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CHAIRMAN HANSON: EL19-027. And I need to know from Commissioners or parties if anyone needs to take a break at this point.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'm good.
MR. SCHUMACHER: That would be welcomed, Chairman Hanson. A two-minute break would be very nice.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, if we have a break, people will need to call and (Inaudible) probably. So we're going to give it -- I show 11:07. So we will take it to 11:20. And I'll try to start this again at 11:20.

So if you will place your phones on mute and remember not to have chats around open mics., place yourselves on mute, and we'll start again at 11:20.
(A short recess is taken.)
CHAIRMAN HANSON: I will call the meeting of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission for March 17, 2020, back to order. And the first item on the agenda is to make certain that $I$ can be heard and that Commissioners are on the line.

Commissioner Fiegen, are you on the line?
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen's present. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Nelson, are you on the line?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm here, and you're
sounding good.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Great. I'll check with
Crowned Ridge.
MR. SCHUMACHER: Miles Schumacher is here. Yes. Thank you, Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Are you aware of any of your parties that you need to have on the line that are not on the line? Are you good to go?

MR. SCHUMACHER: I'll let Brian speak for the rest of the group with him. Are you there?

MR. MURPHY: I'm here. Chairman Hanson, we have everybody on the phone that we need.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Murphy.
And, Staff, who will be representing Staff on this? Are you on the line?

MS. REISS: This is Amanda. I am on the line. And I believe we have Ms. Morey and Mr. Hessler and Mr. Kearney on as well.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. And, Ms. Christenson, Ms. Mogen, Mr. Robish, whoever is representing your group, the Intervenors, are you on the line?

MS. CHRISTENSON: This is Amber Christenson.
Allen Robish is not available today.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. Thank you.

And, Ms. Christenson, will you be the one representing the Intervenors?

MS. CHRISTENSON: We aren't represented as a group in this docket, but $I$ do believe I'm the only Intervenor speaking.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. Ms. Mogen, is that correct?

MS. MOGEN: Yes. Amber will be speaking for me.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
So in Docket EL19-027, a reminder that this is being transcribed so identify yourself before speaking. Cheri Wittler is transcribing the discussion so, please, if you plan to read something, pace yourself slow enough so people can follow through and type it.

In the Matter of the Application by Crowned Ridge Wind II, LLC for a Permit of a Wind Energy Facility in Deuel, Grant, and Codington Counties, the question before the Commission is shall the Commission grant, deny, or grant with conditions a permit for the construction of a wind energy facility to Crowned Ridge Wind II, LLC pursuant to SDCL 49-41B-25? Or how shall the Commission proceed?

We will go through this discussion today giving five minutes to each one of the parties, and then Crowned Ridge will have three minutes for a rebuttal.

We'll begin with Crowned Ridge. Then we'll go to Staff and then to the Intervenors. Excuse me. I misspoke. We will go to Crowned Ridge first and then Intervenors.

Mr. Swanson sent a letter indicating that he would not be here. I will ask at this time, Mr. Swanson, have you joined us?

So after the Intervenors, then we'll go to Staff. Then we'll go back to Crowned Ridge for their three minutes.

So we'll begin now with Crowned Ridge for your presentation.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Chairman Hanson. Miles Schumacher for Crowned Ridge Wind II. The weight of the record in this proceeding shows that the Applicant has met its burden of proof.

On the first element of 49-41B-22, the project will comply with all applicable laws and rules, including the county setbacks required in Deuel, Grant, and Codington Counties.

Contrary to Intervenors' claim, the record in this proceeding shows the project complies with both Grant County ordinances. Intervenors themselves submitted as Exhibit AC-19 Crowned Ridge's Sound and Shadow Flicker Study that shows the project is in compliance with the older Grant County ordinance.
(Inaudible) sound studies that show it will comply with the new ordinance, and these studies show compliance using cumulative impacts not to exceed 45 dBA for nonparticipants, while the old ordinance that Intervenors point to had a threshold for all receptors of 50 dBA.

Therefore, the only potential cumulative impacts that may have not been studied are on accessory structures such as barns where accumulative impact studies are not required by any state or county regulation.

By showing that we will meet both ordinances, the Applicant has met its burden of proof that it will comply with all applicable laws and rules.

The evidence also shows the project will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment, nor to the social and economic condition of inhabitants, which is demonstrated by the Applicant being granted conditional use permits by the counties.

In addition, there is substantial evidence that the project will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment or cultural resources by way of studies, surveys, and consultations with agencies and tribes.

Further, the Applicant has committed to equip
the project with an FAA approved ADLS for the life of the project. In this regard, on March 12, 2020, the Applicant filed with the FAA its application for approval of the ADLS.

In addition, Staff filed with its Brief an Amended Condition 29, which addresses postconstruction avian and bat mortality monitoring, which Applicants support and request that the Commission adopt.

Turning to economic impacts, the project will produce benefits to the community, including the payment of property taxes, lease payments, temporary jobs for 250 construction workers, and up to 7 to 12 permanent workers stationed in South Dakota.

As Applicant noted in its Brief in Footnote 14, there was one easement option that needed to be executed to maintain turbine location No. 85. That easement option has now been renewed and executed.

The record also shows the project will not substantially impair the health, safety, or welfare of the inhabitants. Applicant has appropriately minimized shadow flicker to 30 hours annually and the sound level to no more than 45 dBA at any nonparticipant's residence and no more than 50 dBA at any participant's residence.

Further, consistent with witness Hessler's testimony, Applicant agreed to use four alternative
turbine sites as a way to further reduce (Inaudible) sound.

Applicant presented a Ph.D. and medical doctor, both with many years of relevant experience that testified that the project will not substantially impair the health or welfare of the inhabitants. There is no evidence to the contrary.

Without any expert testimony in support, Intervenors argue that the Commission should limit nonparticipant sound to 40 dBA and shadow flicker to 15 hours annually and 15 minutes per day.

Similarly, the Ehlebracht Intervenors filed a legal brief replete with baseless legal notions on common law, trespass, and governmental takings and inappropriately cited testimony of witnesses in other dockets never proffered for cross-examination in this proceeding, and cited and quoted the Stanton NARUC paper that was objected to and not allowed to be part of the record here.

Accordingly, the positions of Intervenors are not supported by substantial evidence and have no legal basis and should not be relied upon in making a decision in this proceeding.

Applicant has presented substantial credible evidence showing the project will not substantially
impair the health, safety, or welfare of the inhabitants. Applicant has also shown that it will meet or exceed required setbacks established for safety and implement safety practices during construction, operation, and maintenance (Inaudible) the operation of the project 24 hours a day seven days a week. Thus, the evidence also shows that the project will not substantially impair safety.

The record also demonstrates that the proposed project will (Inaudible) --

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Slow up just a smidgen there, please.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes. Thank you.
The record also demonstrates that the proposed project will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region, which is supported by the granting of conditional use permits for the project by the counties.

In summary, Applicant has met its burden of proof and, thus, respectfully requests that the Commission grant it an energy facility permit.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. And we will now turn -- I'll ask one more time if Mr. Swanson is on the line.

I don't believe anyone has joined us.
So we will turn to Intervenors. And I believe, Ms. Christenson, as $I$ understand, you're carrying the load here today.

MS. CHRISTENSON: Thank you. Amber Christenson.
It is not -- excuse me. It is not for the
Intervenors to establish the Applicant does not meet requirements for the permit. The burden of proof rests solely on the Applicant.

You as Commissioners are here to protect South Dakota by ensuring the proposed project will comply with all laws and rules. First and foremost, also you must ensure this project will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment, nor will this project impair the health, safety, or welfare of the inhabitants. This Applicant has not met its burden in all three of the aforementioned instances.

There is no reliable sound study for the Commission to review. As referenced in my posthearing brief and the incorporated Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the sound studies presented by the Applicant do not provide all necessary criteria for review. Accuracy is required by South Dakota rules. The Applicant just admitted during Mr. Schumacher's speech that their sound study is not complete.

The cement batch plant poses serious concerns for public health and safety and air quality. The Applicant is required by state law to provide evidence the project will comply with air quality standards and regulations. Yet they submitted no proof.

The safety of the public will be jeopardized by the placement of the proposed batch plant. During the recent construction of Highway 212 when this site was used as a batch plant Highway 212 was closed to through traffic. This highway is a major route for interstate traffic, and this project is scheduled to be built during peak tourism season.

Despite the plain language of $\operatorname{SDCL} 49-41 B-25.2$, the Applicant has not even applied for FAA approval for ADLS lighting. The Applicant has also testified to the Commission that the project is not funded. The abandonment of a half-built project could seriously impact the welfare of the residents.

The Applicant testified there was no profit and loss statement or balance sheet for the past three years. Yet there was a check issued by Crowned Ridge II to Grant County for their Application fee. And truth and accuracy is required by South Dakota rules.

The Applicant has not proven that it and its subcontractors are insured. The welfare of the
inhabitants shall be protected.
The Applicant has not provided an estimate of expected efficiency of the proposed project. The Applicant has not provided evidence that the project will comply with the standards and regulation of disposal of solid waste. The Applicant has no viable waste plan. The Applicant did not prove waste was not toxic.

The Applicant did not provide a description of the existing environment at the time of the submission of the Application. No preconstruction sound study, no air quality study, no infrasound or low frequency noise studies.

Typically property is the largest asset of any family. Staff Witness Lawrence submitted two properties who reported losses. One in this very project before the project is even permitted or built, and it is a substantial loss.

In my posthearing Brief, Findings and Conclusions, $I$ suggested some conditions if the Commission had found the Applicant's burden had been met.

Staff Witness Hessler during the evidentiary hearing agreed that the Applicant should be able to meet a noise limit on this project for nonparticipants of 40 dBA. A 40 dBA nonparticipant noise limit will reduce annoyance and complaints. I quote, "Sleep deprivation
leads to adverse health effects. No question." That is a quote directly from the Applicant's own witness.

No shadow flicker for nonparticipants. At the very least this Commission should provide the four nonparticipating properties that are going to receive flicker protection by ordering zero flicker for their respective properties. A small amount of turbines moved a few feet or an alternate used would fix the issue for the people who came here for intervention and protection.

Construction noise restriction from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Unreasonable? No. Making the project more palatable to the residents? Yes.

A 1,500-foot setback from any public roadway to protect all travelers. I assume the reason is safety. Commissioner Fiegen addressed the interstate. Our local residents should be afforded the same concern for our state, county, and township roads.

