

August 29, 2022

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Honorable Judge Suzanne Todnem
Office of Administrative Hearings
600 North Robert Street
P.O. Box 64620
St. Paul, MN 55164-0620

**Re: In the Matter of the Application of Rose Creek Wind, LLC for a LWECS Site
Permit for the up to 17.4 MW Rose Creek Wind Project in Mower County,
Minnesota
MPUC Docket No. IP-7065/WS-21-643
OAH Docket No. 23-2500-38341**

Dear Judge Todnem:

Enclosed please find Rose Creek Wind, LLC's Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendations ("Proposed Findings"), which have been e-filed today through www.edockets.state.mn.us/efiling. Given the limited public hearing comments, Rose Creek is not filing separate responses to the public comments but has incorporated those comments into the Proposed Findings. A copy of this filing is also being served upon the persons on the Official Service List of record, and a Word version of the Proposed Findings will be provided under separate cover. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Sincerely,

/s/ Christina K. Brusven

Christina K. Brusven
Attorney at Law
Direct Dial: 612.492.7412
Email: cbrusven@fredlaw.com

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**In the Matter of the Application of Rose
Creek Wind, LLC for a LWECS Site Permit
for the up to 17.4 MW Rose Creek Wind
Project in Mower County, Minnesota**

OAH Docket No. 23-2500-38341
MPUC Docket No. IP-7065/WS-21-643

**ROSE CREEK WIND, LLC'S
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

STATEMENT OF ISSUES	3
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	4
FINDINGS OF FACT	4
I. APPLICANT	4
II. SITE PERMIT APPLICATION AND RELATED PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	4
III. CERTIFICATE OF NEED EXEMPTION AND RELATED PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	10
IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT.....	10
V. SITE LOCATION AND CHARACTERISTICS	11
VI. WIND RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS.....	11
VII. WIND RIGHTS AND EASEMENT/LEASE AGREEMENTS.....	12
VIII. PROJECT SCHEDULE.....	12
IX. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS	12
X. SITE PERMIT CRITERIA	16
XI. APPLICATION OF SITING CRITERIA TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT	18
A. Human Settlement.....	18
B. Zoning and Land Use	18
C. Property Values	20
D. Noise	21
E. Shadow Flicker	22
F. Aesthetic Impacts.....	23
G. Local Economy	24
H. Public Health and Safety	25
I. Public Service and Infrastructure	26
J. Recreational Resources	29
K. Land-Based Economies.....	30
L. Archaeological and Historic Resources.....	32
M. Aviation.....	33
N. Wildlife	33

O.	Rare and Unique Natural Resources.....	37
P.	Vegetation	40
Q.	Soils, Geologic, and Groundwater Resources.....	41
R.	Surface Water and Wetlands.....	43
S.	Air and Water Emissions.....	45
T.	Solid and Hazardous Wastes.....	45
U.	Future Development and Expansion	46
V.	Decommissioning, Turbine Abandonment, and Restoration	47
XII.	SITE PERMIT CONDITIONS	48
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		50
RECOMMENDATIONS		51

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**In the Matter of the Application of Rose
Creek Wind, LLC for a LWECS Site Permit
for the up to 17.4 MW Rose Creek Wind
Project in Mower County, Minnesota**

OAH Docket No. 23-2500-38341
MPUC Docket No. IP-7065/WS-21-643

**ROSE CREEK WIND, LLC'S
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

This matter was assigned to Administrative Law Judge Suzanne Todnem ("ALJ") to conduct a public hearing on the Site Permit Application (MPUC Docket No. WS-21-643) ("SP Application") of Rose Creek Wind, LLC ("Rose Creek" or "Applicant") for an up to 17.4 megawatt ("MW") nameplate capacity Large Wind Energy Conversion System ("LWECS") and associated facilities in Mower County (the "Repower Project"). The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("MPUC" or "Commission") also requested that the ALJ prepare findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendations, and provide recommendations, if any, on conditions and provisions of the proposed site permit.

Public hearings on the SP Application were held on July 27, 2022 (in person) and July 28, 2022 (remote access - telephone and internet). The factual record remained open until August 15, 2022, for the receipt of written public comments.

Christina Brusven, Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., 200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402, Sue Hansen, Project Developer Associate for Consolidated Edison Clean Energy Businesses, appeared on behalf of Rose Creek Wind, LLC.

Scott Ek, Energy Facility Planner, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Staff ("Staff"), 121 Seventh Place East, Suite 350, St. Paul, MN 55101 appeared on behalf of the Commission.

Rich Davis, Environmental Review Manager, 445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1500, St. Paul, MN 55101 appeared on behalf of the Department of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and Analysis ("EERA").

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

Has Rose Creek satisfied the criteria established in Chapter 216F and Section 216E.03, subdivision 7 of the Minnesota Statutes and Chapter 7854 of the Minnesota Rules for a Site Permit for the proposed project?

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The ALJ concludes that Rose Creek has satisfied the applicable legal requirements and, accordingly, recommends that the Commission GRANT a Site Permit for the Project, subject to the conditions discussed below.

Based on the evidence in the hearing record, the ALJ makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. APPLICANT

1. Rose Creek Wind, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company and is registered with the Minnesota Secretary of State. Rose Creek Wind, LLC is owned by Rose Wind Holdings, LLC, which is owned by ConEdison Development (“CED”), a New York renewable energy development and operations company.¹
2. The currently operating Rose Wind Project, owned by CED via a holding company, Rose Wind Holdings, LLC, consists of 11 turbines that were built in 2004 and 2005 pursuant to Conditional Use Permits issued by Mower County. Because the existing turbines were originally permitted by Mower County, the Repower Project does not have a LWECS Site Permit from the MPUC.²
3. The up to 17.4 MW of electricity generated by Rose Wind is sold to Dairyland Power Cooperative (“Dairyland”) under an existing Power Purchase Agreement with CED. The 11 existing Rose Wind turbines range in size from 1.5 MW to 1.65 MW.³
4. The proposed Repower Project will involve decommissioning the 11 Rose Wind turbines and constructing 6 to 7 new turbines with greater power outputs to continue to deliver up to 17.4 MW of electricity to Dairyland.⁴
5. The Repower Project will have a nameplate capacity of up to 17.4 MW.⁵

II. SITE PERMIT APPLICATION AND RELATED PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

6. On January 28, 2022, Rose Creek filed an application requesting a site permit for a LWECS, the Rose Creek Wind Project (MPUC Docket No. IP7065/WS-21-643).⁶

¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 1 Site Permit Application (January 28, 2022) (eDocket No. [20221-182146-02](#)) (“SP Application”).

² Ex. RCW-103 at 1 (SP Application).

³ Ex. RCW-103 at 1 (SP Application).

⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 1 (SP Application).

⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 1 (SP Application).

⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 1 (SP Application).

7. On February 4, 2022, the Commission issued a Notice of Comment Period on the SP Application, announcing it would accept written comments through February 18, 2022, and reply comments through February 25, 2022. The Notice requested comments on whether Rose Creek's SP Application contained the information required under Minn. R. 7854.0500; whether the SP Application should be reviewed as a summary report, summary proceeding, or referral for a contested case hearing; and whether there were any contested issues of fact with respect to the representations made in the SP Application.⁷
8. On February 18, 2022, EERA staff filed comments recommending that the Commission accept the SP Application as substantially complete with the understanding that Rose Creek Wind will continue to work with EERA through the review of the proposed project and the LWECS site permit process, that the Aircraft Detection Lighting Systems ("ADLS") issue should be highlighted in the public hearing notice, that the Commission request the ALJ provide specific findings around this issue to help inform their final decision regarding the Applicant's claim of ADLS causing significant financial burden, that the Commission delay the decision on whether to refer the project for a contested case proceeding until the Commission's consideration of the draft site permit, that the Commission request a full ALJ report with recommendations for the project's public hearing, and that the Commission vary the procedural requirements of Minnesota Rule 7854.0800, to allow longer than 45 days to determine whether to issue a draft site permit.⁸
9. On February 25, 2022, LIUNA Minnesota & North Dakota ("LIUNA") filed reply comments stating their concern about the lack of detail concerning the applicant's plans to ensure that promised benefits are delivered through the applicant's selection of contractor or other means and stating that their preference would be to resolve such concerns through an informal process.⁹
10. On February 25, 2022, Rose Creek filed reply comments stating the following: (1) EERA Staff correctly identifies that Rose Creek is not proposing to install and operate an ADLS; (2) Rose Creek is committed to avoiding impacts to native prairie, and therefore will conduct field studies during the second quarter of 2022 to make a formal determination as to the presence or absence of native prairie within the Project's construction and operation areas, if native prairie is found in areas where Project impacts could occur, Rose Creek will develop a NPPP and will avoid all impacts to native prairie; (3) request that the Commission accept the Application as substantially complete, with the understanding that Rose Creek will provide additional information requested by EERA Staff during the proceedings; and (4) that the Commission refer the matter to the

⁷ Ex. PUC-1 Notice of Comment Period on Application Completeness (February 4, 2022) (eDocket No. [20222-182415-01](#))

⁸ Ex. EERA-1 Comments – EERA Completeness Comments and Recommendations (February 18, 2022) (eDocket No. [20222-182986-01](#)).

⁹ Reply Comments from LIUNA Minnesota and North Dakota (February 25, 2022) (eDocket No. [20222-183214-01](#)).

Office of Administrative Hearings (“OAH”) for a public hearing and preparation of a full ALJ report with recommendations.¹⁰

11. On March 1, 2022, International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49 (“Local 49”) filed supplemental comments stating that it is unclear how the applicant will ensure that socioeconomic benefits are realized and stating that a contested case hearing may be useful for developing a more thorough record on the socioeconomic benefits of the project.¹¹
12. On March 4, 2022, Rose Creek filed supplemental comments in response to comments filed by LIUNA and Local 49 stating that a contested case is not necessary to further develop the record on these issues and agreeing with the Commission’s delay of the decision on whether to refer the project to a contested case proceeding until the Commission’s consideration of the draft site permit.¹²
13. On March 4, 2022, EERA staff filed supplemental comments recommending that the Commission accept the application for the proposed Project as substantially complete.¹³
14. On March 15, 2022, the Commission issued an order with the following dispositions: (1) accepting the site permit application as substantially complete, with the understanding that Rose Creek Wind will continue to work with EERA through the review of the proposed project and the site permit process; (2) delaying the decision on whether to refer the project for a contested case proceeding until the Commission’s consideration of the draft site permit.¹⁴
15. On March 31, 2022, Rose Creek filed an Application Acceptance Compliance Filing stating that Rose Creek had completed the notice requirements of Minn. R. 7854.0600 and provided direct mail notice and newspaper publication relating to Rose Creek’s SP Application.¹⁵
16. On April 19, 2022, the Commission issued a Notice of Public Information Meeting scheduling meetings for May 4, 2022 (in-person) and May 5, 2022 (remote-access) and announcing that written comments would be accepted through May 19, 2022.¹⁶ Notice of

¹⁰ Ex. RCW-104 Rose Creek Completeness Comments (February 25, 2022) (eDocket No. [20222-183184-01](#)).

