 18 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| gauge [1] - 30:13 | Hanson [18] - 3:8, |  |  | 66:23, 68:18 |
| geared [1] - 46:14 <br> generally $[2]$ - 45:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 16,27: 18,38: 3, \\ & 43: 1,50: 5,50: 16, \end{aligned}$ | history ${ }_{[1]}-30: 12$ <br> hoc [1] - 3:3 | increase ${ }^{[2]}$ - 23:3, $23: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jon [1] - 1:14 } \\ & \text { Joy }[1]-1: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $57: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 11,52: 18,53: 20, \\ & 53: 25,54: 8,61: 16, \end{aligned}$ | hoc [1] - 3:3 <br> home [4]-7:8, 7:15, <br> 15:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { incubator }[2]-61: 5 \text {, } \\ & 61: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { July }[5]-1: 8,2: 4,3: 4, \\ 71: 11,71: 14 \end{array}$ |
| generations [1] - 5:16 |  |  |  |  |
| generators [1] - 25:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:20, 63:15, 68:24, } \\ & 69: 6,69: 20 \end{aligned}$ | homes [8] - 12:12, | independently [3] 29:5, 52:22, 53:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { juncture }[3]-61: 4, \\ & 61: 7,65: 23 \\ & \text { June }[1]-13: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| gentleman [1]-15:23 <br> given [4]-10:8, 16:25, | HANSON [43] - 1:11,$\begin{aligned} & 27: 19,28: 12,30: 8, \\ & 31: 10,32: 1,32: 15, \\ & 33: 14,35: 23,36: 7, \\ & 36: 18,36: 25,37: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 4,14: 19,14: 21, \\ & 34: 19,47: 3,47: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 29:5, 52:22, 53:1 } \\ \text { indicated }[1]-47: 25 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { given }[4]-10: 8,16: 25, \\ & 19: 10,48: 23 \\ & \text { goal }[3]-29: 18,33: 9, \\ & 45: 3 \\ & \text { govern }[1]-49: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 19,47: 3,47: 8, \\ & 57: 13 \\ & \text { honestly }[1]-47: 6 \\ & \text { hope }[2]-13: 6,53: 15 \\ & \text { hoped }[1]-30: 24 \end{aligned}$ | indicated [1] - 47:25 <br> indicating [2]-29:24, 54:24 <br> indicating) $[1]-55: 1$ <br> indicative [1] - 55:19 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Kaaz [13]-1:21, 4:4, |



| $\begin{aligned} & 30: 18,31: 4,31: 6, \\ & 31: 25,32: 11,33: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 50:8, 51:25, 52:14, | numbers [1] - 59:6 | online [4]-38:13, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| :13, 34:22, 35:1, | 16, 59:1, 59:3 | O | 43:1 | part |
| 47:9, 47 | ,9, 6.23 | ob | operate [1]-51: | 16:9 |
| 7:21, 48:3, 48:20, | Nelson [19]-17:23, | objected [1] - 40:4 |  | participate [1] - 16:12 |
| 49:8, 58:9, 58:17 | 36:14, 42:18, 43:3, | objection [3] - 30:16 | opinion [1]-65:3 | participated [1]-63:9 |
| municipalities [1] - | :9, 46:1, 50:7, | 31:5, 31:13 | opponents [1] - 63:11 | participating |
| 6:1 | :13, 53:9, 54:2 | objections [1] - 31 | opportunity [8] - 4:6, | $34: 10,35: 8,43: 2$ |