In summary, Commission, Applicants have not simply been unpersuasive. Rather, Applicants have completely failed to meet their burden under state law. Having failed to meet their burden on nearly all, if not all, key areas related to this failed Application, it appears this Commission has no other alternative but in the best interest of South Dakota to deny the Applicant's
deficient Application.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Christenson.

I'll turn to Staff at this time. And we have Darren Kearney, Jon Thurber, Eric Paulson, Kristen Edwards, and Amanda Reiss.

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

Staff filed its Brief with the recommendation that Crowned Ridge Wind II has met its burden of proof and that the Commission should grant the permit so long as the certain conditions Staff proposed are attached to the permit. Those conditions include all of the conditions outlined in Staff's Exhibit S7.

We do have two slight changes to that proposal. And these were both mentioned in Staff's Brief, but I would like to highlight them for the Commission today. The first change is that Staff recommends that Condition 29 be revised.

The original proposal would have required two years of postconstruction mortality monitoring. Staff proposes that that be revised to require one year of postconstruction mortality monitoring to assess predictions of wildife fatality risks at Crowned Ridge

Wind II. This is consistent with the voluntary U.S. Fish \& Wildife Service Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines.

Xcel Energy has agreed that the funds set aside for the second year of postconstruction mortality monitoring would be reallocated to fund a three-year raptor study at Crowned Ridge Wind I and Crowned Ridge Wind II. Staff came to this revision in the condition based on guidance from South Dakota Game, Fish \& Parks, and their further rationale is explained in Staff's Brief as well as the February 27, 2020, letter that's marked as Attachment A.

The second change to Staff Exhibit 7 is mentioned in our Brief as well, and Staff recommends that an additional condition be added -- this condition stems from discussions with Staff witness Morey at the evidentiary hearing regarding whether GF\&P had authority to require Crowned Ridge Wind II to access the facility.

Despite the voluntary agreement from the Applicant, it was determined that GF\&P does not have the authority to require access. Based on this analysis, Staff proposed and the Applicant agreed to a new condition. That condition is outlined in the Brief, but it essentially says Applicant shall allow Crowned Ridge Wind access to the project area to conduct a pre and postconstruction survey to evaluate the potential effect
on the Crowned Ridge Wind II project on the local prairie grouse population.

I would also mention today that Staff has been in communication with the Applicant regarding concerns due to the proximity of the batch plant to a daycare facility. While the daycare facility did not express concerns to Staff with the batch plant, the Applicant has, nevertheless, agreed to look at other options.

Intervenors Goodwin Group, as they identified themselves in the Brief, argued that granting a permit allowing any amount of noise or shadow flicker to cross onto the property of nonparticipants is interfering with their personal property rights. Staff is unconvinced by this argument.

For clarification, the PUC has limited jurisdiction. The PUC does not grant or alter property rights as they exist before a permit is considered or issued. Instead the PUC reviews Permit Applications to determine whether the Application meets the standard in state law, specifically whether the facility will comply with applicable laws and rules ensuring that the facility will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment or social or economic condition of the inhabitants, that the facility will not substantially impair the health, safety, or welfare of the inhabitants,
and that the facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region.

As Goodwin Group mentioned in its Brief, the PUC's role is not to ensure that a project will in no way impact the community, but instead to ensure the project will produce minimal adverse effects. The evidence on the record shows no indication that imposing the noise and shadow flicker limits recommended by Staff would impair the health, safety, or welfare of the inhabitants of the project area, nor would it cause more than minimal effects to the Goodwin Group or other inhabitants of the project area.

The Goodwin Group's argument appears to rest on an idea that any amount of noise or light or blocking of light that crosses property lines should be considered a de facto easement. But this argument fails to provide any real support that a court has ever recognized this concept. Instead, courts have generally recognized that some interference is permissible, such as a road, a railroad, or airport, so long as interference does not render the property completely unusable.

Accepting Goodwin Group's argument would effectively prohibit the permit and construction of any energy project, an unreasonable result.

In the absence of any guidance from the Court supporting Goodwin Group's argument, granting a permit with the proposed conditions ensures that the project will not pose serious injury to the environment, will not substantially impair the health, safety, or welfare of the inhabitants, and will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region.

Staff is available for any questions from the Commission and has nothing further at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Reiss. And, Crowned Ridge, you have three minutes for rebuttal.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Chairman Hanson. Miles Schumacher. I'll be very brief.

First, we stand by the sound studies that were submitted on the record and believe they demonstrate we have met our burden. With regard to the batch plant (Inaudible) indicated we have agreed with Staff to --

CHAIRMAN HANSON: You cut out at the beginning of that sentence. Try 'er again.

MR. SCHUMACHER: I will. Thank you.
With regard to the batch plant, we have agreed with Staff that we will look at and find an alternative location for that and would confirm that our conversations with the neighboring landowner indicate
they have no objection.
With regard to the roads, we will file a traffic control plan in accordance with the conditions under Condition 8 of the proposed condition. Finally, as indicated in my opening comments, we did file the ADLS application with FAA on March 12, so that has been done. We believe we've met our burden and that it would be appropriate to grant the permit.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. And we'll turn to Commissioner questions at this time. I just have one -well, I have several, but $I$ think those will be fleshed out as we go through the process. I do have one question of Ms. Reiss to start off with, and that is in pertaining to the -- the suggestions for the changes to Staff's Exhibit 7. The second one that you discussed you start out with stating, "The Applicant shall allow," and you state, "Crowned Ridge Wind, LLC access to the project."

I'm curious why that does not read, "Applicant shall allow Game, Fish \& Parks access" or as opposed to Crowned Ridge Wind access.

MS. REISS: Sure. Thank you for the question. And $I$ can provide a beginning answer, and, Darren Kearney, if you have more to add, please jump in.

It is my understanding that Crowned Ridge Wind
will be conducting this study, and so the condition is specific to allow them access. I believe Staff would be open to amending that to include Game, Fish \& Parks as well as Game, Fish \& Parks believes it is necessary.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you very much. It just seems strange that Crowned Ridge Wind II, which I recognize is a project in -- that they're two different entities, but it's just saying that Crowned Ridge would allow -- I would like to see them required to allow Game, Fish \& Parks as well so I'll just throw that out there at this juncture.

Are there other questions by Commissioners?
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: This is Commissioner Fiegen, and I do have questions, but $I$ don't know if Commissioner Nelson wanted to go first or if I can just ask a couple.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, you can go. The only question $I$ had was for Mr. Swanson, and he's not here. So go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Vice Chairman. There's just a couple of questions, and Staff, first of all, answered my question on Condition 29 so I appreciate that.

Another question $I$ have -- actually this is for Staff and Crowned Ridge II. On Condition 26 C , that talks
about the sound study. But, if you remember, in December I added something to the sound study so I want to make sure this is a friendly amendment to the condition, is that the public liaison officer will assist contacting nonparticipating landowners for permission to test noise levels on their properties.

I just wanted to get confirmation that the Staff and Crowned Ridge would be okay with that.

MR. MURPHY: Commissioner Fiegen, this is Brian Murphy for Crowned Ridge. Crowned Ridge is okay with that add to that condition.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
MR. MURPHY: And that would be our understanding.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
MS. REISS: This is --
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Excuse me. Go ahead,
Ms. Reiss.
MS. REISS: This is Amanda. Did you need further input, Commissioner Fiegen?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Sure. I'm sure the Staff's okay; correct?

MS. REISS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. And the other
question $I$ have for Staff is on Condition 34. And I had questions right away and then $I$ think you're clear enough in Condition 34 and that is that the Air Detection Light System is required before starting commercial operation. Is that your understanding? Correct? That they cannot start commercial operation until the detection system has been put on?

MS. REISS: Thank you. This is Amanda Reiss for Staff. And, Mr. Kearney, again, if you have additional thoughts, please jump in. But, yes, that is Staff's intent with this condition.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Those were my only questions. And I guess I only have one amendment then for the conditions.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I have no questions, but I do have a motion whenever you're ready.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I have a question. I believe we have Game, Fish \& Parks on the line; is that correct?

MS. MOREY: Yes. This is Hilary Morey with
Game, Fish \& Parks.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Hi, Hilary. Excuse me.
Ms. Morey.
There's a number of questions pertaining to air
quality, water quality, environmental quality, et cetera. Does the Game, Fish \& Parks -- I know you're not DENR. Do you have any concerns over effects on wildife with this project as it's being proposed?

MS. MOREY: In relation to air quality and water quality?

CHAIRMAN HANSON: In relationship to the effect on animal life from -- obviously, if air quality -- air, water, land is affected in some fashion, it's going to affect wildlife. I'm just wondering if you're concerned about those effects and their not -- well, let me rephrase that.

Are you concerned with the effect of this project and -- that it may adversely affect wildife because of its effect on air, water, environment in general -- I know you're concerned with it, but is there a change that needs to take place on the 57 , the Staff's Exhibit 7?

I know that you've negotiated a variety of things, but I'm wondering whether or not there's anything in addition that you see a need for a change.

MS. MOREY: I guess our -- excuse me. This is Hilary Meyer. Or Hilary Morey of South Dakota Game, Fish \& Parks.

Our main concern -- and we've made this clear in
a number of meetings with the Applicant and in previous dockets as well, but our main concern of wind energy projects is impacts to grasslands and fragmentation of grassland landscapes.

Our primary concern there would be grassland nesting birds such as prairie grouse, chestnut-collered longspurs. These species guild, these grassland nesting birds, have been in decline over the last 20 years so those are our main concerns there.

In regards to air quality and water quality, that would be under the realm of South Dakota Department of Environment and Natural Resources so I can't really speak to that. That is not my expertise. But in terms of effects on aquatic organisms, these wind energy projects generally have minimal impacts to aquatic resources, specifically when they site their turbines and access roads outside of waters of the United States.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you very much,
Ms. Morey. Yes. We recognize that the DENR will have the air, water quality, et cetera.

What $I$ was concerned with is -- and you explained it well -- effects on the air and water will, of course, affect wildife. So $I$ was concerned from that standpoint. But your answer is suffice for that question.

Thank you very much.
I have a motion as well; however, I'll certainly allow Commissioner Nelson to make his motion. And I assume it has to do with Staff's Exhibit 7 and amendments to that.

So Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, Commissioner Hanson, I think we've done this often enough that you are exactly right.

I will move in ELI9-027 that the Commission grant the permit for construction of a wind energy facility to Crowned Ridge Wind II, LLC pursuant to SDCL 49-41B-25 and attach the conditions as found in Staff Exhibit S7.