¹¹ Comments from IUOE Local 49 (March 1, 2022) (eDocket No. [20223-183311-01](#)).

¹² Ex. RCW-105 Rose Creek Supplemental Completeness Comments (March 4, 2022) (eDocket No. [20223-183441-01](#)).

¹³ Ex. EERA-2 Response to Reply Comments - Supplemental Comments (March 4, 2022) (eDocket No. [20223-183430-01](#)).

¹⁴ Ex. PUC-2 Order Accepting Application (March 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20223-183769-01](#)).

¹⁵ Ex. RCW-106 Compliance Filing – Rose Creek Application Compliance Filing (March 31, 2022) (eDocket No. [20223-184281-01](#)).

¹⁶ Ex. PUC-4 Notice of Public Information Meeting (April 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20224-184887-01](#)).

the public information meetings was published in the *Austin Daily Herald* on April 23, 2022.¹⁷

17. On May 4, 2022, Commission Staff and EERA Staff held a public information meeting in Austin, Minnesota. Five persons attended this meeting and five of the attendees provided public comments.¹⁸
18. On May 5, 2022, Commission Staff and EERA Staff held a public information meeting via Webex and telephone. Three persons attended this meeting and three of the attendees provided public comments.¹⁹
19. On May 18, 2022, Local 49 filed comments encouraging the Department of Commerce to consider socioeconomic impacts stemming from construction jobs created as a result of the project in the draft site permit.²⁰
20. On May 18, 2022, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (“MNDNR”) filed comments recommending that Rose Creek coordinate with the MNDNR to determine the need for a Prairie Protection and Management Plan (“PPMP”), utilize best management practices to minimize erosion and sediment loads that could affect downstream public waters; obtain a water use permit; conduct two years of post-construction monitoring; create a special permit condition requiring the use of wildlife friendly erosion control; create a special permit condition to minimize impacts of the substation by using shielded and downward facing lighting that minimizes blue hue; and create a permit condition requiring the permittee to avoid using chemical dust suppressants containing chloride.²¹
21. On May 19, 2022, LIUNA filed comments in support of the Project stating that the Project will maximize local benefits, minimize environmental impacts by upgrading an existing facility and efficiently utilize resources through the use of an existing interconnect.²²
22. On May 19, 2022, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (“MNDOT”) filed comments recommending that if temporary access/changes to road radii from the state

¹⁷ Ex. PUC-5 Notice of Public Information Meeting Affidavit of Publication (April 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20224-185348-01](#))).

¹⁸ Ex. EERA-8 Minutes – Public Information Meeting Minutes (May 23, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-185968-01](#)) (“Public Meeting Minutes”).

¹⁹ Ex. EERA-7 Minutes – Virtual Public Information Meeting Minutes (May 23, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-185969-01](#)) (“Virtual Meeting Minutes”).

²⁰ Ex. EERA-3 Comments from IUOE Local 49 and NCSRCC (May 18, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-185869-01](#)) (“Local 49 Comments”).

²¹ Ex. EERA-4 Comments from Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (May 18, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-185867-01](#)) (“MNDNR Comments”).

²² Ex. EERA-5 Comments from LIUNA Minnesota and North Dakota (May 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-185927-01](#)) (“LIUNA Comments”).

trunk highway system onto county or township roads is proposed, and if the PUC issue a site permit, then Rose Creek should engage in early consultation with MNDOT staff.²³

23. On May 20, 2022, the OAH filed notice of Prehearing Conference scheduled for June 2, 2022 (remote-access).²⁴
24. On May 26, 2022, Rose Creek filed a proposed procedural schedule as requested in the Notice of Prehearing Conference.²⁵
25. On June 1, 2022, EERA staff filed comments recommending that the Commission issue a draft site permit to Rose Creek Wind, LLC and providing a preliminary draft site permit for the Commission's consideration.²⁶
26. On June 1, 2022, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency ("MPCA") filed comments on potential environmental impacts associated with the Project.²⁷
27. On June 1, 2022, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") filed comments recommending Rose Creek Wind follow both the Final Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines as well as the Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance ("ECP") to minimize impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and federally listed species, as well as providing specific comments on the Northern Long-eared bat ("NLEB"), prairie bush-clover, impacts to migratory birds, lighting and tower design, and impacts to eagles.²⁸
28. On June 3, 2022, the OAH filed the First Scheduling Order establishing a procedural schedule.²⁹
29. On July 6, 2022, the Commission issued an Order issuing the draft site permit with the modifications proposed by the EERA.³⁰
30. On July 13, 2022, the Commission issued a Notice of Public Hearings and Availability of Draft Site Permit, notifying the public of the availability of the Draft Site Permit and of the July 27, 2022 in-person hearing and July 28, 2022 remote-access public hearing, and

²³ Ex. EERA-6 Comments from MnDOT (May 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-185911-01](#)) ("MnDOT Comments").

²⁴ Notice of Prehearing Conference (May 20, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-185955-01](#)).

²⁵ Proposed Rose Creek Wind Procedural Schedule (May 26, 2022) (eDocket No. [20225-186135-01](#)).

²⁶ Ex. EERA-9 Comments – Recommendations and Preliminary DSP (June 1, 2022) (eDocket No. [20226-186277-01](#)) ("DOC-EERA Comments").

²⁷ Ex. EERA-10 Comments from MPCA (June 1, 2022) (eDocket No. [20226-186247-01](#)) ("MPCA Comments").

²⁸ Ex. EERA-11 Comments from USFWS (June 1, 2022) (eDocket No. [20226-186246-01](#)) ("USFWS Comments").

²⁹ First Scheduling Order (June 3, 2022) (eDocket No. [20226-186374-01](#)).

³⁰ Ex. PUC-6 Order Issuing Draft Site Permit (July 6, 2022) (eDocket No. [20227-187232-01](#)) ("Draft Site Permit").

initiating a public comment period ending August 15, 2022.³¹ Notice of Public Hearings and availability of Draft Site Permit was also published in the *EQB Monitor*.³² Notice of Public Hearings and Availability of Draft Site Permit was also published in the *Austin Daily Herald*.³³

31. On July 20, 2022, Rose Creek filed the direct testimonies of Dan Flo³⁴ and Gokhan Andi.³⁵
32. On July 25, 2022, the Commission filed the public hearing presentation.³⁶
33. On July 27, 2022, the ALJ presided over an in-person public hearing.³⁷
34. On July 28, 2022, the ALJ presided over a virtual public hearing.³⁸
35. On August 15, 2022, Rose Creek filed comments that it received directly from the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (“SHPO”) concerning the Project on May 18, 2022. SHPO offered comments on archaeological resources, history/architecture projects, and tribal consultation.³⁹
36. On August 15, 2022, EERA staff filed comments regarding the Commission’s draft site permit for the Project and the direct testimony of Rose Creek.⁴⁰
37. On August 15, 2022, LIUNA filed comments in support of the Project and recommended that the Commission issue a site permit for the proposed large wind energy conversion system with no additional conditions or requirements included in the site permit.⁴¹
38. On August 19, 2022, Rose Creek filed comments that it received directly from the SHPO concerning the Project on August 17, 2022. SHPO acknowledged that it reviewed the

³¹ Ex. PUC-7 Notice of Public Hearings and Availability of Draft Site Permit (July 13, 2022) (eDocket No. [20227-187361-01](#)).

³² Ex. PUC-9 Notice of Public Hearings and Availability of Draft Site Permit in *EQB Monitor* (July 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20227-187591-01](#)).

³³ Ex. PUC-8 Notice of Public Hearings and Availability of Draft Site Permit Affidavit of Publication (July 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20227-187581-01](#)).

³⁴ Ex. RCW-102 Prefiled Direct Testimony of Dan Flo with Schedules A, B, C, and D (July 20, 2022) (eDocket Nos. [20227-187646-01](#), [20227-187646-02](#), [20227-187646-03](#), [20227-187646-04](#), [20227-187646-05](#) (Trade Secret), and [20227-187646-06](#)) (“Flo Direct”).

³⁵ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 Prefiled Direct Testimony of Gokhan Andi with Schedules A and B (July 20, 2022) (eDocket No. [20227-187644-02](#), [20227-187644-03](#), [20227-187644-04](#), [20227-187644-05](#), and [20227-187644-06](#) (Trade Secret)) (“Andi Direct”).

³⁶ Public Hearing Slide Presentation (July 25, 2022) (eDocket No. [20227-187747-01](#)).

³⁷ See July 27, 2022 Public Hearing Transcript.

³⁸ See July 28, 2022 Public Hearing Transcript.

³⁹ SHPO Comments (August 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188363-01](#)).

⁴⁰ EERA Public Hearing Comments (August 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188365-01](#)).

⁴¹ LIUNA Comments (August 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188370-01](#)).

addendum survey report covering areas that were not accessible during the previous survey efforts and the revised project layout submitted by Rose Creek in July 2022. SHPO offered comments on archaeological resources, history/architecture projects, and tribal consultation.⁴²

III. CERTIFICATE OF NEED EXEMPTION AND RELATED PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

39. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 216B.243, subd. 2, a certificate of need from the MPUC is required for siting and construction of any large energy facility as defined in Minn. Stat. § 216B.2421, subd. 2. Because the Project's nameplate capacity will not exceed 50 MW, a certificate of need is not required.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

40. The proposed project is an LWECS, as defined in the Wind Siting Act (Minnesota Statutes Chapter 216F) with a proposed boundary of 5,258 acres (approximately 2,128 hectares) in size. The Project is located in Lodi and Adams Townships in Mower County, Minnesota.⁴³
41. The proposed Project is an up-to 17.4 MW nameplate capacity wind farm in southeastern Minnesota. Rose Creek is requesting a Site Permit that will allow it to construct 6 to 7 new turbines, each with a greater power output than the existing 11 Rose Wind turbines which will be decommissioned. The Project nameplate capacity and point of interconnect will remain the same.⁴⁴
42. Rose Creek proposes to use a combination of two potential GE model wind turbines and one Gamesa model, including the GE 2.3 MW, 80 m (262.47 ft) hub height turbine; the GE 2.82 MW, 89 m (292 ft) hub height turbine; and the Gamesa 2.0 MW, 100 m (328.08 ft) hub height turbine. The selected turbines are each three-bladed, active yaw (designed to move the machine with respect to the wind direction), active blade pitch control (designed to regulate turbine rotor speed), and each has a generator/power electronic converter system. Each turbine is equipped with variable-speed control and independent blade pitch to enhance efficiency. An automated Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition ("SCADA") system located at the Project Site will provide remote supervision and control of turbine equipment and performance.⁴⁵
43. The Project will include a wind access buffer of five rotor diameters ("RD") in the prevailing wind directions and three RDs in the non-prevailing wind directions, a noise setback meeting the MPCA's Noise Standards found in Minnesota Rules Chapter 7030; a

⁴² SHPO Comments (August 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188477-01](#)).