| must [4] - 18: | 60:16, 61:21 | obtain [1] - 19:20 | $20: 12,30: 25,60:$ | 5:4, 45:13 |
| 19:20, 38:5, 51:8 | 4:11, 67:8, | obtained [1] - 34:2 | $61: 5,61: 8,61: 15$ | 14, 49 |
| N |  | obvious [1] - 50:2 |  |  |
| ```name [4] - 8:20, 14:25, 16:23, 31:24 named [1] - 15:23 national [2]-26:9, 42:13 naturally \({ }_{[1]}-23: 6\) nature [1] - 29:9 nay \([7]-50: 4,52: 10\), 53:24, 62:19, 62:23, 69:5, 69:19 near [4] - 10:3, 10:4, 14:14, 14:18 necessarily [4] - 23:3, 25:2, 33:24, 46:17 necessary [2] - 17:3, 53:16 need \([13]-8: 6,12: 5\), 13:6, 13:24, 19:6, 24:15, 29:14, 32:21, 39:7, 57:7, 58:3, 60:19 needed [6]-23:19, 29:19, 29:22, 30:4, 44:4, 59:21 needs [2] - 39:13, 63:24 negotiate [2]-7:25, 11:4 negotiating [2] - 58:13, 60:10 neighbor [3] - 6:5, 7:21, 20:5 neighbors [1]-5:3 NELSON [52]-1:12, 17:24, 18:8, 18:14, 19:5, 19:15, 19:24, 20:2, 20:18, 20:25, 21:12, 21:16, 21:24, 23:21, 24:3, 24:14, 24:23, 25:7, 25:11, 25:13, 36:2, 36:15, 37:7, 37:13, 38:1, 38:14, 38:18, 41:24, 42:3, 42:9, 43:4, 44:11, 44:17, 44:22, 45:24, 46:2, 46:25,``` | never $[3]-8: 1,20: 15$, | ob | opposed [9] - 19:7 |  |
|  | 58:11 new [3]-41:25, 42:2, | $39: 3,40: 5,41: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 18,41: 3,50: 4 \\ & 52: 9,53: 24,62: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { particular }[8]-25: 5, \\ 29: 3,29: 25,30: 21, \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | 64:13 | $69: 5,69: 19$ | $: 1,46: 13,48: 7$ |
|  | next [4]-5:15, 14:17 | occasion [1] - 68:1 | opposition [1] - 29:10 | 54:1 |
|  | $\left.\begin{array}{r}\text { 28:20, } \\ \text { night } \\ {[1]}\end{array}\right]-411$ | occurred [2] | options [1] - 57 oral [2] - 3:23, 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { particularly [1] - 64:2 } \\ & \text { party [2] - 3:23, 14:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | night's [1] - 5:13 | OF ${ }_{[6]}-1: 2,1: 3,1: 4$ | order $[4]-3: 2,3: 2$ | pass [3] - 38:10, 38:11 |
|  | nine [1] - 16:1 | 71:1, 71:3 | 30:10, 30: | passed [1]-50:20 |
|  | nine-acre [1] | offer [5] - 7:19, 39:1 | ordinances [1]-24:2 | passes [1] - 54:6 |
|  | h[2] - 39:2, 41: |  | organized [1] - 26:17 | passion [1] - 59:3 |
|  | [3] - 10: |  | originally [5] - 15:22, | $\text { past }[1]-12: 8$ |
|  | noise [3] - 7:14, 8:3 | office [2]-16:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 23,47: 14,58: 10 \\ & 58: 15 \end{aligned}$ | pasture [1]-5:10 <br> Pause [1]-45:16 |
|  | 15:5 | 26:24 | ought [2]-25:13 | $\text { pay }[2]-40: 13,40: 2$ |
|  | noisy [1] - 9:1 | officer [2]-63:16 | 40 | payment [1] - $39: 20$ |
|  | non [2]-43:11, 43:15 | 63:18 | ourselves [1] - 68:6 | peer [3]-11:13, |
|  | none [5] - 42:24, | om | outdated [3]-5:21, | 11:18, 11:1 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:17, 52:9, 62:18 } \\ & 69: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $46: 1$ | $63: 22,63: 2$ | people [9]-9:12, $9: 25,35: 20,43: 2$ |