If I might continue, I would move to amend my motion with a series of what $I$ am going to call Nelson proposed amendments. These are in written form, and at this point we're going to have to take just a little bit of a pause for Joy Lashley to e-mail that out to everybody involved here, put it on the website.

Commissioners, I am going to send it to you as we speak, and $I$ think we just need to be at ease until everybody gets that before $I$ proceed with describing what's in those amendments.

Commissioner Hanson, are you still there?

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I am. And I'm assuming these are, for the most part, the amendments that Karen sent out as no doubt to each one of us -- we assume so -- as suggestions of -- I don't see all of them that she mentioned.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. And as soon as everybody's got it, I'll go through them one at a time and kind of explain the origin of each one.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Mr. Schumacher. Excuse me. Well, let's see how many -- we have 22 persons on the phone right now for this docket.

Is there anyone who has not received this information?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Chairman Hanson. Miles Schumacher.

I have not received it. I have the docket up, and I don't see it posted there yet. I can't speak for Mr. Murphy as to whether or not he and the remaining Crowned Ridge representatives have it yet.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. Well, we'll give it a few more minutes, and then we will start to go through it. It's a number of --

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. I think it's probably self-explanatory enough that $I$ can do it -- and just for the public's benefit, I e-mailed the document
just now to my two fellow Commissioners so they've got it. Our Staff is in the process of e-mailing it to the docket list and posting it on our website, but because we're working remotely, that may not be happening as smoothly as we hoped.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: We'll give it a few more minutes here, and then we will start with it. I don't think it's going to be difficult by any means to understand. I think we've discussed a number of these items at this juncture so we'll start here in just a couple of minutes.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Chairman, Miles Schumacher. I will verify (Inaudible).

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. You cut out right after the word "verify."

MR. SCHUMACHER: I have received it. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.

Have the other parties -- I assume Staff has received it. Ms. Christenson, have you received it?

MS. CHRISTENSON: Yes. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
Staff?
MS. REISS: Staff has received it.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
Commissioner Nelson, would you proceed then?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Certainly. And I've just been advised by Staff that it has been posted to the website, but our website has to go through a replication process before it actually appears out there. And now I'm being told that it's there. So I think we're good to go.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Let's call the amendments to Staff Exhibit $S 7$-- you may come up with another amendment as we go through this process. Please proceed.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.
So, to begin with, I believe that the Applicant has met their burden under state law and are, therefore, entitled to receive a permit, hence the motion. Staff did a great job of putting together their Exhibit $S 7$ as a foundation for the conditions that need to be attached.

However, through discussions at the hearing and since the hearing, there are several items that have bubbled up that $I$ think demand that $S 7$ be amended and, hence, my proposal.

And I'll just go through this, and if people have questions, I'm certainly happy to answer that.

No. 1, inserting the word "itemized." That's something we talked about during the hearing.

No. 2, providing just a little bit of additional information that the landowners -- that they be given the

Order in addition to the Permit. I think that additional information is good.

No. 3 is the change to paragraph 29 that Staff has already talked about. I think I've taken that language verbatim from what Staff presented. And, Ms. Reiss, if $I$ haven't, please let me know.

No. 4 deals with paragraph 34. And this is a complete replacement for paragraph 34. But I think it gets at the question that Commissioner Fiegen asked just a little bit earlier in that $I$ want to be very clear that we are requiring the Applicant, first of all, to utilize an ADLS. Secondly, that they be required to apply for their permit from the $F A A$ in enough time to receive that permission by the commercial operation date, and then that it, in fact, be operational by the commercial operation date.

And so I've just expanded upon that requirement, making sure that we all understand that we intend it to be there by commercial operation date.

No. 5, I'm proposing to delete paragraph 40 . As we've looked at that paragraph, we think we already have the authority to do what's outlined there, and there's not any reason to spell that out a second time.

No. 6 is the whooping crane amendment language that was talked about during the hearing and was agreed to by Staff and by the Applicant. So I've included that. Commissioner Hanson, you can give me a point for actually including a whooping crane amendment maybe for the first time?

No. 7, in looking through S7 I think there's some grammatical things that maybe before the final order is written can be cleaned up just a little bit. Nothing subjective, but just some grammatical changes.

No. 8, the Intervenors, and I don't recall which Intervenor, suggested that we require that the completion of the LNTE blade attachments on Crowned Ridge Wind I turbines be completed before commercial operation of Crowned Ridge Wind II. I think that's a reasonable requirement. In order for the sound modeling to be accurate, that does need to happen. And so I've included that as a requirement.

Now I'll say from a practical perspective, I think it's a moot issue. I am very confident that the LNTE blade attachments will be in place much prior to Crowned Ridge Wind II being ready to go commercial, but let's just put it in there and spell it out.

No. 9, this comes from Applicant witness
MaRous who indicated that the project owner would be willing to cooperate with ag spray applicators to shut down turbines as needed for effective and safe spray application and operation. So we've just included that in the conditions.

No. 10, and this is something -- a provision that Staff spoke to already today. Again, Ms. Reiss, I think I've got the language right here, but if it needs to be changed in any way, you can let us know.

And then $I$ 'm going to add a No. 11 on here just to keep this easy. Let's include Commissioner Fiegen's paragraph 26C, a public liaison suggestion. Let's just include it in here so we can look at all of this at the same time.

With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions about any of these individuals. And if any of my fellow Commissioners want to pull any of these out and deal with them separately as opposed to an omnibus group, I'm fine with that too.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. And I would like to have Commissioner Fiegen's -- on its own, let her make that motion and explain it.

There are a number of areas that $I$ have concerns with. And $I$ will give you a point for adding the whooping crane at the end. Obviously, I was going to if you had not, but I appreciate your coming around to my side of the world on supporting the birds.

Commissioner Fiegen, do you have -- I have some comments on the motion, but I'm going to hand over the mic. to you.

You have the floor, Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: And, Chairman Hanson, if I could, I will just voluntarily pull back that 26C portion of that and let Commissioner Fiegen handle that. Not a problem.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. Commissioner Fiegen.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I am still reviewing the amendments so $I$ will have comments in a little bit. And it doesn't matter if my amendment's on there or not. I'm okay either way.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yeah. I'd like to print a paper copy of this so that $I$ can -- so that $I$ can work on it. I'm going to -- I have to send this over to a different computer, turn that computer on and then send it to a -- my printer here. Three computers on my work area and two iPads and two phones gets a little bit challenging at a time like this.

So if we could take just maybe 10 minutes here so that $I$ can make a copy and anybody else who's in that position can look this over. Thank you. I'm going to go on mute here and take care of that.
(A short recess is taken.)

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. As we discuss it -- I know I said 10 minutes, but as we discuss it $I$ think people will be able to follow along.

Commissioner Fiegen, do you have any questions or discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: If my amendment wasn't put on and Commissioner Nelson took it off, I do move to amend the section of -- oh, all the sudden $I$ can't find it. The section on the public liaison officer, 26C, by adding, "The public liaison officer will assist in contacting nonparticipating landowners for permission to test noise levels on their properties."

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Great. Okay. And I'm going to accept that as a motion to amend.

And we've discussed it. But is there any discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: No. I think all of us probably agree with that and the two parties -- or the three parties I'm assuming all agree also.

And for the other conditions, while I looked through all of them, $I$ guess $I$-- actually there are -- I think the -- 34 is probably written a little bit more clearly. And I want to make sure that was the case so I reread that. I wanted to make sure 40 could be deleted, and I do believe Commissioner Nelson is proper on that.

And then $I$ certainly appreciate the amendment on the sprayers, the aircraft sprayers that spray for our agricultural people, and $I$ appreciate that amendment. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. Any further discussion on the motion? Looks like a friendly motion.

Hearing no further discussion on the motion to amend, Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Hanson votes aye. The motion carries.

That brings us to further discussion, motions to amend. I'm going to ask that on No. 10 of the list of amendments that after the word on the first line,
"Applicants shall allow Game, Fish \& Parks and Crowned Ridge Wind," I'd like to see it very plain that GF\&P has access to the project area. That's all the discussion $I$ have on that.

Any further discussion on that motion to amend?
Hearing none on the motion to amend,
Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Motion carries.
Brings us back to further discussion on the main
motion. Commissioner Fiegen, Commissioner Nelson -Commissioner Nelson, do you wish to amend your own motion here or --

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, no, I don't, but I think we're back to -- I don't think we're back to the main motion because $I$ don't think we voted on these 10 items yet. So I think we're on my motion to amend.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Correct. You're correct. We're back on the amended motion to amend.

Anything further, Commissioner Fiegen? I have a few items if you --

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: You know, I have went through them, and this is Commissioner Fiegen again, and I believe these are correct. Thank you.

And I also appreciate the new paragraph on the LNTE blades. So I appreciate that too. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yes. Absolutely.
I'm a little concerned with item No. 7. It says minor grammatical changes. I'd like to phrase that a little bit differently, but $I$ don't want -- some of the areas where I see that we need some changes -- you know, I think once we get back to the main motion I'll have
some motions at that point so $I$ won't -- I guess $I$ won't worry about that at this juncture.

I'm going to look at -- there were a couple of things that $I$ have concerns with. And, no, I do not have concerns with the whooping crane.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman, I do have a question for Commissioner Nelson on the paragraph 34.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Please proceed.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I see FSA in there. Is that correct, or is that a state officer thinking about FFA?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. That's me thinking about FFA, and that does need to be FAA. And let's just consider that a friendly amendment. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Would you point that out. I was looking at -- oh, I see it. Twice it says FFA. I assume that's under minor grammatical changes. Oh, it's on there just once. Okay.

Too many papers to deal with.
Item 29, did you make a motion on -- there it
is. Replace paragraph 29.
I agree with that in its entirety, and I understand that -- with one exception. And I understand the negotiation that took place with -- between Staff,
$G F \& P$, and the Applicant. I just have never been comfortable with a one-year postconstruction -- one year gives us such a short moment in time and the effects.

And so I would like to leave that as a two-year and just leave everything else the same as it's presented there. I think you did a real good job of putting that together, and certainly Karen appreciates your work on this.

Commissioner Nelson, I hope you don't have any heartburn with that, but $I$ will move that -- I move that in paragraph 29 to supplant the word "one" in the first line with the word "two" so that it reads, "Applicant agrees to undertake a two-year independently conducted postconstruction."

Discussion on that motion. I guess I've already discussed it. I just feel it's too short of a window in time to have a real decent study of any sort. I'd like to see three to four years. But a one-year just causes me real concern.