⁴³ Ex. RCW-103 at 6 (SP Application).

⁴⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 7 (SP Application).

⁴⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 10 (SP Application).

minimum setback from residences of 1,500 feet and sufficient distance to meet noise standards, and a minimum setback of 250 feet from public roads and trails.⁴⁶

44. Rose Creek estimates the costs to design and construct the repowered Project to be approximately \$24 to 36 million. Ongoing O&M costs and administrative costs are estimated to be approximately \$700,000 to \$1.2 million per year, including landowner land lease and easement payments.⁴⁷

V. SITE LOCATION AND CHARACTERISTICS

45. The Project is located in Lodi and Adams Townships in Mower County, Minnesota.⁴⁸
46. The Project boundary contains approximately 5,258 acres⁴⁹, and leasing for the Project is nearly complete.⁵⁰ Rose Creek is still negotiating one collection line agreement and expects to secure that prior to the start of construction.⁵¹
47. Land cover within the Project boundary consists of approximately 95.8 percent cultivated crops.⁵²
48. The Project is located in a rural area. Within the Project Area, the population density is approximately 55.1 individuals per square mile.⁵³

VI. WIND RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS

49. Modeled wind speeds near the Project Area are measured at a 80 m (262.47 ft) wind speed frequency distribution and have an average wind speed of 8.78 meters per second (“m/s”).⁵⁴
50. A wind resource assessment was conducted for the Project by TrendLine Insights, LLC (“Trendline Insights”). Interannual variation is the variation in expected annual wind speeds at a specific location. The interannual variation of the 20-year ERA-5 dataset at the Project Area is 2.178%. The Project Area at 80 m (262.47 ft) is characterized with higher wind speeds during the fall, winter, and late spring (October to April; $\sim > 8.0$ m/s) and significantly lower wind speeds during the early spring and summer (May to September; $\sim < 7.0$ m/s).⁵⁵

⁴⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 8 (SP Application).

⁴⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 90 (SP Application).

⁴⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 6 (SP Application).

⁴⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 6 (SP Application).

⁵⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 7 (SP Application).

⁵¹ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 4 (Andi Direct).

⁵² Ex. RCW-103 at 42 (SP Application).

⁵³ Ex. RCW-103 at 14 (SP Application).

⁵⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 81 (SP Application).

⁵⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 74 (SP Application).

51. The Project Area is characterized by a distinct bimodal wind direction frequency distribution with prevailing winds coming from the northwest and a secondary lobe from the south. The stronger northwesterly winds occur during the winter and fall months, while the weaker southerly winds occur during the late spring and summer months.⁵⁶
52. A net capacity factor of approximately 48 percent is expected annually. The projected average annual output of approximately 73.7 gigawatt hours is anticipated for the Project.⁵⁷

VII. WIND RIGHTS AND EASEMENT/LEASE AGREEMENTS

53. At the time the Application was filed, Rose Creek had secured 95% of land leases required to accommodate setback requirements and Project infrastructure. Since then, Rose Creek has worked with landowners to secure one additional good neighbor agreement and the agreement for the laydown yard site.⁵⁸ The secured easement agreements will ensure access for construction and operation of the Project and identify the obligations and responsibilities of the landowners and Rose Creek.⁵⁹
54. Rose Creek has made three changes to the proposed Project layout to reflect the status of land leasing and easement acquisition. First, based on landowner negotiations to date, it has become increasingly unlikely that Rose Creek will be able to obtain sufficient land control to build the Alternative (T1) wind turbine shown in the Application for Scenario 1. Presuming Rose Creek is unable to secure the necessary land control, it would not build Alternative T1 and would instead construct only the six primary turbines reflected in the Application. Second, Rose Creek has identified an area for the laydown yard and signed an agreement with the landowner. The laydown yard will be approximately seven acres of land and located in the Northeast corner of the land described as follows: The East Half of the Northwest Quarter of Section 16, Township 101 North, Range 16 West, Mower County, Minnesota. Third and finally, based on the results of its native prairie survey, Rose Creek has decided to relocate one segment of the planned collection lines to avoid an identified native prairie community.⁶⁰

VIII. PROJECT SCHEDULE

55. Rose Creek anticipates Project construction starting in the second quarter of 2023, and to begin commercial operations in the fourth quarter of 2023.⁶¹

IX. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

⁵⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 75 (SP Application).

⁵⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 90 (SP Application).

⁵⁸ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 3 (Andi Direct).

⁵⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 12 (SP Application).

⁶⁰ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 3 (Andi Direct).

⁶¹ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 2 (Andi Direct).

56. On May 4, 2022, Commission Staff and EERA Staff held an in-person meeting and a May 5, 2022 remote-access public meeting. Eight people attended this meeting and provided public comments.⁶²
57. During the comment period ending May 19, 2022, written comments were filed by International Union of Operating Engineers Local 49 (“IUOE Local 49”) and North Central States Regional Council of Carpenters (“NCSRCC”), MNDNR, LIUNA Minnesota & North Dakota, and MNDOT.⁶³
58. On June 1, 2022, comments were filed by the MPCA and USFWS.⁶⁴
59. On May 18, 2022, the IUOE Local 49 and NCSRCC filed comments in support of the Project and asked the Department to consider socioeconomic impacts stemming from construction jobs created as a result of the Project in the draft site permit.⁶⁵ Site Permit Condition 10.5 addresses this issue.⁶⁶
60. On May 18, 2022, the MNDNR filed comments recommending that Rose Creek coordinate with the MNDNR to determine the need for a PPMP, utilize best management practices to minimize erosion and sediment loads that could affect downstream public waters; obtain a water use permit; conduct two years of post-construction monitoring; create a special permit condition requiring the use of wildlife friendly erosion control; create a special permit condition to minimize impacts of the substation by using shielded and downward facing lighting that minimizes blue hue; and create a permit condition requiring the permittee to avoid using chemical dust suppressants containing chloride.⁶⁷ Rose Creek has reviewed the MNDNR’s comments and agrees with the recommendations.⁶⁸ Site Permit Conditions 4.7, 5.6.2, 7.5.1, 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5 address these issues.⁶⁹
61. On May 19, 2022, LIUNA Minnesota & North Dakota filed comments in support of the Project, stating that “this repower project will provide significant socioeconomic benefits to the regional economy because the developer, Consolidated Edison, has indicated the company’s willingness to work with labor unions to recruit and utilize skilled local workers to build it.” LIUNA also states their support for the Project in saying that it will “efficiently use existing wind resources and have a minimal impact on the surrounding environment. The developer is replacing outdated wind turbines with new more efficient turbines. Additionally, the project will utilize an existing interconnection point, which is

⁶² Exs. EERA-7 (Virtual Meeting Minutes), and EERA-8 (Public Meeting Minutes).

⁶³ Ex. EERA-3 (Local 49 Comments); Ex. EERA-4 (MNDNR Comments); Ex. EERA-5 (LIUNA Comments); Ex. EERA-6 (MnDOT Comments).

⁶⁴ Exs. EERA-10 (MPCA Comments) and EERA-11 (USFWS Comments).

⁶⁵ Ex. EERA-3 (Local 49 Comments).

⁶⁶ Ex. PUC-6 (Draft Site Permit).

⁶⁷ Ex. EERA-4 (MNDNR Comments).

⁶⁸ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 4 (Andi Direct).

⁶⁹ Ex. PUC-6 (Draft Site Permit).

critical at a time of grid congestion. This project will maximize local benefits, minimize environmental impacts by upgrading an existing facility and efficiently utilize resources through the use of an existing interconnect.”⁷⁰ Site Permit Condition 10.5 addresses these issues.⁷¹

62. On May 19, 2022, the MNDOT filed comments on potential impacts and mitigation measures, stating that the Rose Creek could utilize the State of Minnesota trunk highway system for removal and delivery of materials to the project site. Also, MNDOT stated that if temporary access/changes to road radii from the state trunk highway system onto county or township roads is proposed, then Rose Creek should engage in early consultation with the MNDOT as some access may be prohibited. MNDOT expressed their appreciation for Rose Creek’s stated turbine setback of 1.1X tip height being applied to the Project. The MNDOT went on to say that Rose Creek should familiarize themselves with MNDOT construction projects within the project and anticipated delivery areas, because MNDOT’s highway construction activities could impact the Applicant’s plans to haul oversize loads to the proposed site. MNDOT also stated that early coordination with MNDOT staff is strongly encouraged. MNDOT emphasized that any permits applied for as a part of the Rose Creek Wind Project will not be issued until the PUC has issued an approved Site Permit for the Project.⁷² Rose Creek has reviewed the MNDOT comments and agrees with the recommendations.⁷³ Site Permit Conditions 5.6.2, 6.6, and 10.1 address these issues.⁷⁴
63. On June 1, 2022, the MPCA filed comments on the environmental impacts of the Project stating the following: (1) if stormwater from the Project construction has the ability to flow to the unnamed creeks along the north of the Project site that have construction-related impairments, then additional erosion and sediment control Best Management Practices (“BMPs”) are required per the MPCA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System General Construction Stormwater permit (“CSW Permit”); (2) a temporary sediment basin will also be required if 5 or more acres of the site drains to a common location.; (3) any unavoidable disturbance of the existing 50 feet of buffer to wetlands or other surface waters identified at the site (public or non-public) will require use of redundant (double) down gradient sediment controls; (3) if the total impervious surface equals 1 or more acres, then permanent stormwater management must be included in the Project plans and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan; and (4) if infiltration methods of stormwater management are not feasible due to high water tables or poorly drained soils, then use of wet sediment basins or a combination may be required.⁷⁵ Rose Creek has reviewed the MPCA’s comments and agrees with the recommendations.⁷⁶ Site Permit Condition 6.2 addresses these issues.⁷⁷

⁷⁰ Ex. EERA-5 (LIUNA Comments).

⁷¹ Ex. PUC-6 (Draft Site Permit).

⁷² Ex. EERA-6 (MNDOT Comments).

⁷³ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 5 (Andi Direct).

⁷⁴ Ex. PUC-6 (Draft Site Permit).

⁷⁵ Ex. EERA-10 (MPCA Comments).

⁷⁶ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 4 (Andi Direct).