|  | nonparticipant ${ }_{[1]}$ | on | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{OL} \\ & \mathrm{ou} \end{aligned}$ | 45:6, 56:20, 63:10 |
|  | - | 24:10, 59:18, $60:$ |  | 63:11, 66:20 |
|  | nonparti | one [58] - 3:10, 4:8 | own [1] - 61: | per [3]-34:11, 43:14, |
|  | 11:1, 34:6, 34:10 | $4: 15,6: 1,8: 1,8: 2$ | owned [1] - 15:2 | 49:1 |
|  | $34: 17,35: 4,43: 15$ | $10 \cdot 20,14: 10,14$ | owner [2] - 40:13, | perfect [5] - 60: |
|  |  | $1$ | 40: | 60:9, 61:1, 61: |
|  | north [1]-15 | $21: 14,23: 5,24: 6$ | owns [1] - 16:13 |  |
|  | northwest [1]-21:13 | 29:1 |  | 6 |
|  | Notary [2] - 71:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 11 \\ & , 31: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | period [1] - 51:5 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 18 \\ & \text { note }[3]-12: 21,28: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 17,31: 21, \\ & 32: 23,32: 25, \end{aligned}$ | p.m [3] - 1:8, 2:5, 70:2 <br> page [2] - 18:15, 20:3 | periodically [1]-7:16 <br> permission [1]-44:18 |
|  | 3 |  |  | permit [22]-3:13, |
|  | notice $[7]$ - 15:18 | $40: 24,41: 1$ | palms [1]-21 | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 18,9: 22,19: 7, \\ & \text { 19:11, 19:17, 24:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $15: 25,16: 15,17$ | 42:1, 42:10, 45:25 | papers [2]-26:1 | $28: 16,28: 21,32: 5,$ |
|  | 17:4, 17:6, | 54 | 26:17 | $36: 20,36: 22 \text {, }$ |
|  | no | 910 | $\text { parameter }{ }_{[1]}-60$ | $: 1,37: 8,37: 21,$ |
|  |  |  | eters [1] - 11 | :4, 51:2, 52:2 |
|  | 42:7, 42:11, 43:24 |  | parcel [6] - 15:22, | 64:8, 64:17, 65:1 |
|  | nowhere [1] - 11: |  | , 16:3, 16:1 | PERMIT [1] - 1:4 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { number }[14]-26: 15, \\ 39: 8.39: 11, ~ 40: 22 . \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { one-yea } \\ \text { 29:11 } \end{gathered}$ | 16:15, 20:8 <br> parenthesis [1] - 51:4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { permits [2] }-4: 24, \\ 19: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 8,39: 11,40: 22, \\ & 47: 5,47: 7,50: 20, \end{aligned}$ | ones [6] - 31:22, 36:2, | parenthesis [1]-51:4 <br> part [2]-20:19, 22:25 | 19:20 <br> permitting [1]-25:5 |
|  | 51:3, 51:4, 57:15, | 42:4, 48:18, 60:19, | participant $[4]$ - 14:10, | person [4] - 6:8, |
|  | :16, 58:10, 60:6, | 65:21 | 14:11, 16:7 | $15: 21,16: 10,59: 20$ |
|  |  | Onida [2] - 1:24, 71:13 |  |  |


| ```perspective \({ }_{[1]}\) - 34:16 pertaining [3]-27:25, 31:19, 60:17 pertinent \([1]-60: 15\) Phillips [1] - \(31: 25\) phone [1]-4:9 phonetic [3]-14:9, 14:24, 15:23 piece \([4]-15: 8,28: 13\), 30:1, 36:10 pieces [1] - 28:25 Pierre \({ }_{[2]}-2: 3,3: 6\) pink [1] - 21:13 pinning [1] - 17:13 pinpoint \({ }_{[1]}\) - 57:9 pitch [1]-59:4 pitched [1]-58:10 place \([7]-4: 22,5: 17\), 49:14, 58:13, 67:5, 68:2, 68:6 placement [1] - 45:23 places [4]-5:4, 26:9, 42:14, 66:3 Plan [1]-26:25 plan [2]-27:1, 27:9 plate [1] - 57:22 plus [3]-34:11, 51:12, 65:25 point [8]-11:25, 18:17, 26:6, 31:2, 35:2, 37:5, 46:9, 48:5 pointed [3]-10:20, 11:11, 18:11 pointing [1]-21:3 points [2]-13:17, 67:4 polluting \([1]-5: 12\) popcorn [1]-33:18 porch [1]-66:25 portion [1]-15:24 positive \({ }_{[1]}-6: 14\) possibility [1] - 53:12 possible [3]-5:18, 8:12, 62:14 possibly [2]-41:22, 48:18 post \({ }_{[1]}\) - 16:22 postconstruction [1] - 29:6 posted [2]-38:23, 39:13 Posthearing [3] - 18:15, 37:9, 37:11 posthearing \({ }_{[1]}\) - 37:21 posting [1] - 38:15 potential [2]-23:15, 46:10``` | ```potentially \({ }^{[2]}-14: 4\), 46:15 practically \({ }_{[1]}\) - 57:9 practiced [2]-4:10, 4:11 precautions [1] - 10:2 precedent \({ }_{[1]}\) - 59:15 precedents [1]-60:18 preceding [1] - 31:11 Precision [1]-1:24 predicted [1] - 47:3 prefer \({ }_{[1]}\) - 17:18 preparation [1] - 22:4 prepared \({ }_{[1]}\) - 64:17 present [2]-37:19, 50:25 presentation \([4]\) - 12:1, 18:1, 31:19, 32:2 presentations [1] - 31:14 presented [16] - 10:5, 10:25, 32:9, 33:4, 33:23, 36:13, 37:1, 47:23, 51:6, 51:12, 51:13, 64:14, 65:24, 66:15, 67:2, 68:14 presenting [1] - 5:2 presently [1] - 10:4 president [1] - 55:7 pretty [2]-22:16, 50:22 previous [5] - 26:20, 28:9, 30:12, 57:2, 66:8 previously [2] - 12:23, 13:17 price [2]-7:8, 7:18 Prinz [3]-15:23, 16:21 pro [2]-1:21, 1:23 problem [1]-32:14 proceed [1] - 3:21 proceeding \([1]\) - 70:2 proceedings [3]-2:1, 71:9, 71:12 Proceedings \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1:7 process [7]-24:7, 39:19, 58:2, 62:3, 63:14, 66:5, 66:14 processes [1] - 31:20 product [2]-36:10, 50:19 Professional [2] - 71:6, 71:19 professional [2] - 66:15, 66:17 professionals \({ }_{[1]}\) - 57:8 proffered [1] - 32:24``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { prohibited }[1]-10: 4 \\ & \text { Project }[1]-3: 15 \\ & \text { project }[22]-7: 20, \\ & 9: 24,10: 3,10: 4, \\ & 15: 1,16: 13,16: 19, \\ & 17: 3,22: 7,22: 18, \\ & 24: 5,25: 10,27: 10, \\ & 33: 3,35: 6,38: 6, \\ & 40: 12,40: 21,41: 7, \\ & 41: 14,41: 16,51: 11 \\ & \text { PROJECT }[1]-1: 6 \\ & \text { projects }[1]-5: 23 \\ & \text { proof }[1]-7: 1 \\ & \text { property }[18]-4: 21, \\ & 6: 18,7: 14,7: 18, \\ & 7: 19,7: 21,7: 24,8: 2, \\ & 8: 25,9: 24,10: 7, \\ & 11: 7,15: 10,15: 13, \\ & 15: 24,15: 25,41: 14, \\ & 56: 23 \\ & \text { proponents }[1]- \\ & 63: 11 \\ & \text { proposal }[1]-35: 15 \\ & \text { proposed }[2]-13: 15, \\ & 27: 12 \\ & \text { proposing }[1]-40: 11 \\ & \text { protect }[5]-48: 9, \\ & 48: 12,48: 18,58: 8, \\ & 61: 20 \\ & \text { protected }[4]-6: 11, \\ & 34: 20,49: 7,49: 23 \\ & \text { protecting }[1]-35: 20 \\ & \text { protects }[1]-58: 18 \\ & \text { prove }[5]-7: 21,8: 7, \\ & 9: 14,10: 5,11: 14 \\ & \text { proven }[5]-5: 4, \\ & 10: 14,10: 16,11: 9, \\ & 11: 22 \\ & \text { provide }[7]-9: 23, \\ & 12: 2,13: 25,16: 18, \\ & 17: 3,41: 13,57: 10 \\ & \text { provided }[11]-6: 19, \\ & 6: 24,9: 13,13: 21, \\ & 13: 24,15: 18,17: 4, \\ & 29: 16,39: 18,39: 21, \\ & 60: 16 \\ & \text { provides }[1]-51: 8 \\ & \text { provision }[4]-29: 13, \\ & 46: 13,46: 22,48: 25 \\ & \text { provisions }[2]-39: 25, \\ & 45: 22 \\ & \text { proximity }[1]-6: 9 \\ & \text { Public }[4]-1: 19,3: 1, \\ & 71: 7,71: 18 \\ & \text { public }[6]-10: 9,40: 8, \\ & 63: 16,63: 18,69: 14 \\ & \text { PUBLIC }{ }_{[2]}-1: 1,1: 10 \\ & \text { publicly }[1]-6: 22 \\ & \text { published }[1]-17: 4 \\ & \text { PUC }[1]-18: 19 \end{aligned}$ | ```pulled [4]-16:8, 16:10, 57:25 pulling [1] - 16:8 purchase [1] - 12:4 purchased [2]-4:21, 16:1 purposes [1]-6:22 pursuant \({ }_{[1]}\) - 3:19 pursue [1]-68:1 pushing [1] - 56:2 put [7]-5:18, 6:23, 16:23, 42:9, 44:18, 45:4, 64:18 putting [3]-46:17, 46:18, 66:1```$\mathbf{Q}$ <br> Qualy $[1]-14: 24$ <br> quarantine $[1]-3: 8$ <br> questioning $[1]-$ <br> $50: 24$ <br> questions $[16]-13: 16$, <br> $14: 2,17: 21,18: 10$, <br> $23: 22,26: 5,27: 17$, <br> $31: 15,33: 17,33: 18$, <br> $34: 24,35: 22,44: 24$, <br> $50: 1,50: 25,53: 5$ <br> quibble $[1]-26: 3$ <br> quick $[1]-26: 7$ <br> quite $[3]-9: 11,10: 19$, <br> 19:16 <br> quote $[2]-18: 17$, <br> $32: 22$ <br> quoted $[1]-18: 2$R <br> raise $[1]-15: 16$ <br> raised $[2]-13: 18$, <br> $41: 11$ <br> RANGE $[3]-1: 3,1: 4$, <br> $1: 6$ <br> range $[1]-6: 7$ <br> Range $_{[21]}-1: 18$, <br> $3: 12,3: 14,3: 19$, <br> $3: 24,4: 5,7: 23,9: 13$, <br> $13: 1,13: 11,13: 12$, <br> $14: 5,24: 18,26: 18$, <br> $27: 6,27: 11,45: 18$, <br> $47: 23,63: 17,63: 20$ <br> rarely $[1]-31: 13$ <br> rather $[1]-34: 1$ <br> rational $[4]-56: 10$, <br> $56: 12,59: 4,59: 6$ <br> rationale $[1]-31: 6$ <br> re $[1]-27: 4$ <br> re-identify $[1]-27: 4$ <br> reachable $[1]-46: 17$ <br> read $[7]-33: 23,34: 6$, | ```40:4, 43:12, 51:9, 52:2, 52:25 real [2]-10:12, 28:25 realized \([1]\) - 17:13 really [9]-7:16, 20:10, 22:5, 37:15, 46:14, 56:24, 59:5, 61:17, 67:23 Realtime [2]-71:6, 71:19 reason [10]-20:19, 26:13, 33:6, 37:13, 41:17, 46:15, 49:10, 59:7, 59:8, 59:11 reasonable [10]-10:2, 33:24, 43:10, 44:1, 46:5, 46:16, 49:20, 49:21, 49:25, 50:3 reasons [1]-62:2 receive [3]-15:25, 16:15, 44:1 received [2] - 7:3, 17:6 receiving [1]-49:12 recently [1] - 16:16 receptor [2] - 14:14, 14:18 receptors [1]-14:23 recognize [2]-55:23, 59:20 recollection [2] - 21:23, 47:11 recommend [2]-37:7, 39:22 recommendations [1] - 9:22 recommended [12] - 8:24, 9:1, 28:21, 32:5, 36:8, 36:20, 37:1, 37:9, 37:21, 38:8, 51:2, 52:20 reconsideration [1] - 58:11 record [9]-6:23, 7:1, 8:19, 14:5, 15:10, 21:22, 31:17, 35:11, 58:12 records [2] - 16:4, 16:10 red [2] - 5:12, 41:3 reduced [1] - 23:6 redundancy [1]-28:1 redundant [2]-27:21, 27:23 reference [3]-14:14, 18:1, 27:8 references [1] - 13:19 referring [2]-18:4, 18:5 regarding [8] - 12:19, 26:24, 28:4, 28:5,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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