Any further discussion on that motion?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, yeah. No hard feelings, but I'm probably going to oppose it. You know, and Staff and Game, Fish \& Parks, you know, looked at what they thought was needed. You know, one year is what they came up with so I'm going to stick with that for
now.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yeah. I agree. I understand that they went through that process. I think it was the type of a deal where they felt they could -- well, they definitely did through their discussion, that they traded the two year to a one year in order to get the Applicant also agrees to fund a federal grant match. And I think we're in a position where we're able to accomplish both. So that's why I went with that.

Thank you, though, for the comment.
Any further discussion on the motion to amend the -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Fiegen here.

It makes me a -- I appreciate what you're doing, but I would like to ask Crowned Ridge because I know there's negotiations and give and take on settlement. And I appreciate that they were willing to do the additional LEC study.

So I just want to talk to Crowned Ridge if they'd be willing to do that. Because $I$ know during settlement discussions there's give and take. So if I could ask the question to Crowned Ridge.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioner Fiegen. I would like Kim Wells to provide
you some context and background of the discussions. And I think that will help.

So, Kim, can you -- are you still on?
MS. WELLS: I am. Thank you for the
opportunity. I would just like to highlight that the rationale for proposing the amendment to Condition 29 was because Crowned Ridge, Xcel, and GF\&P all agreed that there was existing data in the scientific literature to look at the effects of wind on bird and bat mortality. So there is data to draw on.

We also agreed that there's a lot of South Dakota data. We agreed that because there's already two years being completed at Crowned Ridge I, we didn't think that a second year at Crowned Ridge II offered compellingly new or different information. And, third, we in conjunction with Xcel and GF\&P thought this was a more useful study for the funds to meet a need that GF\&P articulated.

I'm sure Hilary would be able to articulate more of how that fits into the State Wildife Action Plan, but in short those are the three reasons why we came to this amendment to Condition 29.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Fiegen here. I'm going to actually -although I agree a lot of times with Commissioner Hanson, I'm going to oppose his amendment today because I believe the settlement discussion, and we got to hear part of it just now, relieves me of that concern.

So when $I$ read this $I$ also became very concerned with the one year. And so $I$ kept on going back to the filing, and $I$ became more comfortable after I read more of the filing. So I'm going to oppose it but certainly appreciate the amendment.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
Ms. Morey, just a short question. We don't need to have other people testify for you, but $I$ know that there was a significant negotiation that took place, and I know the position that you finally promised on.

However, you did originally ask for a two-year. Do you feel there was good reason to ask for a two-year?

MS. MOREY: This is Hilary Morey with
South Dakota Game, Fish \& Parks. So when I originally prepared my testimony for this docket we asked for the two years of postconstruction mortality monitoring. As you mentioned, that two years gives you a little bit more of a spacial time frame to look at the effects of wind energy impacts because these projects do last for 20 to 30 years.

However, once we started working with Crowned Ridge $I$ on the grouse study, we started to come up with some additional objectives that were of interest to us as Game, Fish \& Parks to look at specific species interactions with wind energy projects.

So we felt that this was a good compromise because we would still get one year of that postconstruction monitoring and, as Ms. Wells mentioned, we'll have the two years of postconstruction monitoring of the adjoining Crowned Ridge I wind facility. So we're really excited about this opportunity to conduct this raptor study at both Crowned Ridge I and Crowned Ridge II footprints.

This is some research that was done about 20 years ago in southeastern South Dakota so we would essentially be able to repeat this research in a new location and 20 years later to look at the impacts of these facilities on our raptor populations in the state.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, that's great news. And that was a good compromise that you made from that standpoint.

Would a two-year independently conducted postconstruction avian, et cetera, et cetera -- would a two-year give you a much better idea of -- would it give you a better study?

MS. MOREY: This is Hilary Morey for Game, Fish
\& Parks. The two studies are pretty different, I guess. So the postconstruction mortality monitoring would only monitor animals, bats and birds, that are killed by operating turbines. Whereas this raptor project would actually look for raptor use within the project area.

So I don't think that we can use the postconstruction mortality monitoring necessarily to add to the study. I'm not 100 percent sure. I would have to speak with our project collaborators. But they're two -excuse me.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I think you're misinterpreting my question. I'm not asking you to give up anything. I'm asking simply if you -- if you got your cake and got to eat it too, in other words, you were able to keep the raptor study and everything that's been agreed to up to this point, you simply would have two years instead of one year, would that be of significant benefit?

MS. MOREY: This is Hilary Morey with South Dakota Game, Fish \& Parks.

Yes. I understand your question now. And we would -- we would like to fund this avian predator study. That's our number one priority. And I guess it's up to the Applicant if they can fund both the study and a second year of postconstruction mortality monitoring for
the project. But there would be utility in both of those.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. Appreciate your answer.

It hurt a little bit when you said something about avian mortality wasn't significant or something of that nature. I forget what it was.

All right. Well, thank you for that. Appreciate it.

We're back to the motion to amend. And I've heard my colleagues and, nevertheless, I hope that you both understand that the Applicant does have enough dollars in their pocket to hande one more year of this and it would be a much better study and hope that you'll have seen the light.

So, on that, is there any further discussion?
If not, on the motion to amend, going from one year to two year, Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: With my sunglasses on, I'm going to have to vote no.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen, did you take your glasses off?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes no.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, Commissioner Hanson votes aye. And the motion fails. Ouch.

Okay. Back to the discussion on has anyone -- I still have one motion to amend, but I'd like to know if anybody else has anything first. If not, I have a question first, and then perhaps the motion.

On the main motion it shows No. 5, delete paragraph 40. And $I$ was in love with that paragraph because $I$ felt that it provides a hammer that the permit is conditioned on the Applicant and any future owner, that the permit can be revoked by the PUC. It makes it very, very plain. And $I$ want it very plain that the project can be revoked by the PUC if conditions are not met.

It seems like we have had some -- well, I know we have had some discussions and concerns about semantics and whether or not the PUC can revoke permits so I'll ask the attorneys, is it very clear within this document -if we do not have paragraph 40, is it very clear, and where is it very clear, that the PUC can revoke the permit if a condition is not met? So whomever -whichever attorney can answer that question, I appreciate it.

MS. CREMER: This is Karen Cremer. Are you looking to Staff and Crowned Ridge, or are you looking to Adam and I?

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, I'm looking to you and

Adam. Certainly you're the ones who will be making the decision. But if Crowned Ridge were to attest to the fact that, yes, here's another paragraph that absolutely makes it conclusive that you can remove the permit, then, of course, that would be on record and that would be ironclad.

However, in the absence of that, yes, Ms. Cremer, I'd love to hear from one of you on this.

MS. CREMER: Well, with that then, I'll let Crowned Ridge go.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. Mr. Schumacher, is there somewhere within this document that it is absolutely clear that the permit can be revoked by the PUC if a condition is not met by the Applicant or an owner?

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yes. This is Miles Schumacher. I don't see the specific language, unless it's read in conjunction with the statute that was referenced in one of our earlier dockets today.

MS. CREMER: And this is Karen Cremer.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
MS. CREMER: And, with that, I would say I would agree with Miles. To me, the first two sentences are already covered by statute. It even references the statute. So that seems unnecessary to me to have those first two sentences.

As to the last sentence, to me that's covered in 41.

I think where we're running into problems in prior dockets, you know, that we heard earlier today is it has to do with jurisdiction and who has jurisdiction and not the fact that we can't revoke. Clearly we can. It becomes a matter of when we could do that. And so that would be my take on paragraph 40.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
With great trepidation, I will not make a motion then to exclude that. I keep wrestling with it even after I say that because $I$ don't want to build things for the present people that are involved. I don't want to build things for other areas that may be changed somewhere.

You know, if we don't specify it here and something changes elsewhere, then we lose that opportunity to make it very clear. And I don't like to build things from the standpoint of the three Commissioners who are here now because there will be three different Commissioners many years from now. And so I really, really struggle with deleting paragraph 40.

I'm going to ask my fellow Commissioners. It may be redundant at this juncture, but I'm wrestling with
it so much that I'm going to ask you to support it in deleting that portion in No. 5 where it states to delete paragraph 40. I'd like to leave paragraph 40 in the document.

And you can tell I'm not vacillating a lot, but I'm falling back and forth on this. I just am too uncomfortable with deleting it. So that's my motion.

Any discussion from my fellow Commissioners?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. This is
Commissioner Nelson. I hear where you're coming from but, you know, I've got my statute book open to 49-41B-33, and it's crystal clear to me that we have that authority by statute. I don't think we gain anything by putting it in the conditions. So I'm okay with it as it is, taking that paragraph out.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
I would like to ask Staff for their legal
opinion. Because I believe, like Commissioner Nelson, we're okay. But are they concerned if that statute would be deleted by the state legislature in upcoming years and that's why we should have this? Because, otherwise, I fall in line with Commissioner Nelson.

MS. REISS: Thank you. This is Amanda Reiss for Staff. And $I$ don't think that Staff has that concern when we included that condition in our proposal. I believe if $I$ remember correctly, this condition stemmed from some discussions with Intervenors, and Staff attempted to craft a condition that would address some of their potential concerns.

I think Staff agrees that the statute identified does give the PUC authority to revoke a statute if required. The one thing that this condition does address that the statute does not is in regard to the individual turbines. But if the Commission would like to remove this condition, I believe we could potentially address individual turbine concerns in a different manner, if necessary.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So, Commissioner Hanson, if I could just have a couple minutes to look at everything one more time, I'd appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Please go ahead.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So other people can talk if they want to. I just want a couple of minutes.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay.
(Pause.)
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: This is a hard one because I certainly appreciate how Staff talked about trying to work with Intervenors. And that softens my heart, but $I$ still don't think we need this. But I appreciate Staff's effort and Crowned Ridge for agreeing.

But my goal is to make this as clean as possible, and I don't think 40 is needed. I've tried to look at that in the last hour a couple times and $I$ believe it's unnecessary but I certainly appreciate the effort of working with the Intervenors.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. I will look for any further discussion on the motion to amend by deleting the deletion of paragraph 40.

Any further discussion on the motion to amend the amendment -- proposed amendment?

Hearing none, all those in favor will -- well, Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: No.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes a very soft no.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Hanson votes a very hard aye.

Motion fails. I hope that doesn't bite us in the future.

We are back to the amended motion to amend. Any further discussion on the amended motion to amend?

Hearing none --
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So I just have a question.
Are we to the main motion now?
CHAIRMAN HANSON: No. We are on the motion --
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: -- of the S7 exhibit.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: That has been amended.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Editorial comment. It hasn't been amended enough, but it's been amended. We're back to the motion to amend as amended. Any further discussion?