64. On June 1, 2022, the USFWS filed comments recommending Rose Creek Wind follow both the Final Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines as well as the ECP to minimize impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and federally listed species, as well as providing the following specific comments: (1) if the status of the NLEB changes, then the USFWS recommends further coordination with the USFWS to understand implications these changes might have on project operations; (2) the lack of suitable habitat makes it highly unlikely that prairie bush-clover occurs within the proposed project area; (3) the USFWS recommends any necessary lights on buildings, turbines or meteorological (met) towers are compliant with the 2016 Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) guidance on tower lighting; and (4) if the project proponent wishes to apply for an eagle take permit, pre-construction surveys will need to comply with the data collection requirements under the 2016 Eagle Incidental Take Permit Regulations.⁷⁸ Rose Creek has reviewed the USFWS’s comments and agrees with the recommendations.⁷⁹ Site Permit Conditions 7.1, 7.5.1, 5.3.9, and 5.3.28 address these issues.⁸⁰
65. On August 15, 2022, Rose Creek filed comments that it received directly from the SHPO concerning the Project on May 18, 2022. SHPO commented on archaeological resources, history/architecture projects, and tribal consultation. Concerning archaeological resources, the SHPO stated that they look forward to reviewing the result of the additional Phase I survey work when it becomes available. Concerning history/architecture projects, the SHPO agreed with Rose Creek’s determination that the project, as currently proposed, will have no adverse effect on the Adams State Bank, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Concerning tribal consultation, the SHPO asked to be informed if any tribes express concern or disagreement with efforts to identify historic properties and/or the assessment of effects for this project.⁸¹
66. On August 15, 2022, EERA staff filed comments regarding the Commission’s draft site permit for the Project and the direct testimony of Rose Creek. Concerning the three changes to the overall project layout mentioned in the direct testimony, EERA stated that it appreciates the updates on Alternative (A1) turbine, the laydown yard area, and relocation of one segment of the collection line system provided by Rose Creek. EERA supports Rose Creek’s plan to only proceed with the use of turbine locations with which they can reach agreements with landowners, as this will eliminate the need for wind access buffer waivers. EERA supports Rose Creek’s request that the specifically identified laydown yard be included on an updated Site Map to be attached to the Site Permit. EERA supports the collection line segment shift to the other side of the road to avoid native prairie impacts. EERA staff agrees with Rose Creek’s requested revision to Section 2.1 of the DSP. Concerning the ADLS, EERA stated that ADLS provides a good mitigation measure to reduce impacts on nighttime aesthetics for local residents. EERA deferred to the Commission’s weighing of factors as to whether the mitigation benefits outweigh the cost of ADLS implementation and maintenance at the Rose Creek Wind

⁷⁷ Ex. PUC-6 (Draft Site Permit).

⁷⁸ Ex. EERA-11 (USFWS Comments).

⁷⁹ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 4 (Andi Direct).

⁸⁰ Ex. PUC-6 (Draft Site Permit).

⁸¹ SHPO Comments (August 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188363-01](#)).

Project. Concerning the decommissioning of the existing Rose Wind facility, EERA staff disagreed that Special Condition 6.1 is unnecessary and beyond the scope of this proceeding. However, EERA agreed with Rose Creek that the decommissioning of the existing Rose Wind Project and commencement of construction of the proposed Rose Creek Wind Project can occur concurrently. Thus, EERA supports the deletion of the second sentence in Special Condition 6.1.⁸²

67. On August 15, 2022, LIUNA filed comments in support of the Project stating the Project will provide significant socioeconomic benefits to the regional economy. LIUNA recommended that the Commission issue a site permit for the proposed large wind energy conversion system with no additional conditions or requirements included in the site permit.⁸³
68. On August 19, 2022, Rose Creek filed comments that it received directly from the SHPO concerning the Project on August 17, 2022. SHPO acknowledged that it had reviewed the addendum survey report covering areas that were not accessible during the previous survey efforts and the revised project layout submitted by Rose Creek in July 2022. SHPO commented on archaeological resources, history/architecture projects, and tribal consultation. Concerning archaeological resources, SHPO concluded that there are no known or suspected archaeological sites that will be affected by the project as it is currently proposed. Concerning history/architecture projects, SHPO agreed with Rose Creek's determination that the project, as currently proposed, will have no adverse effect on the Adams State Bank. Concerning tribal consultation, SHPO asked to be informed if any tribes express concern or disagreement with efforts to identify historic properties and/or the assessment of effects for this project.⁸⁴

X. SITE PERMIT CRITERIA

69. Wind energy projects are governed by Minn. Stat. Ch. 216F and Minn. R. Ch. 7854. Minn. Stat. § 216F.01, subd. 2, defines a large wind energy conversion system as a combination of wind energy conversion systems with a combined nameplate capacity of five (5) MW or more. Minn. Stat. § 216F.03 requires that a LWECS be sited in an orderly manner compatible with environmental preservation, sustainable development, and the efficient use of resources.
70. In addition, when deciding whether to issue a site permit for a LWECS, the Commission considers the factors set forth in Minn. Stat. § 216E.03, subd. 7, which specifies, in relevant part, that the Commission "shall be guided by, but not limited to, the following considerations:
 - (1) evaluation of research and investigations relating to the effects on land, water and air resources of large electric power generating plants and high-voltage transmission lines and the

⁸² EERA Public Hearing Comments (August 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188365-01](#)).

⁸³ LIUNA Comments (August 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188370-01](#)).

⁸⁴ SHPO Comments (August 19, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188477-01](#)).

effects of water and air discharges and electric and magnetic fields resulting from such facilities on public health and welfare, vegetation, animals, materials and aesthetic values, including baseline studies, predictive modeling, and evaluation of new or improved methods for minimizing adverse impacts of water and air discharges and other matters pertaining to the effects of power plants on the water and air environment;

(2) environmental evaluation of sites . . . proposed for future development and expansion and their relationship to the land, water, air and human resources of the state;

(3) evaluation of the effects of new electric power generation . . . systems related to power plants designed to minimize adverse environmental effects;

(4) evaluation of the potential for beneficial uses of waste energy from proposed large electric power generating plants;

(5) analysis of the direct and indirect economic impact of proposed sites . . . including, but not limited to, productive agricultural land lost or impaired;

(6) evaluation of adverse direct and indirect environmental effects that cannot be avoided should the proposed site . . . be accepted;

(7) evaluation of alternatives to the applicant's proposed site . . . proposed pursuant to subdivisions 1 and 2;

(8) ***

(9) evaluation of governmental survey lines and other natural division lines of agricultural land so as to minimize interference with agricultural operations;

(10) ***

(11) evaluation of irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources should the proposed site . . . be approved; and

(12) when appropriate, consideration of problems raised by other state and federal agencies and local entities.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ Minn. Stat. § 216E.03, subd. 7. Considerations (8) and (10) are omitted because they pertain only to proposed routes of high voltage transmission lines.

71. The Commission must also consider whether the applicant has complied with all applicable procedural requirements.⁸⁶
72. The Commission's rules require the applicant to provide information regarding any potential impacts of the proposed project, potential mitigation measures, and any adverse effects that cannot be avoided as part of the application process.⁸⁷ No separate environmental review document is required for a LWECS project.⁸⁸

XI. APPLICATION OF SITING CRITERIA TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Human Settlement

73. The Project is located in a rural, agricultural region in southeastern Minnesota.⁸⁹ Within the Project area, the population density is approximately 55.1 persons per square mile. The Project Boundary includes both Adams and Lodi Townships in Mower County, Minnesota, while all Project infrastructure will be in Adams Township. No municipalities are within the Project Site. The City of Adams is directly north of the Project and the City of Taopi is 1.5 miles northeast. The City of Austin, located approximately 15 miles (24.14 km) northwest of the Project Site, is the county seat and largest city in Mower County.⁹⁰
74. There are 11 windfarms and 385 wind turbines (including the 11 existing Rose Wind turbines) within 10 miles of the Project Boundary of various heights, rotor diameters, and lighting mechanisms.⁹¹
75. The Project area is rural in nature with an agriculture-based economy and will remain so after construction.⁹² The Project will not displace residents and will not significantly change the population size or demographics in the Project area or Mower County.⁹³

B. Zoning and Land Use

76. The Project is located in Mower County in an area zoned for agricultural use.⁹⁴
77. Mower County has adopted a Comprehensive Plan and a Zoning Ordinance. The land for the Project is zoned for agricultural use, however, the Project Site contains an existing

⁸⁶ Minn. R. 7854.1000, subp. 3.

⁸⁷ Minn. R. 7854.0500, subp. 7.

⁸⁸ Minn. R. 7854.0500, subp. 7 ("The analysis of the environmental impacts required by this subpart satisfies the environmental review requirements of chapter 4410, parts 7849.1000 to 7849.2100, and Minnesota Statutes, chapter 116D. No environmental assessment worksheet or environmental impact statement shall be required on a proposed LWECS project.").

⁸⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 14 (SP Application).

⁹⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 14 (SP Application).

⁹¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 24 (SP Application).

⁹² Ex. RCW-103 at 43 (SP Application).

⁹³ Ex. RCW-103 at 14, 15 (SP Application).

⁹⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 15 (SP Application).

wind farm surrounded by agricultural land. The Project will involve the replacement of existing turbines with new turbines in the same general vicinity, and the surrounding area will remain in agricultural use. As such, no significant change to land use is proposed.⁹⁵

78. According to Mower County Zoning Maps, the Project falls entirely within the Agricultural District. The Zoning Ordinance also includes a Shoreland Management Overlay District, which may apply to new development within 300 ft (91.44 m) of Public Water Inventory (“PWI”)-listed waterways.⁹⁶
79. The intent of the Shoreland Management Overlay policy is to regulate the subdivision, use, and development of shoreland areas to: (1) protect and enhance the quality of surface waters; (2) preserve the natural environmental values (steep slopes, vegetation, and wildlife); (3) promote wise utilization of waters related to land resources; and (4) preserve historic values. Shoreland is located within 1,000 ft (304.8 m) of the normal high-water mark of a lake, pond, or flowage; and within 300 ft (91.44 m) of any river or stream, or the landward extent of a floodplain designated by ordinance on a river or stream, whichever is greater. Per the County’s Zoning Ordinance Section 14-90, the Shoreland Overlay regulations apply to all public waters in the unincorporated areas of Mower County. Within the Project Site, Shoreland Management Overlay occurs within 300 ft (91.44 m) of one public waterway in the north central portion of the Project.⁹⁷
80. Within the Zoning Ordinance, Mower County also maintains a Floodplain Management Ordinance, which applies to all Floodway, Flood Fringe, or General Floodplain areas within the county. There are no mapped floodplains that fall within the Project.⁹⁸
81. The Mower County Zoning Ordinance outlines special requirements for wind energy conversion facilities with a rated capacity of 100 kilowatt (kW) or less and between 100 kW and 5 MW. Per the ordinance, wind energy conversion systems are a permitted use within agricultural districts if they are 100 kW or less and are allowed as a conditional use if between 100 kW and 5 MW. The existing Rose Wind turbines were sited following the then-current Ordinance. The Project will have a total capacity of up to 17.4 MW; therefore, the County requirements do not apply to the Rose Creek Wind Project.⁹⁹
82. The Project is consistent with the Mower County Comprehensive Plan’s goals to conserve prime agricultural lands for long-term agricultural use, conserve and enhance the County’s rich natural resource base, and maintain healthful living environments and compatible land use relationships. Since there are existing wind turbines that are considered compatible with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, the replacement wind

⁹⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 15-18 (SP Application).