Hearing none, Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Hanson votes aye. Motion
carries.
We're now back to the main motion as amended.
Further discussion on that. Well, I'd turn to Commissioner Fiegen. Do you have any motion --

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. Thank you,

Chairman Hanson. I do have discussion on the main motion when you're ready.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. Do you have any motions to amend at this point?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: No. No.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. I have one motion to amend. I probably have more than one, but just to make some verbiage clear -- but I have a subjective motion.

Throughout the document of 57 we refer to Applicant shall, Applicant will, Applicant agrees, et cetera, et cetera throughout the -- and I'm not about to change all of those Applicants to Applicant or future owner. However, I would like to add -- so that it applies prospectively to all future owners, whomever they may be, I'd like to add an additional paragraph that states these permit conditions shall apply to any future owner who takes possession pursuant to 49-41B-29.

And this is something as $I$ was rereading this last night in preparation for today's meeting rather than e-mailing Adam or Karen at 2 o'clock in the morning $I$ decided I'd just write down something. I called Karen this morning early and said that was my concern. What do you think?

I had a different paragraph written up. She suggested that this would -- and certainly as an attorney
she writes law much better than I. So this -- the purpose of this is to make certain that any -- all future owners are very clear, again -- I've been in contract businesses for a very, very long time. I just like things -- as you can tell from my other amendments, motions to amend and concerns, that it would make it very clear that this obligations of these conditions are on the shoulders for all future owners of the property.

So the paragraphs states that, "These permit conditions apply to any future owner who takes possession pursuant to 49-41B-29." That's all the discussion $I$ have on that. I make it as a motion and the main motion as amended.

Discussions, questions?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Commissioner Nelson -- go ahead, Commissioner Fiegen.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: No. I'm just -- all I wanted to say is thank you, Commissioner Hanson, for bringing that to our attention. I totally agree with you on it, and $I$ assumed it was already done so I appreciate you bringing that to our attention.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. So here's my question. Yeah. I certainly agree it, but it looks to me like 49-41B-29 states that we, the PUC, can't transfer
a permit to anyone unless they agree to abide by all of the conditions. So how does this motion to amend add anything beyond what the statute requires?

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I'll ask Ms. Cremer on that. I did not have my Title 49 out right now so $\operatorname{c}$ can't check that very easily.

I don't know that $I$ needed to say pursuant to that. I just look at it from the standpoint that the conditions of the permit apply to all future owners. So perhaps Karen has a better way to phrase it or an answer to your question.

Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: Thank you. This is Karen Cremer. And, again, you know, we had a very quick discussion this morning. And, again, $I$ would just state that it is in statute clearly, just kind of like the prior discussion we had but you had asked for some language and so I provided that to you.

Does that answer it?
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Nelson, does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Well, yes. What I heard is that this is no different than the discussion we just had, that it's already covered in statute. So I absolutely don't disagree with the intention. I just
don't think it's needed because it's already covered.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: And $I$ don't know that it is covered by the way that you explained or read that statute. So it is something that I'm -- that I believe needs to be a part of it if that cite needs to be removed from it and just simply state these permit conditions shall apply to any future -- or excuse me. These permit conditions apply to any future owner who takes possession --

Yeah. I think the cite is still appropriate because it states if they take possession pursuant to that, where we give them permission.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yeah. And I'm not arguing that point. Let me just read the statute. It's short. And then I'll shut up.

49-41B-29, "A permit may be transferred subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission to a person who agrees to comply with the terms, conditions, and modifications contained therein. The Commission shall adopt rules pursuant to the authority granted under this chapter."

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. Thank you for reading that. It does appear that -- excuse me, Commissioner Fiegen.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: No. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I was just going to say that it does sound that it's covered under present statute. Thank you.

Commissioner Fiegen, did you have anything?
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: No. Just for Staff of the Public Utilities Commission, they have worked, of course, with transfers and, you know, we get to see it at a hearing but we don't always get to see the behind-the-scenes issue.

Have the Staff ever had issues with a transfer where the new owners objected to the permit conditions and they thought our laws weren't stringent enough?

MS. REISS: Thank you. This is Amanda Reiss for Staff. And $I$ don't believe we've had any concerns or come across any issues with that statute. Or with transferring the conditions to a new owner.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the discussion we've had. And $I$ know that if a transfer comes up to us in a docket, we can make sure that that happens.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Yes. Thank you for that. Appreciate the discussion and work from everyone, especially when we're in compressed time frames as we are.

I'm going to withdraw that Motion because it -if we do our due diligence when someone transfers, then it's taken care of.

Are there any further motions to amend the main Motion that's amended?

I have a question of Staff on 8C on page 2. The second line there refers to active construction period. Again, I'm a stickler on semantics and contracts, and it says, "Repaired through the active construction." Shouldn't we state through -- any time that they're doing construction on it, that they will do this?

I'm thinking of striking the word "active" and through --

MS. REISS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Excuse me. Go ahead. Sorry.
MS. REISS: Oh. Thank you. And I think, you know, when Staff put together this condition $I$ think we tried to look to the future and what construction we were looking to to protect the roads. And I think the additive "active" really protects that time when there's large machinery traveling across roads on a regular basis multiple times a day.

I think if you -- if you do remove it, there may be a question as to whether general maintenance is included as construction. And then I think there's
concern as to whether those maintenance trucks have caused a problem or whether it's just general wear and tear.

I do think there are road use agreements with local entities that can address that as well, but that's just a little bit of a rationale and explanation, but clearly this Commission is free to alter this condition as you see fit.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. I appreciate that.
Perhaps you can help me with No. 15C. And for those people who are wondering why the heck didn't I talk to you prior to this, for those folks who aren't aware, we're not allowed to chat, except in an open meeting like this in regards to this.

So in 15C there's a suggestion that the word "insure" at the beginning of the sentence -- so that it would read "Insure all access soils generated." That might seem a small change, but I'm concerned whether the Motion on minor grammatical changes that we passed includes that.

Would the -- well, would the fellow
Commissioners assume with me that that is -- should be included, we don't need a Motion to amend, et cetera, just that -- well, maybe we do.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Chairman Hanson, this is

Commissioner Nelson. That was exactly the types of things that $I$ intended to cover with my phrase minor grammatical changes.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Right. And when I looked at that certainly in item 2 when it states, "Applicants shall construct" instead of "Applicant shall, one," you know, that sort of thing, yes. I don't know if this falls under -- far enough down the list to be minor. So that's why I asked whether we needed (Inaudible) included.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Chairman Hanson, if I could just interject, this is Karen Cremer. If you go back up to 15 where it says, "Applicant shall."

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Right.
MS. CREMER: The two words right before. So it's "Applicant shall strip the topsoil. Applicant shall store the topsoil. Applicant shall...all excess soils." It doesn't say what they (Inaudible). And so I just put a verb in there.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay.
MS. CREMER: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Right. Yeah. I understood that. It makes grammatical sense to do that. Your adjective may be different from the next person's, but I assume that you'll make sure that's changed and that
there won't be an argument from the Applicant.
We'll turn to page 5 then and look at 22 -well, it's -- it's the third indentation with the dot. It states, "Once received, Staff shall have 10 calendar days."

Calendar days are a lot different than business days. And if the request is made on a Friday and there's a Monday holiday -- or for any other reason, that could knock -- with two weekends in there, that would knock that down to four working days with Staff. And with the compressed times that we always have, that just did not seem like a very long -- 10 days --

Even 10 business days don't seem like a long enough time for me. So I'd like to change that to business days instead of calendar days. So I make that as a Motion to amend at this time.

And I've spoken to it, which I guess I shouldn't do prior to making a Motion, but it seems to facilitate the work we do a little bit easier if we do that.

So I have a motion to strike "calendar" and supplant the word "business" with "calendar." And I've spoken to it.

Any discussion on that Motion?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: This is Commissioner Nelson. I don't have a problem with it. But if $I$ could
just ask Staff if there was any reason for this being a more accelerated time frame than 10 business days?

MS. REISS: Thank you, Commissioner Nelson.
This is Amanda Reiss for Staff. I think, if I remember correctly, there was discussion in previous dockets about needing to move forward expeditiously. So I believe we included calendar days as opposed to business days.

Staff has no concern changing that at this point. We have not, though, conferred with Crowned Ridge Wind II regarding such a change at this point.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Further discussion on the Motion?

Obviously, if it's business days and it's a pressing deal, Staff has never been known to be dilatory in any fashion so $I$ don't believe that's going to hurt the Applicant in any way if we make certain that future Staff has an opportunity.

Further discussion on the Motion?
Hearing none, Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Hanson votes aye. The Motion carries.

Item No. 7 on the Motion to Amend -- the Amended Motion to Amend stated the grammatical changes. And just for the record, I'm going to point out what $I$ consider some of those. And I know that the Commission -- my fellow Commissioners are thinking similarly.

On 26B, which is on page 6, about one, two, three, four -- about six lines from the bottom the word "wind" needs to be added before "turbines," and the word "Commission" removed before the word "Staff."

And there's 15 times when the word "wind" should be added on page 6 and 7 in front of the word "turbine." And in some cases the word "Commission" should be removed. So I would -- whomever is working through that process make certain that the word "wind" is placed in front of "turbine" so it says "wind turbine."

And then on page 8 I'm wondering whether some of these are significant enough to change. And some instances, like on page 8, it would be 33, the second paragraph of 33, which is on -- at the top of the page. It has the word "Applicant."

And, again, in 33A, the first line, it says,
"Applicant." And again it says, "Applicant" in B. And the second line from the top of $B$ it says, "turbine." It should probably say, "project owner."

In every place where it says "Applicant" it
should probably say "project owner" instead of
"Applicant." I would consider those to be items that would fall undermine or grammatical changes, but it's really not a minor grammatical change. But unless my fellow Commissioners disagree and think that we need to have a Motion on those or they disagree with me.

In 33E, however, I think that it is material where it states escrow -- "the escrow account obligations," and it should state the "decommissioned funding account." And it's not the escrow account at this point. It's a decommissioning funding. I think we know that, but just so there's no misunderstanding. That needs to be done in $E$ and $F$ and $H$. And when it states "agreement" it should state escrow agreement."

And in $H(i i)$ and iii and item 4, Roman numeral II, III, and IV, it should say "decommission funding account" instead of "escrow" and "escrow account." And the same in $I$ and $J$ where it refers to the account and at the beginning of the sentence says, "account funds," it should say "decommissioning."

And $I$ know you're all excited with me going through this like this, but there's a sentence at the end of 35 that $I$ have a question on. "If no waiver is obtained, Applicant shall file a mitigation plan with the Commission prior to construction and obtain Commission
approval of the mitigation plan."
Is that a part of S 7 ?
Can someone from Staff -- I'm having trouble getting through all of the different items $I$ have on my computer here to check that. That would be item 35.

I believe that -- I'm going to answer my own
question. I believe that it is the same grammatical situation with item 37 needs to be changed on the word "wind and "project owner," et cetera, and "wind turbine."

And in 41 -- I believe whoever is redoing it will notice 41 where there's a number of changes that need to take place, but I'll bring that to their attention at this time. And then -- and that is all that I have on it, much to the relief of my fellow Commissioners.

Are there any other motions to be made at this time?

Hearing none, we have a main motion as amended. Hearing no further discussion on the main motion as amended -- excuse me. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So sometime I'd like to make a statement on the main motion.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Why don't we do that now. I was thinking we'd do it afterwards but, yes, it makes all the sense to do it now.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So are you -- did you just state that you were amending those -- the statements that you just made, is that an amendment?

CHAIRMAN HANSON: No. That is to bring
attention to whomever is doing the grammatical changes, that those are items to consider when they do their -because it really needs to have clarification.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: There's ambiguity with them, and whoever's doing it should recognize that.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Right. Thank you. Whenever you're ready, I'll be ready. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. Then I'll yield the floor to Commissioner Fiegen for comment on the main motion as amended. Unless you wish to go after someone else.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'll go after you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: All right. Well, Commissioner Nelson, you made the main motion so I'll let you go.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: I don't have much else to add. As I said when I made the Motion, I believe that through the hearing and the evidence that has been presented that the Applicant is entitled by law to this permit.

I believe that the conditions that we have put together are conditions necessary to protect the people and the property in that area. And $I$ fully understand that there's a balance here, that not everyone in that area is going to be happy with this.

Obviously, Mr. Swanson believes that there are some property rights that have been taken away with this. That's an argument that, you know, he can make to Circuit Court, which is the appropriate place for that argument to be made. And, you know, we'll see whether he is right or not on that -- on the law.

But for the task that we have, that we have been given by statute, $I$ believe the company is entitled to this permit and, hence, my Motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.
Throughout the process we have said a number of the things that I'll probably touch on at this time.

Wind dockets are always troubling to me. I shouldn't -- they didn't start out that way years ago, 17 years ago when we were first working on them. There's a lot of issues that have been clarified since that time, a lot of issues that we didn't even think about back then or realize and concerns that have been brought up. And they're challenging to me from the standpoint that $I$ do believe that properties are affected. Certainly $I$ think
we all agree, and that's why there's laws that have been passed.

Maybe it's the old legislator in me. When I was in the legislature we had the freedom to make decisions based upon how we felt from talking to lots of different folks, and we're constrained as Commissioners from that standpoint. We follow the law. If the law says this is what we do after we've gone over the entire process, then that's what we do.

And Staff brought out those five requirements that we had -- and they are requirements. We certainly must protect the citizens, but at the same time we have to follow the law. And if the Applicant proves that they fulfilled their requirements, then we're obliged to vote in favor of the permit with the conditions.

And I think we've provided some excellent conditions here. I would certainly like to have a couple more on there. They're not heartbreaking by any means to me. I won't regurgitate what they were but would very much have liked to have seen that.

A couple of areas that I'm uncomfortable with in dockets of this nature. One has to do with the valuation. I think we heard some real good lay testimony and exhibits on valuation, something that we had not heard prior to this.

It does appear both from expert and lay testimony that the valuation of properties -- the property values are affected by the proximity to a wind farm. It's a matter of -- well, I think it's supported by the fact that there's -- there's no disagreement that sound, light, flicker, aesthetics of a wind farm affect value. Otherwise, there wouldn't be any need for those issues to be part of it, to be used for determining setbacks, for instance.

So, obviously, it's not a question of whether wind farms affect a value; it's a question of how close is too close? At what distance do they -- is there too much flicker, is there too much sound, is there -- is the aesthetics wrong? And $I$ think that's supported by evidence. It's supported by the facts of what has been presented to us.

I think that -- well, I really struggle with the whole thing because of that. And I think that Mr. Swanson's letter touched on that in a fashion that $I$ guess I can consider to be very legitimate. I think his letter was -- I did not dismiss his letter by any means. I read it a couple times. I thought that it had some very good points.

And when it spoke to very much the affect that wind farms have on other properties, nonparticipants, and
he used the word "aggressively," that the wind farm was aggressively designed. He said that it was intended to hug the regulatory limits rather than limiting conflicts with nonparticipants. And $I$ think that was a profound statement because certainly the wind farms do everything they can to get the very last wind turbine up that's going to the economic value to the wind farm.

And I recognize we do not legislate the setbacks, that that's done by the counties and the legislature. And so, you know, I would really encourage the counties and the legislature -- especially the counties that do not have a setback law and the legislature in that respect. Even the legislature from the standpoint of looking at this very seriously and the counties to revisit the setback laws and the regulations that they have overview.

And these are outside the Public Utilities Commission's ability. And so I -- lawful ability. And so I just wish to impress to the legislators that they have the freedom to make the laws. We have the responsibility to make certain that they're -- that we abide by them. And I'm just very concerned with that, concerned with -- I'd like to hear further information on the no such thing as moon flicker.

You know, I just do not accept the yardstick
experiment that is sufficient to disprove the theory that there's moon flicker. We didn't have evidence on that that we can use to support any decision that we make. However, I'd certainly like to hear more on that.

I'll end with that, but there's a lot of
concerns that $I$ have that $I$ just don't feel that when we -- when we make these decisions we make them based upon the strongest testimony that we have. And that's proper. However, I think that the other parties, the Intervenors, are outgunned in many respects. Certainly they don't have millions of dollars to spend on these things. And so I just feel like I'm not getting the whole story when we make these decisions.

I'm going to obviously support the Motion because $I$ think that's the proper thing to do and that we are in a position where we've done the very best that the Public Utilities Commission can do.

I congratulate our Staff and certainly the Applicants for the work that they've done. But I'd really like to also say the Intervenors came with a lot of ammunition, did an excellent job, and there are a number -- this final decision has their footprints on it. They have helped meld it and influence the conditions, and so they shouldn't go away thinking that they were at a loss because it wasn't killed.

The fact is, they helped make it a better piece, and for that we appreciate the Applicant and the Intervenors, the Staff for a tremendous amount of work that the average folks just don't understand how many thousands of pages and the amount of work that goes into something of this nature.

So, with that, I'd say thank you to my fellow Commissioners for all that you've done and gone through with this process as well.

And, Commissioner Fiegen, the floor is yours.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Commissioner Hanson.

Crowned Ridge II certainly has been a lengthy process, and not only lengthy today but the permit process is quite lengthy. And as a Public Utilities Commissioner we always have to look at federal law and state law and county laws and ordinances when we do a permit.

And so as a Commissioner $I$ have to look at the record. And so $I$ believe the Public Utilities Commission Staff and the developer has developed a record to approve the permit.

And we have to look at evidence and facts. And I asked the experts several questions, for example, on property rights and property valuations, and there was
nothing in the record that $I$ have seen that would add another condition. And that's what $I$ continue to look at, the record, the evidence, and the facts.

And the Public Utilities Commission Staff have really done a good job in developing conditions. And as we heard today, they worked with Intervenors. They worked with other interested parties like GF\&P, and they also, of course, worked with the Applicant.

And I appreciate my fellow Commissioners even bringing additional conditions. And some of those conditions certainly weren't talked about at the evidentiary hearing but they added them today and I certainly appreciate that.

All parties have worked very hard, and I appreciate working with every one of them. But I certainly appreciate the Staff's additional negotiations on working with the developers.

So thank you to my fellow Commissioners, and I'll be supporting the Motion.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Is there any further discussion on the Motion -- the main motion as amended?

Hearing no further discussion on the main motion as amended, Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Hanson votes aye. The Motion is carried.