⁹⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 17 (SP Application).

⁹⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 17 (SP Application).

⁹⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 17 (SP Application).

⁹⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 17 (SP Application).

turbines will continue to be compatible with the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan.¹⁰⁰

83. The Project is not likely to impact future zoning and expansion of incorporated areas in the Project Area. Urban Expansion Districts are intended to designate areas of the County where urban development can take place. The Project is located more than 5 miles from the nearest Urban Expansion District, which will minimize potential impacts on future urban growth. The Project will also allow for participating landowners to continue to use their agricultural land for activities such as farming and grazing, with a minimal loss of land that will be occupied by Project facilities. In return, participating landowners will receive income from Project leases. The Project will positively impact local economies by providing a diversified income stream for landowners, possible temporary construction jobs for local workers and suppliers, and tax benefits to the local governments.¹⁰¹
84. The Project compliments current agricultural and other land uses within and nearby the Project boundary and does not conflict with the applicable zoning and/or comprehensive plan requirements. The Project is not expected to impact future zoning and expansion of developed areas in the surrounding area. The Project infrastructure is compliant with the Mower County setback conditions to the extent practicable to minimize impacts on future agricultural use. The location of the Project will not limit continued agricultural use of the surrounding area. The Project is not expected to have negative impacts on local zoning, conservation easements, or comprehensive plans. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek Wind has taken steps to avoid and minimize impacts to land use and local zoning.¹⁰²
85. All turbines associated with the Project are located within the Agricultural District. Rose Creek plans to site turbines and any associated aboveground facilities outside of the Shoreland Management Overlay District. Because the Project will involve decommissioning of existing turbines and constructing new turbines in the vicinity, the Project will continue to be compatible with the existing Mower County zoning ordinance. If any new shoreland crossings or land use changes occur as a part of the Project, Rose Creek will comply with the applicable regulations, as necessary.¹⁰³

C. Property Values

86. Project facilities will be sited and constructed predominantly on leased agricultural lands owned by participating landowners being compensated for the use of their property.¹⁰⁴ The Project is not expected to have negative impacts on local zoning, conservation easements, or comprehensive plans. There is no evidence in the record indicating that the Project will negatively impact property values in the Project area.

¹⁰⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 18 (SP Application).

¹⁰¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 18 (SP Application).

¹⁰² Ex. RCW-103 at 18 (SP Application).

¹⁰³ Ex. RCW-103 at 18 (SP Application).

¹⁰⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 46 (SP Application).

87. The Project may alter the viewshed from nearby public and private lands. However, as this is a repowering project, turbine structures are already present within the viewshed of the Project Area. The number of turbines will be reduced from eleven to six or seven and it is not anticipated to have an impact on tourism in this area.¹⁰⁵
88. The record demonstrates that the Project will not negatively impact property values of participating or non-participating landowners, within or near the Project area.

D. Noise

89. The operation of wind turbines produces noise. “Noise” means “any sound not occurring in the natural environment, including, but not limited to, sounds emanating from aircraft and highways, and industrial, commercial, and residential sources.”¹⁰⁶ The term “background or ambient noise” as described in the MPCA’s Guide to Noise Control in Minnesota refers to all noise sources other than the noise source of concern. Common background sound sources within an agricultural and/or rural environment include, but are not limited to, sound from farm equipment such as tractors and combines, sound generated from traffic on roadways, sounds from birds, and wind rustling through the vegetation.
90. LWECS, along with all other sources of man-made noise, must comply with the MPCA’s Noise Standards found in Minn. R. Ch. 7030.¹⁰⁷ The Noise Standards regulate noise from the operation of the wind turbines and other project-related sources. The Noise Standards limit the sound pressure level, measured in decibels, using the A-weighted scale (“dB(A”).¹⁰⁸ The Noise Standards specify both L₁₀ and L₅₀ limits for one-hour periods for daytime and nighttime hours.¹⁰⁹ L₁₀ is the sound pressure level exceeded ten percent of the time for a one-hour survey, and L₅₀ is the sound pressure level exceeded 50 percent of the time for a one-hour survey.¹¹⁰
91. The Noise Standards are specific to the type of land use adjacent to the Project. The most stringent limits are for Noise Area Classification (“NAC”) 1, which includes household units, including farm houses.¹¹¹ In NAC 1, the nighttime noise limit is 50 dB(A).¹¹² The Noise Standards also contain specific measurement procedures to be used for accurately measuring the noise from the source only, while taking care not to include noise from

¹⁰⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 45 (SP Application).

¹⁰⁶ Minn. Stat. § 116.06, subd. 15.

¹⁰⁷ Minn. Stat. § § 116.07(c) and 216E.03, subd. 7(d) and Minn. R. Ch. 7030.

¹⁰⁸ Minn. R. 7030.0020 and 7030.0040.

¹⁰⁹ Minn. R. 7030.0040.

¹¹⁰ Minn. R. 7030.0020, subp. 7 and 8.

¹¹¹ Minn. R. 7030.0050, subp. 2.

¹¹² Minn. R. 7030.0040, subp. 2.

“background noise”, which is defined as “any ambient noise other than the noise to be measured, including wind, precipitation, traffic, etc.”¹¹³

92. The Project is in an agricultural land use setting. Therefore, existing sources of noise may include frequent agricultural activity road use by freight truck and automobile traffic, farmstead operations, wind turbine operations, and intermittent aircraft overflights. There are 11 existing wind turbines within the Project Site, 15 turbines within 1,000 ft of the Project Boundary, and 21 turbines within 0.5 mile of the Project Boundary.¹¹⁴
93. Rose Creek contracted with KiloNewton to conduct a sound modeling study. The modeling was conducted using OpenWind, a modeling software that calculates sound levels at site-specific locations using sound sensitive receptors. The modeling results of Scenario 1 indicate that the maximum value at any receptor due to the Project was found to be just below 47.0 dB(A); therefore, the Project is not projected to cause or contribute to any exceedance of the standard. No receptors were modeled to exceed a total sound of 50 dB(A). The modeling results of Scenario 2 indicate the maximum value at any receptor due to the Project was 46.4 dB(A); therefore, the Project is not projected to cause or contribute to any exceedance of the standard. No receptors were modeled to exceed a total sound of 50 dB(A).¹¹⁵
94. Project-specific sounds may also be produced temporarily during Project construction. The sound levels resulting from construction activities vary significantly depending on several factors, such as the type and age of equipment, the specific equipment manufacturer and model, the operations being performed, and the overall condition of the equipment and exhaust system mufflers. Reasonable efforts will be made to minimize the impact of sound resulting from construction activities. Most Project construction work will occur during the daytime, although some construction may occur outside of typical business hours; construction that occurs outside of normal business hours is typically work that needs to be finished during the same time period as it is initiated (e.g., concrete pouring). All equipment will be maintained in good working order in accordance with manufacturer specifications.¹¹⁶
95. Project construction and decommissioning activities that produce noise will comply with applicable state and local regulations. The Project will comply with MPCA noise standards based on the acoustic modeling results and all turbines will be set back more than 1,500 ft from receptors. The Project will adhere to the MPUC process for documenting, investigating, and resolving complaints related to Project noise.¹¹⁷

E. Shadow Flicker

¹¹³ Minn. R. 7030.0060 and “A Guide to Noise Control in Minnesota; Acoustical Properties, Measurement, Analysis and Regulation,” MPCA (November 2015) available at: www.pca.state.mn.us (accessed March 8, 2018) [hereinafter “MPCA Guide”] at 13.

¹¹⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 20 (SP Application).

¹¹⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 21-22 (SP Application).

¹¹⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 22 (SP Application).

¹¹⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 22-23 (SP Application).

96. Shadow flicker is an intermittent change in light intensity from the interaction of an operating wind turbine and the sun. The result may be repeated changes in brightness as wind turbine blades rotate. Shadow flicker is limited to time periods when the wind turbine is operating, and the sun is shining. In addition, shadow flicker is limited to the times of day when a window of the participating or non-participating residence is in the shadow of the wind turbine.¹¹⁸
97. Shadow flicker is currently present in the Project Area due to operating turbines, including Adams Wind, Rose Wind, and other nearby wind farms. No complaints are known to have been recorded related to shadow flicker from existing turbines.¹¹⁹
98. Rose Creek designed the Project to minimize potential impacts from shadow flicker on participating and non-participating residences. These design considerations include turbine setbacks of at least 1,500 ft (456 m) from participating and non-participating residences and fewer turbines than the existing Rose Wind Project, which will result in reduced shadow flicker.¹²⁰
99. The modeled shadow flicker results demonstrate that no residence is expected to experience shadow flicker more than 30 hours per year.¹²¹
100. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to avoid and minimize impacts from shadow flicker.¹²²

F. Aesthetic Impacts

101. The topography of the Project Area is relatively flat, with some areas of undulating, rolling relief. There are no USFWS national parks or refuges, USFWS Waterfowl Production Areas, Minnesota state parks, MNDNR aquatic management areas, MNDNR wildlife management areas (WMA), or other MNDNR-managed lands within the Project Site. However, there are several public recreation and wildlife areas within 3 miles (4.83 km) of the Project. One waterway listed on the state Public Waters Inventory, a tributary to Little Cedar River, is located in the north central portion of the Project Site. Private lands and homes in this area of Mower County include residential farmsteads along rural county and township roads.
102. The existing Rose Wind project is located within the Project Site and consists of 11 turbines with red-blinking lights. These will be decommissioned prior to the commercial operation of the proposed Project. There are 11 windfarms and 385 wind turbines (including the 11 existing Rose Wind turbines) within 10 miles of the Project Boundary of various heights, rotor diameters, and lighting mechanisms. MET towers associated

¹¹⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 24 (SP Application).

¹¹⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 24 (SP Application).

¹²⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 26 (SP Application).

¹²¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 27 (SP Application).

¹²² Ex. RCW-103 at 24-27 (SP Application).

with these wind facilities may be present on the landscape with individual lighting systems.¹²³

103. While the installation of the proposed wind turbines may impact the visual surroundings of the wind facility and could visually impact public resources and individuals' visual experiences, the degree of visual impact will vary based on personal preferences. The Project will not be introducing a new feature type to the landscape, and it will not create a new impact on public resources because many wind turbines are currently operating in the Project Area. The Project meets MPUC setback requirements, and public resources are not present within the Project Site, with the exception of one public water that will not be impacted.¹²⁴
104. The number of turbines in the immediate vicinity will be reduced by four or five, after the removal of the 11 Rose Wind turbines and depending on the Rose Creek layout scenario. In addition, no MET towers will be constructed for Rose Creek. Therefore, the overall impact from turbine lighting will be less than current conditions.¹²⁵
105. The Project's facilities will include up to 7 wind turbines, collector lines, gravel turbine access roads, and a temporary construction yard. The Project will not include a meteorological evaluation tower ("MET") or an operations and maintenance ("O&M") facility.¹²⁶ The existing Rose Wind project does not include MET towers.¹²⁷

G. Local Economy

106. Overall, the Project will positively impact the local economy by providing new revenue streams to participating landowners and by continuing to support the county's tax base.¹²⁸
107. Mower County will experience short-term positive economic impacts associated with tax payments during the construction phase of the Project through the use of the hotels, restaurants, and other consumer goods and services by the various workers, as well as the purchase of materials such as fuel, equipment, services, and supplies necessary to construct and operate the facilities from local vendors.¹²⁹
108. The existing Rose Wind project has been providing significant long-term positive economic benefits to the state and the local economy of southeastern Minnesota. The current production tax is \$0.36 per MW hour. Rose Wind is unique in that the land occupied by Project facilities, including the turbines, access roads, and most of the collector lines, is owned in fee by CED, which pays a property tax of 0.85% of the property's market value. These lands will continue to be owned by CED via a holding

¹²³ Ex. RCW-103 at 24 (SP Application).

¹²⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 25 (SP Application).

¹²⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 25-26 (SP Application).

¹²⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 1 (SP Application).

¹²⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 6 (SP Application).

¹²⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 46 (SP Application).

¹²⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 46-47 (SP Application).

company also solely owned by CED, and therefore will continue to provide property tax revenue to local governments, albeit at a new valuation that does not include the Rose Wind turbines.¹³⁰

109. The existing turbines that were built in 2004 and 2005, have nameplate capacities that are 1.5 and 1.65 MW. The newer turbines replacing the existing turbines have a higher nameplate capacity of 2 MW to 2.82 MW. Since the turbines are newer, they are going to increase reliability, as well as efficiency. The byproduct of this is an increase in yearly generation of electricity from the new turbines when compared to the existing turbines. Consequentially, there will be increased wind energy production tax revenue to the county and township due to a certain multiplier times energy produced and megawatt hours a year.¹³¹
110. It is anticipated that the new Rose Creek Project will pay a wind energy production tax to Mower County of \$1.20 per MW hour of electricity produced. This will result in an annual wind energy production tax of approximately \$70,000 to \$80,000 for Mower County and Adams Township once the Project is operational. In comparison, the existing Rose Wind had an average annual wind energy production tax of approximately \$12,000 to \$13,000.¹³²
111. The Project's estimated total payments to landowners are expected to exceed \$2 million over the life of the Project.¹³³
112. The Project is expected to create approximately 50 construction jobs and the existing local staff are currently planned to be retained for O&M of the Project, once complete.¹³⁴
113. Mitigation measures are not anticipated because socioeconomic impacts associated with the Project will be primarily positive with an influx of wages and expenditures made at local businesses during Project construction and an increase in the County's tax base from the construction and operation of the wind turbines. In addition, the Project will not result in permanent impacts to agricultural land after decommissioning.¹³⁵
114. The record demonstrates that the Project will result in both short- and long-term benefits to the local economy.

H. Public Health and Safety

115. The term electromagnetic fields ("EMF") refers to electric and magnetic fields that are present around electrical devices indoors and outdoors. Voltage or electrical chargers generate electric fields and the flow of electricity along transmission lines, collector lines,

¹³⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 46 (SP Application).

¹³¹ Exs. EERA-7 at 12 (Virtual Meeting Minutes) and EERA-8 at 12 (Public Meeting Minutes).

¹³² Ex. RCW-103 at 47 (SP Application).

¹³³ Ex. RCW-103 at 47 (SP Application).

¹³⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 46 (SP Application).

¹³⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 47 (SP Application).

and substation transformers generate magnetic fields. The intensity of the electric field is related to the voltage of the line and the intensity of the magnetic field is related to the current flow wire. EMF strength decreases significantly with increasing distance from the source.¹³⁶

116. EMF associated with a transformer or turbine will dissipate within 5 ft (1.5 m), and the Project was sited beyond typical dissipation distances where EMFs will be at background levels. Furthermore, all collector lines will be buried at a depth of 50 to 54 inches (1.27 m – 1.37 m) and EMF from underground collector lines dissipates within 20 ft (6.1 m) on either side because they are buried and wound with copper wires. No conclusive evidence exists that EMFs from wind facilities and their associated equipment present health concerns.¹³⁷
117. The Project will comply with required setbacks and Rose Creek will regularly inspect and maintain each turbine in good condition. Additionally, impacts to safety and security of the local population from construction and maintenance are not expected. During operation, the Project will not interfere with emergency services.¹³⁸

I. Public Service and Infrastructure

118. The Project is in rural southern Minnesota immediately north of the Iowa border. Rural residences in the Project Area are served by a system of existing roads and utilities that provide access, water, electricity, telephone, and other communication services to rural residences and farmsteads. Rural residences and farmsteads are likely to use private septic systems and water wells for household needs. The small cities of Adams and Taopi, Minnesota are located north of and adjacent to and 1.5 miles northeast, respectively, of the Project Area.¹³⁹
119. Rose Creek Wind will submit FAA Form 7460 for the Project. The FAA evaluates the aeronautical compatibility and regulatory compliance under FAA Part 77. Additionally, a Tall Towers Permit and approval may be required by MNDOT, if the turbines are greater than 500 ft above ground level, prior to developing the Project to ensure the safety of airspace within Minnesota. Determinations of no hazard are anticipated in spring 2022; the Project does not anticipate any impacts to aviation.¹⁴⁰
120. Existing road infrastructure within the Project Site consists of state, county, and township roads that typically follow section lines, farmstead driveways, and farming access roads. Various county and township roads provide access to the Project Site. No railroads were identified within the Project Site.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 59 (SP Application).

¹³⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 60 (SP Application).

¹³⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 40 (SP Application).

¹³⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 28 (SP Application).

¹⁴⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 39-40 (SP Application).

¹⁴¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 28 (SP Application).

121. Temporary impacts are expected to public roads during construction as materials, personnel, and equipment will be brought in via existing highways and roads. Construction traffic will use the existing county, township, and state roadway system to access the Project and deliver construction materials and personnel. Changes to road radii for turbine and blade delivery may be required; however, they will be returned to pre-construction conditions. After construction is complete, operation activities for the new (up to 7) turbines will be similar to the existing (11) turbines. There will be no new operational activities and traffic in the Project Area will not increase.¹⁴²
122. To mitigate potential impacts to public roads during construction, prior to construction, Rose Creek Wind will coordinate with MNDOT, Adams Township, and the Mower County Public Works Department to ensure all relevant permits are obtained, delivery plans are communicated, traffic management plans are implemented where necessary, and weight limits are not exceeded. Additionally, large trucks will have a maximum speed limit of 25 miles per hour within project construction areas. Rose Creek will negotiate road use agreements with applicable roadway authorities to ensure that impacted or damaged roadways will be restored to their original condition or better. Temporary impacts to the landscape associated with temporary access road approaches, the crane walks, and other temporary activities will be restored to previous agricultural conditions or otherwise reseeded with seed mixes appropriate for the region. Traffic is not expected to increase during the operations phase of the Project.¹⁴³
123. There are several communication systems in the Project Area, including microwave, radio, fixed land-mobile stations, and television. Rose Creek also identified one cellular site recorded with the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) that is owned by Verizon and located 7.55 miles (12.2 km) east of the Project Boundary. No pipelines were identified within the Project Site in publicly available databases or mapping. However, according to Minnesota Geospatial Information, three electric transmission lines 69 kV and greater are located within the Project Site. In addition, two other transmission or distribution lines under 69 kV are located within the Project Site.¹⁴⁴
124. Based on Rose Creek Wind’s analysis of the proposed turbine locations, there are no potential obstructions between the wind turbine locations and the Fresnel Zones or Consultation Zones of the incumbent microwave paths in the Project Area. Thus, no impacts on microwave paths are anticipated due to the Project.¹⁴⁵
125. As there were no stations found within 3 km (1.86 miles) of the Project, which is the maximum possible exclusion distance based on a directional AM antenna broadcasting at 1000 KHz or less, the Project should not impact the coverage of local AM stations. The coverage of FM stations is generally not sensitive to interference due to wind turbines, especially when large objects (e.g., wind turbines) are located in the far field region of the radiating antenna to avoid the risk of distorting its radiation pattern. Station KFNL-FM is

¹⁴² Ex. RCW-103 at 31 (SP Application).

¹⁴³ Ex. RCW-103 at 33 (SP Application).

¹⁴⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 29-30 (SP Application).

¹⁴⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 31, 33 (SP Application).

the nearest FM station to the Project Site at 9.9 km (6.15 miles) away. At this distance there should be adequate separation to avoid radiation pattern distortion.¹⁴⁶

126. The Project is not anticipated to have any impacts to licensed and operational AM or FM broadcast stations, and mitigation is not anticipated.¹⁴⁷
127. Fixed land-mobile stations may be used in the Project Area for police, fire, emergency medical services, emergency management, hospitals, public works, transportation and other state, county, and municipal agencies, among other reasons. Fixed land mobile-stations are typically unaffected by wind projects because their systems have multiple transmitters that provide redundancies such that their signals can be broadcasted around wind turbines. No significant impacts are anticipated to these services in the Project Area.¹⁴⁸ Six site-based licenses were identified in the communication systems study area.¹⁴⁹
128. The Project is not anticipated to have any impacts on fixed land-mobile stations, and mitigation is not anticipated.¹⁵⁰
129. Based on an Off-Air TV Analysis that was completed in February 2021, a total of 93 database records were identified for TV stations within approximately 150 km (93.21 miles) of the Project. Based on the analysis, it was determined that 11 of the full-power digital TV stations and 2 low-power digital TV stations may have their reception interrupted, however, the areas primarily affected would be within 10 km (6.21 miles) of the turbines that have clear line-of-sight to a proposed wind turbine but not to the respective station. Residences may have degraded reception from these stations due to multipath interference caused by signal scattering because TV signals are reflected by the rotating wind turbine blades and masts. However, modern digital TV receivers have undergone significant improvements to mitigate the effects of signal scattering. When used in combination with a directional antenna, it is even less likely that signal scattering from wind farms will cause interference to digital TV reception. Nevertheless, signal scattering could still impact certain areas currently served by the TV stations, especially those that would have line-of-sight to at least one wind turbine but not to the station antennae.¹⁵¹
130. In the unlikely event that interference is observed in any of the TV service areas, the interference may be mitigated through use of a high-gain directional antenna placed outside and oriented towards the signal origin. Both cable service and direct broadcast satellite service will be unaffected by the presence of the wind turbine facility. If TV interference is reported, Rose Creek will log the report, determine if the interference is related to the Project, and work with the landowner and local communication technician

¹⁴⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 31 (SP Application).

¹⁴⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 33 (SP Application).

¹⁴⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 31 (SP Application).

¹⁴⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 29 (SP Application).

¹⁵⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 33 (SP Application).