Thank you all very much. And ordinarily I would say have a safe trip home, but $I$ think just about everybody is.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 4:16, 4:22, 10:25, | 74:11 | 64:1 | move [6] - 26:10, | 19:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23:20, 35:16, 38:12, | marked [1] - 16:10 | modeling [1] - 31:14 | 26:15, 34:7, 38:10, | NELSON [29] - 1:11, |
| 48:25, 57:7, 62:21, | MaRous [1] - 31:23 | modifications [1] | 61:6 | 3:25, 21:17, 23:17 |
| 62:23 | match [1] - 39:7 | 55:1 | moved [1] - 14:7 | 26:7, 27:6, 27:23, |
| lines [2] - 18:15, 62:7 | material [1] - 63:7 | Mogen [3]-1:21 | MR [15] - 3:5, 4:4, 4:9, | 1, 29:10, 33:4, |
| list [3] - 28:3, 35:15, | MATTER [1] - 1:4 | 4:20, 5:6 | 4:11, 6:13, 10:13, | 35:9, 35:24, 36:7, |
| 59:8 | matter [6]-2:2, 5:15, | MOGEN [1] - 5:8 | 19:13, 19:21, 22:9, | 37:12, 38:21, 44:19, |
| literature [1] - 40:8 | 33:12, 47:8, 68:4, | moment [1] - 38:3 | 22:13, 27:14, 28:12, | 48:9, 50:18, 51:17, |
| LLC [5] - 1:4, 5:16, | 74:10 | Monday [1] - 60:8 | 28:16, 39:24, 46:16 | 53:15, 53:23, 54:22, |
| 5:21, 20:18, 26:12 | MCCOMSEY [1] - 74:5 | monitor [1] - 43: | MS [32] - 4:16, 4:23, | :13, 58:25, 60:24, |
| LNTE [3]-31:11, 31:19, 36:19 | McComsey [3]-1:24, | monitoring [10]-8:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 3,5: 8,11: 5,15: 8 \\ & 20: 22,22: 17,22: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:11, 61:21, 65:21, } \\ & 72: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ioad [1] - 11:4 |  | $41: 21,42: 8,42:$ | $22: 24,23: 8,23: 21$ | Nelson [29]-3:23, |
| local [3] - 14:16, 17:1, | 67:18, 68:21 | $43: 3,43: 8,43: 25$ | 4:5, 24:22, 28:20, | 21:15, 23:16, 26:3, |
| 58:5 | medical [1] - 9:3 | moon [2] - 69:24, 70:2 | 28:23, 40:4, 41:18, | 26:6, 26:16, 28:25, |
| location [3] - 8:16 | meet [7] - 7:13, 10:2, | $\operatorname{moot}[1]-31: 18$ | 43:1, 43:19, 45:22, | $34: 7,34: 25,35: 8,$ |
| 19:24, 42:17 | 11:7, 13:22, 14:21, | MOREY [6] - 23:2 | $46: 9,46: 20,46: 22$ | $35: 23,36: 4,36: 5$ |
| longspurs [1]-25:7 | $14: 22,40: 17$ | 24:5, 24:22, 41:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 1,54: 13,56: 13 \\ & 57: 14,57: 16,59: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 7,38: 9,44: 18 \\ & 48: 10,48: 21,48: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Iook [20] - 17:8, 19:23 } \\ 32: 10,33: 23,37: 3 \end{gathered}$ | meeting [3]-3:15, | $43: 1,43: 19$ | 57:14, 57:16, 59:15, $59: 21,61: 3$ | $50: 17,51: 16,53: 15$ |
| 40:9, 41:23, 42:4 | meetings [1] - 25: | 16:15, 23:21, 23:24, | multiple [1] - 57:22 | 54:20, 59:1, 60:25, |
| 42:17, 43:6, 49:17, | meets [1] - 17:19 | 24:23, 25:19, 41:12, | Murphy [4]-1:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 3,61: 20,65: 20, \\ & 72: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:8, 50:11, 54:8, | meld [1] - 70:23 | $41: 18,43: 1,43: 19$ | 4:13, 22:10, 27:18 MURPHY [4]-4:11, | nesting [2] - 25:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 57: 18,60: 2,71: 16, \\ & 71: 19,71: 23,72: 2 \end{aligned}$ | mention [1] - 17:3 <br> mentioned [6] - 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { morning [3] - 52:20, } \\ & 52: 22,54: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $22: 9,22: 13,39: 24$ | $25: 7$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { looked }[4]-30: 21, \\ 34: 20,38: 23,59: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $16: 13,18: 3,27: 5$ | mortality [10] - 8:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { must [2] - 11:13, } \\ & 67: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { never }[3]-9: 16,38: 1 \text {, } \\ & 61: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| looking [7] - 31:5, $37 \cdot 17,45 \cdot 23,45 \cdot 25$ | met [12] - 6:16, 7:14, | 40:9, 41:21, 43:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mute }[3]-3: 11,3: 13, \\ & 33: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { nevertheless [2] - } \\ 17: 8,44: 11 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 17,45: 23,45: 25, \\ & 57: 19,69: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $10: 19,11: 16,13: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 8,43: 25,44: 6 \\ & \text { most [1]-27:2 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\text { new }[7]-7: 3,16: 2$ |
| looks [2] - 35:6, 53:24 | 29:12, 45:12, 45:19, | Motion [19]-57:1, | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 18,40: 15,42: 16, \\ & 56: 11,56: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| lose [1] loss [3] | 46:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 5,58: 1 \\ & 60: 16,60 \end{aligned}$ | NARUC [1] - 9:17 | news [1] - 42:19 |
| $70: 25$ |  | 61:13, 61:19, 61:24, | Natural [1] - 25:12 | next [1] - 59:24 |
| losses |  | $62: 1,62: 2,63: 6$ | nature [3] - 44:7, | nice [1] - 3:6 |
| love [2]-45:6, 46:8 | might [2] - 26:15, | $65: 22,66: 14,70: 14$ | 67:22, 71:6 | night [1] - 52:19 |
| low [1] - 13:11 | 58:18 | $72: 19,72: 21,73: 3$ | nearly [1] - 14:2 necessarily [1] | noise [9]-13:11, |
|  | miles [1] - 46:23 | motion [60]-23:18, |  |  |
| M | Miles [7]-1:18, 4:4, | $26: 2,26: 3,26: 16$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { necessary [4] - 11:22, } \\ 21: 4,49: 15,66: 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:11, 18:7, 18:14 } \\ & 22: 6,34: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| machinery [1] - 57:21 | $28: 13,46: 16$ | $4: 5,34: 14,34: 16$ | need [18] - 3:1, 3:8 | none [6] - 35:22 |
| mail [1]-26:19 | millions [1] - 70:11 | $35: 6,35: 7,35: 12,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 7,4: 12,22: 20 \\ & 24: 21.26: 22.29: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $50: 16,51: 3,51: 16$ |
| mailed [1] - 27:25 <br> mailing [2] - 28:2 | minimal [3] - 18:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 21,35: 22,36: 2, \\ & 36: 4,36: 5,36: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 21,26: 22,29: 15, \\ & 31: 15,36: 24,37: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 61:20, 64:18 <br> nonparticipant [2] - |
| mailing $[2]-28: 2$ 52.20 | $18: 10,25: 15$ | $36: 4,36: 5,36: 9$ | $40: 17,41: 12,50: 4$ | nonparticipant [2] - <br> 9:10, 13:24 |
|  | minimized [1] - 8:20 | 36:10, 36:12, 36:25, | $58: 23,63: 5,64: 12$ | nonparticipant's [1] - |
| $25: 2,25: 9,36: 3$ | minor [6] - 36:22, | $7,$ | 68:7 | 8:22 |
| $36: 9,36: 25,45: 5$ | $37: 18,58: 19,59: 2$ | $44: 25,45: 2,45: 2$ | needed [7] - 8:15, | nonparticipants [6] - |
| 51:5, 51:22, 52:1, | minute [1]-3:6 | $45: 5,47: 11,48: 7$ | $31: 25,38: 24,50: 7$ | $7: 5,13: 23,14: 3,$ |
| 53:12, 57:4, 64:18, | minutes [12] - 5:24 | $50: 12,50: 14,50: 24$ | $54: 7,55: 1,59: 9$ | $17: 12,68: 25,69: 4$ |
| 64:19, 64:22, 65:14, $65 \cdot 2072 \cdot 21 \quad 72 \cdot 22$ | 5:25, 6:10, 9:11, | $51: 1,51: 2,51: 5$ | needing [1] - 61:6 <br> needs [9]-3.2, 24:17 | nonparticipating [3] - |
| Main [1] - 1:24 | 19:11, 27:21, 28:7, | 51:6, 51:14, 51:20, | $32: 5,55: 5,62: 8$ | $14: 5,22: 5,34: 11$ <br> Notary [2]-74:7 |
| maintain [1] - 8:16 | $28: 11,33: 21,34: 2$ | $52: 6,52: 8,53: 12$ | $63: 13,64: 8,65: 7$ | $74: 18$ |
| maintenance [3] - |  | 4:2, 60:20, 64:18, | negotiated [1] - 24:19 | noted [1] - 8:14 |
| $10: 5,57: 24,58: 1$ | $43: 12$ | 64:19, 64:22, 65:15, | negotiation [2] - <br> 37:25, 41:14 | nothing [3]-19:8, |
| major [1] - 12:10 <br> manner [1] - 49:14 | misspoke [1] - 6:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 20,72: 21,72: 22 \\ & \text { motions [6] - 35:14, } \end{aligned}$ | negotiations [2] - | $31: 7,72: 1$ <br> notice [1] - 64:11 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { March [6] - 1:8, 2:5, } \\ 3: 16,8: 2,20: 6, \end{gathered}$ | ```misunderstanding [1] -63:12 mitigation [2]-63:24,``` | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 1,52: 3,53: 6, \\ & 57: 4,64: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $39: 17,72: 16$ <br> neighboring [1] - | notions [1] - 9:13 <br> number [9]-23:25, |