¹⁵¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 32 (SP Application).

to determine if a high-grain directional antenna could be installed. Alternatively, Rose Creek may offer monetary compensation comparable to the direct cost of the antenna.¹⁵²

131. The telephone communications in the mobile phone carrier bands are typically unaffected by the presence of the wind turbines and no significant harmful effect to mobile phone services are anticipated in the Project Area. The Project is also not expected to impact broadband service. Thus, no mitigation is anticipated.¹⁵³
132. The Project will be constructed to avoid impacts to pipelines and other underground infrastructure as well as overhead transmission lines. Although not a requirement under Minnesota rules, Project turbines will be set back at least 1.1 times total height from all electric transmission lines as an impact avoidance measure.¹⁵⁴
133. The Project is not anticipated to have any impacts on pipeline or transmission lines and mitigation is not anticipated.¹⁵⁵
134. The record demonstrates that construction and operation of the Project is expected to have a minimal effect on existing public services and infrastructure in the area.¹⁵⁶

J. Recreational Resources

135. Recreational opportunities in Mower County (MN) and Mitchell County (IA) include areas to bike, hike, fish, hunt, camp, and observe nature.¹⁵⁷
136. There are no state or county parks/trails located within the Project, however, Shooting Star State Trail runs adjacent to the northern Project Boundary. Additionally, there is one county-managed trail in Iowa. The Wapsi-Great Western Line Trail (designated as both a recreational trail and bike trail), located 2.6 miles (4.18 km) east of the Project. Lake Loise State Park (MN) is located 7.0-miles (11.26 km) east of the Project. The park offers swimming, fishing, and paddling in its 25-acre man-made lake, as well as hiking and horseback riding. There are two county parks located in Iowa within the 10 miles (16.09 km) of the Project. The Wapsi-Great Western Line Bike Trail is designated as a county park and owned and managed by Mitchell County. The bike trail is split into two segments, north and south, and travels through Lake Hendricks Park in Elma, Iowa and the Wapsi-Great Western Line Recreation Area near the city of McIntire. The northern segment of the trail/park meanders through the Pinicon Alders WMA before reaching the Minnesota-Iowa border. Riverside County Park, located 5.6-miles (9.01 km) southeast of the Project in Stacyville Iowa, offers recreationists a place to camp, fish, and canoe in Little Cedar River.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵² Ex. RCW-103 at 33-34 (SP Application).

¹⁵³ Ex. RCW-103 at 32, 34 (SP Application).

¹⁵⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 33 (SP Application).

¹⁵⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 34 (SP Application).

¹⁵⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 28 (SP Application).

¹⁵⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 37 (SP Application).

¹⁵⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 38-39 (SP Application).

137. Mower County has more than 250 miles (402.34 km) of state-designated snowmobile trails. While no snowmobile trails traverse the Project, portions of three trails are within 10 miles (16.09 km) of the Project.
138. The Project will avoid Scientific Natural Areas (“SNA”). The closest SNA, Shooting Star Prairie, is located approximately 4.5 miles (7.24 km) east of the Project.¹⁵⁹
139. Several public and recreational lands are located within 10 miles (16.09 km) of the Project. However, there are no public lands located within the Project Site and the Project will not impact the Shooting Star State Trail. Therefore, direct impacts to recreational facilities are not anticipated. Though the Wapsipinicon River does flow through the Project Site, no collector lines or access roads/crane paths will cross the waterbody.¹⁶⁰
140. In addition, the number of turbines will be reduced from eleven to six or seven, potentially reducing the number of turbines within the viewshed of recreational lands. Turbines will be sited consistent with the 3 RD X 5 RD setback from recreational lands and trails.¹⁶¹
141. The design and mitigative measures described above will effectively minimize impacts such that the Project will not cause adverse impacts to recreational resources.¹⁶² Based on the record, no significant impacts to recreational opportunities are anticipated.

K. Land-Based Economies

142. The majority of the Project Area is in agricultural cropland. Cultivated crops account for approximately 5,038 acres or approximately 95.8% of the Project Site. Mower County has approximately 1,068 active farms with approximately 447,193 acres of land in farms.¹⁶³
143. Local forested land within the Project Area is generally associated with homes in the form of woodlots and along the creeks. These, however, are not typically considered economically significant forest resources.¹⁶⁴
144. A review of the MNDOT Aggregate Source Information System indicates one aggregate pit in the Project Area.¹⁶⁵
145. The Project is not expected to significantly impact agricultural land use or the general character of the area. Approximately 2.85 acres (approximately 0.05% of the Project Site) of land will be taken out of agricultural production for the life of the Project to accommodate the turbine pads and permanent access roads. Landowners may continue to

¹⁵⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 39 (SP Application).

¹⁶⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 39 (SP Application).

¹⁶¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 39 (SP Application).

¹⁶² Ex. RCW-103 at 39 (SP Application).

¹⁶³ Ex. RCW-103 at 42 (SP Application).

¹⁶⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 43 (SP Application).

¹⁶⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 43 (SP Application).

plant crops near and graze livestock up to the turbine pads. In some instances, agricultural practices will be impacted by requiring new maneuvering routes around the turbine structures for agricultural equipment. Less than 0.1 percent of the Project Site will be converted to non-agricultural land use. This will not significantly alter crop production in the Project Site.¹⁶⁶

146. The Project is not expected to significantly impact agricultural land use or the general character of the area. Construction activities such as clearing, grading, trench excavation and backfilling, as well as the movement of construction equipment within the construction easement, may result in impacts on farmland resources. Potential impacts on soil resources include soil erosion, soil compaction, reduction of soil fertility and changes to other soil characteristics.¹⁶⁷
147. No feedlots will be impacted by the Project; however, during construction, agricultural practices may be interrupted temporarily in areas that are typically farmed and construction activities may result in the temporary reduction in access to those areas and damage to drain tiles. Drain tiles will be repaired as needed, during construction. This economic impact is offset through lease payments agreed to by the landowner. Overall, long term operations will not significantly alter existing crop production in the Project Area or Mower County.¹⁶⁸
148. A majority of the woodlots are associated with homesteads, which are not considered economically significant resources. Mixed forested areas account for less than 1% of the total Project Site, and very few trees are anticipated to be removed for Project construction. Therefore, impacts to forestry-based economies are not anticipated.¹⁶⁹
149. Project infrastructure will not be located within or near existing mines; therefore, impacts to mining resources are not anticipated. Rose Creek Wind may request to use aggregate from mining operations for use during construction. Rose Creek Wind will coordinate with the local mining operations, as appropriate. No abandoned mines are known to exist within the Project.¹⁷⁰
150. Rose Creek will implement the following BMPs: (1) Topsoil will be stripped from any agricultural area used for traffic or vehicle parking, segregated, and replaced during restoration activities, (2) Drainage problems caused by construction will be corrected to prevent damage to agricultural fields; (3) Following completion of construction and during decommissioning, subsoils will be decompacted in all construction areas that will return to use as agricultural fields, (4) Permanent access roads will be left for future use

¹⁶⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 43 (SP Application).

¹⁶⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 43 (SP Application).

¹⁶⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 43 (SP Application).

¹⁶⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 44 (SP Application).

¹⁷⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 44 (SP Application).

only if requested by the property's landowner; and (5) Excess concrete will not be buried or left in active agricultural areas.¹⁷¹

151. The proposed mitigative measures will effectively avoid and minimize impacts such that the Project will not result in unavoidable adverse impacts to land-based economies.¹⁷²

L. Archaeological and Historic Resources

152. Rose Creek initiated coordination with the SHPO and the Office of the State Archaeologist ("OSA") for the Project in March 2021. A Phase Ia literature search was completed for the Project in August 2021. Based on the results of the literature search, a Phase I archaeological survey and an Architecture-History Effects Analysis were completed in November 2021. The Phase I archaeological survey was completed in Project areas where access had been granted by Project participants. Surveys identified no previously unidentified archaeological resources.¹⁷³
153. Rose Creek initiated coordination with the 11 federally recognized tribes that share geography with the state of Minnesota in 2021. To date, three Tribes (Lower Sioux Indian Community, Upper Sioux Community, and Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community) have expressed interest in receiving further information on the Project. In August 2021, information on the results of the literature search and the plan to conduct a Phase I archaeological survey were provided to these communities. Rose Creek continues to provide regular Project updates to these three interested Tribes.¹⁷⁴
154. Additional surveys for new or previously unsurveyed Project areas were performed in Summer 2022. Reports detailing the results of the archaeological survey were published in July 2022.¹⁷⁵
155. On June 21-22, 2022, Merjent conducted an additional Phase I survey for the Project. The July 2022 report represents a continuation of archaeological investigations completed for the Project in November 2021. Some parcels were not surveyed during the previous effort due to lack of access. The July 2022 report completes the Phase I survey in areas where survey access was granted and includes Project design changes. The 2022 Survey Corridor encompasses 67.0 acres in Township 101 North, Ranges 15 and 16 West, in Mower County, Minnesota.¹⁷⁶
156. A literature search completed in advance of survey identified no previously recorded archaeological sites intersecting the 2022 Survey Corridor. The Phase I survey conducted on June 21-22, 2022 produced the following result: No archaeological sites were

¹⁷¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 44-45 (SP Application).

¹⁷² Ex. RCW-103 at 42-45 (SP Application).

¹⁷³ Ex. RCW-103 at 34 (SP Application).

¹⁷⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 34 (SP Application).

¹⁷⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 35 (SP Application).

¹⁷⁶ Ex. RCW-102 at 5-6 and Schedule C at 2 (Flo Direct).

encountered. Merjent recommends that no further archaeological work is needed, and that no historic properties will be affected by the Project as currently planned.¹⁷⁷

157. Land use in the Survey Corridor consisted of cultivated fields and county and township road ROW. Cultivated fields contained young, recently planted corn and soybeans. Typical road ROW conditions consisted of built-up paved or graveled roadbed, ditches with mixed grasses and weeds, concrete culverts, and utilities. Natural streams crossing the Survey Corridor have been modified into controlled drainages. No archaeological sites were identified during the survey, and no areas were identified for shovel testing. Merjent recommends that no further archaeological work is needed, and that no historic properties will be affected by the Project as currently planned.
158. Section 5.3.16 of the Draft Site Permit addresses archeological and historic resources. If previously unidentified archaeological and historic sites are found during construction, the Applicant would be required to consult with SHPO and the State Archaeologist. Ground disturbing activity will stop, and local law enforcement and the State Archaeologist will be notified should human remains be discovered.¹⁷⁸
159. The record demonstrates that the Project design and mitigative measures described above will effectively avoid and minimize impacts such that the Project will not cause adverse impacts to cultural resources.¹⁷⁹

M. Aviation

160. There are no registered public or private airports within 10 miles (16.09 km) of the Project Boundary.¹⁸⁰
161. The Project area is predominantly agricultural; therefore, crop dusting activities within the Project Boundary may occur.¹⁸¹ The location of the Project will not limit continued agricultural use of the surrounding area including crop dusting. Crop dusting activity usually occurs during daylight hours with good visibility, allowing pilots to have a clear line of site with obstacles. Therefore, Rose Creek expects impacts to crop dusting activities to be minimal.¹⁸²
162. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to minimize and mitigate impacts to aviation.