| $39: 23,40: 7,40: 13$, <br> $40: 14,42: 2,42: 10$, <br> $42: 12,45: 23,46: 2$, <br> $46: 10,50: 5,61: 9$, <br> $71: 13$ <br> Ridge's $[1]-6: 24$ <br> rights $[4]-17: 13$, <br> 17:17, $66: 7,71: 25$ <br> risks $[1]-15: 25$ <br> Rislov $[1]-1: 14$ <br> road $[2]-18: 19,58: 4$ <br> roads $[5]-14: 18$, <br> $20: 2,25: 17,57: 19$, <br> $57: 21$ <br> roadway $[1]-14: 14$ <br> Robish $[2]-4: 20,4: 24$ <br> role $[1]-18: 4$ <br> Roman $[1]-63: 15$ <br> route $[1]-12: 10$ <br> RPR $[1]-1: 24$ <br> rules $[7]-6: 18,7: 15$, <br> $11: 12,11: 23,12: 23$, <br> $17: 21,55: 20$ <br> running $[1]-47: 4$ <br>  <br> $\quad$ S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { section }[2]-34: 8, \\ & 34: 9 \\ & \text { see }[15]-21: 9,24: 21, \\ & 27: 4,27: 10,27: 17, \\ & 35: 18,36: 24,37: 9, \\ & 37: 17,38: 18,46: 17, \\ & 56: 7,56: 8,58: 8, \\ & 66: 10 \\ & \text { seem }[3]-58: 18, \\ & 60: 12,60: 13 \\ & \text { self }[1]-27: 24 \\ & \text { self-explanatory }[1]- \\ & 27: 24 \\ & \text { semantics }[2]-45: 14, \\ & 57: 8 \\ & \text { send }[3]-26: 21, \\ & 33: 16,33: 17 \\ & \text { sense }[2]-59: 23, \\ & 64: 25 \\ & \text { sent }[2]-6: 5,27: 2 \\ & \text { sentence }[5]-19: 20, \\ & 47: 2,58: 16,63: 19, \\ & 63: 22 \\ & \text { sentences }[2]-46: 23, \\ & 47: 1 \\ & \text { separately }[1]-32: 15 \\ & \text { series }[1]-26: 16 \\ & \text { serious }[6]-7: 17, \\ & 7: 22,11: 14,12: 1, \\ & 17: 22,19: 3 \\ & \text { seriously }[2]-12: 17, \\ & 69: 14 \\ & \text { Service } \\ & \text { set }[1]-16: 3 \\ & \text { setback }[3]-14: 2 \\ & 69: 12,69: 15 \\ & \text { setbacks }[4]-6: 19, \\ & 10: 3,68: 9,69: 9 \\ & \text { settlement }[3]-39: 17, \\ & 39: 22,41: 4 \\ & \text { seven } 41]-10: 6 \\ & \text { several }[3]-20: 12, \\ & 29: 17,71: 24 \\ & \text { shadow }[6]-6: 25, \\ & 8: 21,9: 10,14: 3, \\ & 17: 11,18: 8 \\ & \text { shall }[18]-5: 18,5: 21, \\ & 13: 1,16: 23,20: 17, \\ & 20: 20,35: 17,52: 10, \\ & 52: 16,55: 7,55: 20, \\ & 59: 6,59: 13,59: 16, \\ & 60: 4,63: 24 \\ & \text { shall...all }[1]-59: 17 \\ & \text { sheet }[1]-12: 20 \\ & \text { short }[7]-3: 14,33: 25, \\ & 38: 3,38: 16,40: 21, \\ & 41: 12,55: 14 \\ & \text { shorthand }[2]-74: 9 \\ & \text { shoulders }[1]-53: 8 \\ & \text { show }[3]-3: 9,7: 2,7: 3 \end{aligned}$ | ```showing [2]-7:13, 9:25 shown [1] - 10:2 shows [8]-6:15, 6:22, 6:25, 7:16, 8:18, 10:7, 18:7, 45:5 shut [2]-31:24, 55:15 side [1] - 32:24 significant [4] - 41:14, 43:18, 44:6, 62:17 similarly [2]-9:12, 62:5 simply [4] - 14:20, 43:14, 43:17, 55:6 site \({ }_{[2]}-12: 8,25: 16\) sites [1] - 9:1 situation [1] - 64:8 six [1] - 62:7 sleep [1] - 13:25 slight [1] - 15:16 slow [2]-5:13, 10:11 small [2] - 14:7, 58:18 smidgen [1] - 10:11 smoothly [1] - 28:5 social [2] - 7:18, 17:23 soft [1] - 50:21 softens [1]-50:3 soils [2] - 58:17, 59:17 solely [1]-11:9 solid [1]-13:6 someone [3] - 57:2, 64:3, 65:15 sometime [1] - 64:21 somewhere [2] - 46:12, 47:16 soon [1] - 27:6 sorry [1]-57:15 sort [2]-38:17, 59:7 sound [16] - 6:24, 7:2, 8:21, 9:2, 9:10, 11:18, 11:21, 11:25, 13:10, 19:15, 22:1, 22:2, 31:14, 56:2, 68:6, 68:13 sounding [1] - 4:1 South [18]-1:24, 2:3, 2:4, 3:16, 8:13, 11:11, 11:23, 12:23, 14:25, 16:8, 24:23, 25:11, 40:12, 41:19, 42:15, 43:20, 74:7, 74:13 SOUTH [2] - 1:2, 74:1 southeastern [1] - 42:15 spacial [1] - 41:23 speaking [3] - 5:5, 5:8, 5:11 species [2]-25:7, 42:4``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { specific }[3]-21: 2, \\ & \text { 42:4, 46:17 } \\ & \text { specifically }[2]- \\ & \text { 17:20, 25:16 } \\ & \text { specify }[1]-47: 17 \\ & \text { speech }[1]-11: 24 \\ & \text { spell }[2]-30: 23,31: 21 \\ & \text { spend }[1]-70: 11 \\ & \text { spoken }[2]-60: 17, \\ & 60: 22 \\ & \text { spray }[3]-31: 24, \\ & 31: 25,35: 2 \\ & \text { sprayers }[2]-35: 2 \\ & \text { SS }[1]-74: 2 \\ & \text { STAFF }[1]-1: 12 \\ & \text { Staff }[72]-1: 23,4: 14, \\ & 6: 2,6: 9,8: 5,13: 14, \\ & 13: 21,15: 5,15: 9, \\ & 15: 10,15: 13,15: 19, \\ & 15: 22,16: 7,16: 12, \\ & 16: 13,16: 15,16: 21, \\ & 17: 3,17: 7,17: 13, \\ & 18: 8,19: 7,19: 18, \\ & 19: 23,21: 2,21: 22, \\ & 21: 25,22: 7,23: 1, \\ & 23: 9,26: 14,28: 2, \\ & 28: 18,28: 22,28: 23, \\ & 29: 2,29: 8,29: 13, \\ & 30: 3,30: 5,31: 1, \\ & 32: 4,37: 25,38: 23, \\ & 45: 23,48: 20,49: 2, \\ & 49: 5,49: 8,50: 2, \\ & 56: 5,56: 10,56: 14, \\ & 57: 6,57: 17,60: 4, \\ & 60: 10,61: 1,61: 4, \\ & 61: 8,61: 15,61: 18, \\ & 62: 9,64: 3,67: 10, \\ & 70: 18,71: 3,71: 21, \\ & 72: 4 \\ & \text { Staff's }[10]-15: 15, \\ & 15: 17,16: 9,20: 15, \\ & 22: 23,23: 10,24: 17, \\ & 26: 4,50: 4,72: 16 \\ & \text { stand }[1]-19: 15 \\ & \text { standard }[1]-17: 19 \\ & \text { standards }[2]-12: 4, \\ & 13: 5 \\ & \text { standpoint }[7]-25: 24, \\ & 42: 21,47: 20,54: 8, \\ & 66: 24,67: 7,69: 14 \\ & \text { Stanton }[1]-9: 17 \\ & \text { start }[9]-3: 10,3: 13, \\ & 20: 14,20: 16,23: 6, \\ & 27: 21,28: 7,28: 10, \\ & 66: 19 \\ & \text { started }[2]-42: 1,42: 2 \\ & \text { starting }[1]-23: 4 \\ & \text { state }[18]-7: 11,12: 3, \\ & 14: 18,14: 21,17: 20, \\ & 20: 18,29: 12,37: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:20, 42:18, 48:23, 10 } \\ & 54: 15,55: 6,57: 10, \\ & 63: 9,63: 14,65: 2, \\ & 71: 17 \\ & \text { State }_{[2]}-2: 3,74: 7 \\ & \text { STATE }_{[2]}-1: 2,74: 1 \\ & \text { statement }[3]-12: 20, \\ & 64: 22,69: 5 \\ & \text { statements }[1]-65: 2 \\ & \text { States }[1]-25: 17 \\ & \text { states }[9]-48: 2, \\ & 52: 16,53: 9,53: 25, \\ & 55: 11,59: 5,60: 4, \\ & 63: 8,63: 13 \\ & \text { stating }[1]-20: 17 \\ & \text { stationed }[1]-8: 13 \\ & \text { statute }[17]-46: 18, \\ & 46: 24,46: 25,48: 11, \\ & 48: 13,48: 22,49: 8, \\ & \text { 49:9, } 49: 11,54: 3, \\ & 54: 16,54: 24,55: 4, \\ & 55: 14,56: 2,56: 15, \\ & 66: 13 \\ & \text { stemmed }[1]-49: 4 \\ & \text { stems }[1]-16: 14 \\ & \text { stick }[1]-38: 25 \\ & \text { stickler }[1]-57: 8 \\ & \text { still }[7]-26: 25,33: 10, \\ & 40: 3,42: 7,45: 2, \\ & 50: 4,55: 10 \\ & \text { store }[1]-59: 17 \\ & \text { story }[1]-70: 13 \\ & \text { strange }[1]-21: 6 \\ & \text { strike }[1]-60: 20 \\ & \text { striking }[1]-57: 12 \\ & \text { stringent }[1]-56: 12 \\ & \text { strip }[1]-59: 16 \\ & \text { strongest }[1]-70: 8 \\ & \text { structures }[1]-7: 10 \\ & \text { struggle }[2]-47: 23, \\ & 68: 17 \\ & \text { studied }[1]-7: 9 \\ & \text { studies }[8]-7: 2,7: 3, \\ & 7: 11,7: 23,11: 21, \\ & \text { 13:12, } 19: 15,43: 2 \\ & \text { study }[20]-6: 25, \\ & 11: 18,11: 25,13: 10, \\ & 13: 11,16: 6,21: 1, \\ & 22: 1,22: 2,38: 17, \\ & 39: 19,40: 17,42: 2, \\ & 42: 12,42: 25,43: 9, \\ & 43: 16,43: 22,43: 24, \\ & 44: 14 \\ & \text { subcontractors }[1]- \\ & 12: 25 \\ & \text { subject }[1]-55: 16 \\ & \text { subjective }[2]-31: 8, \\ & 52: 8 \\ & \text { submission }[1]-13: 9 \\ & \text { submitted }[4]-6: 24, \\ & \text { ste } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 12:5, 13:14, 19:16 | 1:10 | transferred [1] - 55:16 | -63:3 | 61:24, 73:1, 73:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { substantial [4] - 7:21 } \\ 9: 21,9: 24,13: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { themselves [2] - 6:23, } \\ & \text { 17:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $5$ | understood [1] - 59:22 | W |
| sub |  | transfers [2] - 56:7 | 38 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 19,9: 5,9: 25,10: 7, \\ & 17: 24,19: 4 \end{aligned}$ | therefore [2]-7:8 |  | unduly [3] - 10:15 18:1, 19:5 |  |
| - 34:8 | [1] -55:1 | traveling [1] - 57: | -25:1 | water [7]-24:1, 24:5, |
| suffice [1] - 25:2 | they've [2]-28: | :3 | unless [4]-46:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:9, 24:15, 25:1 } \\ & 25: 20,25: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| sufficient ${ }^{[1]}$ - 70:1 | thinking [6]-37 | trepidation [1] - 47:11 | $54: 1,63: 4,65: 15$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 25:20, 25:22 } \\ \text { waters }[1]-25: 17 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { suggested }[3]-13: 19, \\ & 31: 10,52: 25 \end{aligned}$ | thinking [6]-37:10 $37: 12,57: 12,62: 5$ | trespass [1]-9: | unnecessary [2] 46:25, 50:9 | wear [1]-58:2 |
| suggestion ${ }_{[2]}$ - 32:9, 58:15 | $64: 24,70: 24$ | tried [2] - 50:7, 57: | unpersuasive ${ }_{[1]}$ $14: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { website }[4]-26: 20, \\ & 28: 3,29: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| suggestions [2] | $60:$ | trip [1] | $14: 2$ | week [1] - 10:6 |
| suggestions 20:15, $27: 4$ | ughts [1] - 23 <br> usands [1] | trouble [1] - 64: | unreasonable | weekends [1]-60 |
| ```SULLY \({ }_{[1]}\) - 74:3 summary [2] - 10:19, 14:19 sunglasses [1] - 44:19 supplant [2] - 38:11, 60:21``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { threat }[4]-7: 17,7: 22, \\ & 11: 13,17: 22 \\ & \text { three }[13]-5: 25,6: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trucks }_{[1]}-58: 1 \\ & \text { true }_{[1]}-74: 11 \end{aligned}$ | unusable ${ }_{[1]}-18: 21$ | weight [1] - 6:14 <br> welcomed [1]-3:5 |
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