N. Wildlife

163. The existing Rose Wind Project has been operating since 2004, prior to the issuance of the USFWS voluntary *Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines* (“WEG”), the *Eagle*

¹⁷⁷ Ex. RCW-102 Schedule C at 6 (Flo Direct).

¹⁷⁸ Ex. PUC-6 at Section 5.3.16 (Draft Site Permit).

¹⁷⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 34-35 (SP Application).

¹⁸⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 40 (SP Application).

¹⁸¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 40 (SP Application).

¹⁸² Ex. RCW-103 at 40 (SP Application).

Conservation Plan Guidance: Module 1 – Land-based Wind Energy, Version 2 (“ECPG”), the MNDNR *Guidance for Commercial Wind Energy Projects*, and the MNDNR and Minnesota Department of Commerce-Energy Environmental Review and Analysis (“DOC-EERA”) *Avian and Bat Survey Protocols for Large Wind Energy Conversion*. As a result, formal WEG Tier 1 or Tier 2 site screening and characterization studies and Tier 3 field surveys were not required or completed prior to the construction of the existing Rose Wind Project. In addition, Tier 4 post-construction fatality monitoring (“PCM”) was not required or completed when operation commenced.¹⁸³

164. The siting and development process for the proposed Project followed the tiered process described in the WEG and ECPG, as well as wind energy guidance from the MPUC, MNDNR, and DOC-EERA.¹⁸⁴
165. Wildlife species, including birds, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians, with the potential to occur within or near the Project were determined through Tier 1 and 2 site evaluations, Tier 3 field surveys, and available desktop data sources, including MNDNR Natural Heritage Information System (“NHIS”), and USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (“IPaC”).¹⁸⁵
166. Completed study reports, including the Tier 1 and Tier 2 Report, 2021 Raptor Nest Survey, and Northern Long-eared Bat Habitat Assessment, are provided in the Application as appendices. Avian use and acoustic bat use surveys have also been completed at the Project; and survey reports were provided in 2022.¹⁸⁶
167. The Minnesota Ornithologists’ Union (“MOU”) has recorded 184 species of birds in Mower County over the last 20 years; 48 of these include confirmed breeding records. The LeRoy and Austin USGS Breeding Bird Survey routes (approximately 8 and 17 miles from the Project, respectively) and one National Audubon Society Christmas Bird Count point in Austin, Minnesota (approximately 14 miles from the Project), have collectively recorded 121 unique bird species in the Project Area. Public data from the eBird database indicates that 263 species have been recorded in Mower County, Minnesota.¹⁸⁷
168. Avian and eagle use surveys were conducted between January and December 2021. The objective of the avian use surveys was to characterize spatial use of the Project Area by diurnal birds across seasons, with special attention to eagles, which are federally protected by the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (“BGEPA”), and species designated as state-listed or as Species in Greatest Conservation Need (“SGCN”) in Minnesota.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³ Ex. RCW-103 at 58 (SP Application).

¹⁸⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 58 (SP Application).

¹⁸⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 58 (SP Application).

¹⁸⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 58 (SP Application).

¹⁸⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 59 (SP Application).

¹⁸⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 59 (SP Application).

169. In Summer 2022, Rose Creek provided an Avian Use Survey Report to the MNDNR and USFWS that summarizes the results of avian use surveys conducted from January to December 2021. No federally or state-listed threatened or endangered species were observed during avian use surveys. Six species designated as Minnesota Species in Greatest Conservation Need were documented, including upland sandpiper (one observation; also federally designated as a Bird of Conservation Concern), northern harrier (two observations), American kestrel (five observations), American white pelican (two observations containing 23 and eight individuals; also a state-listed Species of Special Concern), sedge wren (two observations), and dickcissel (22 observations). A total of 28 bald eagle observations totaling 18 eagle exposure minutes were documented during surveys, and two additional observations were documented incidentally. No golden eagles were observed during surveys.¹⁸⁹
170. Tier 3 eagle and raptor nest surveys were conducted during the 2021 breeding season. A hybrid ground-based and aerial survey was conducted to locate bald eagle and other raptor nests within two miles of the original 12,745-acre Project Boundary. The aerial survey was conducted in accordance with the guidance provided in the ECPG, the *Interim Golden Eagle Technical Guidance*, and the *Updated Eagle Nest Survey Protocol*. The ground-based survey was conducted following methods adapted from the ECPG and the *Updated Eagle Nest Survey Protocol*. MNDNR and Minnesota Department of Commerce (“MNDOC”) approved the survey study plan on February 25, 2021, and March 3, 2021, respectively.¹⁹⁰
171. According to the MNDNR, an estimated 78 mammal species have the potential to occur in Minnesota. All eight of the bat species known to occur in Minnesota have the potential to occur within the Project Area. These species include the federally threatened northern long-eared bat (NLEB; *Myotis septentrionalis*), three state-listed species of concern big brown bat (*Eptesicus fuscus*), little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*), and tri-colored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*), and the hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagan*), eastern red bat (*Lasiurus borealis*), and evening bat (*Nycticeius humeralis*). The eastern red bat, silver haired bat, and hoary bat are migratory species; the others overwinter in Minnesota by hibernating in caves and mines during the winter. Big brown, little brown, silver-haired, eastern red, hoary, and tri-colored bats were recently detected during pre-construction acoustic surveys at the Mower County Wind Project north of the Project.¹⁹¹
172. An NLEB habitat assessment was conducted to identify and quantify potentially suitable summer NLEB habitat within 2.5 miles of the original 12,745-acre Project Boundary (the assessment area). This assessment defined potentially suitable NLEB summer habitat as described in the *2020 Range-Wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidelines*.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁹ Ex. RCW-102 at 2-5 and Schedule B at 5 (Flo Direct).

¹⁹⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 60 (SP Application).

¹⁹¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 61 (SP Application).

¹⁹² Ex. RCW-103 at 67 (SP Application).

173. Seasonal bat activity levels at the Project were monitored from April 16, 2021 to October 20, 2021 using two acoustic bat detectors. One detector was positioned between crop fields in an agricultural area similar to the areas where turbines have been sited; this detector was intended to be representative of future turbine placement (representative station). A second detector was located north of the existing Rose Wind turbines in an area containing forest and water sources considered attractive to bats. This detector was intended to gather a more representative sampling of the bat species composition within the Project Area (bat feature station). Detectors were set to record daily from one half-hour prior to sunset until one half-hour after sunrise. The microphones deployed at the two chosen locations were elevated 1.5 m off the ground; due to the lack of meteorological towers at the Project, no raised microphones set at or above the rotor-swept zone were included in the study design. MNDNR and MNDOK approved this survey methodology on February 25, 2021 and March 3, 2021, respectively.¹⁹³
174. Rose Creek provided the 2021 Bat Activity Survey Report to the MNDNR in March 2022 and the USFWS in July 2022. Acoustic surveys were conducted from April 16 – October 20, 2021 at two monitoring stations. One station was located in cropland, which is the dominant land cover type within the Project area and representative of planned turbine locations (representative station), and one station was placed along a creek riparian system, which is considered habitat attractive to bats for foraging and drinking (bat feature station). Activity was higher at the bat feature station (98.35 ± 14.15 bat passes per detector-night) compared to the representative station at RW1g (6.37 ± 0.73 bat passes per detector-night). The bat feature station on average recorded almost 16 times more activity than the representative station. Eight species with the potential to occur within the Project area were identified in the survey data. Hoary bats and silver-haired bats were the primary species recorded, present on 83% and 79% of all calendar nights, respectively, followed by big brown bats on 77% of calendar nights. Other commonly detected species included little brown bat (73%), eastern red bat (53%), evening bat (39%), and tri-colored bat (30%). Little brown bats, tri-colored bats, and big brown bats are state-listed in Minnesota as Species of Special Concern. No federally listed bat species were confirmed at the Project.¹⁹⁴
175. According to the MNDNR, 49 reptile and amphibian species have the potential to occur in Minnesota. Based on heavy agricultural use within the Project Area, reptile and amphibian species are likely limited to those that are common, widespread, and resilient to agricultural and human disturbance.¹⁹⁵
176. Concerning potential impacts of the Project, Rose Creek's ground-disturbing construction activities could potentially reduce, alter, or fragment wildlife habitats, which may affect local wildlife species. However, Rose Creek sited the Project to minimize indirect impacts to wildlife species, including birds and bats, by placing turbines and other Project infrastructure primarily within previously disturbed agricultural areas; avoiding wetlands, waterbodies, and naturally vegetated areas, including forests and potential prairies; and

¹⁹³ Ex. RCW-103 at 61 (SP Application).

¹⁹⁴ Ex. RCW-102 at 2-5 and Schedule A at 2-3 (Flo Direct).

¹⁹⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 62 (SP Application).

using developed road systems to the extent possible. Additionally, post-construction restoration will occur in temporarily disturbed areas, reducing the length of time until affected wildlife habitats are revegetated. BMPs will be implemented during Project construction, operation, and decommissioning to minimize the extent of vegetation removal and indirect impacts to wetlands and waterbodies.¹⁹⁶

177. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to minimize and mitigate impacts to wildlife. Section 7.5.2 of the Draft Site Permit addresses avian and bat protection.

O. Rare and Unique Natural Resources

178. Rose Creek evaluated the potential presence of rare and unique natural features through a desktop review of online databases including the IPaC and the MNDNR NHIS. A one-mile (1.61 km) buffer was applied and reviewed for potential occurrences of rare and unique features.¹⁹⁷
179. Merjent consulted information from the USFWS' IPaC tool to determine the potential presence of federally listed species. Two federally listed species are potentially present in the Project: the NLEB and the prairie bush clover.¹⁹⁸
180. Merjent reviewed the MNDNR and USFWS Townships Containing Documented NLEB Maternity Roost Trees and/or Hibernacula Entrances in Minnesota (dated June 3, 2020). No known roost trees or hibernacula have been recorded in Mower County. Suitable hibernacula such as caves or mines have not been documented within the Project Area. Landcover within the Project Site is primarily row-crop agriculture; however, stands of trees greater than 3 inches (7.62 cm) diameter at breast height could provide suitable roosting or foraging habitat for NLEBs. Tree clearing is not currently proposed for the Project. In addition, and as described above, there are no known roost trees or hibernacula within Mower County.¹⁹⁹
181. Western EcoSystems Technologies, Inc. ("WEST") conducted a habitat assessment for the Project to quantify the amount of potentially suitable NLEB summer habitat located within the Project Site and within a 2.5-mile buffer. Within the assessment area, approximately 2,125 acres of potentially suitable NLEB summer habitat are primarily situated within the riparian areas of the Little Cedar River, Wapsipinicon River, North Branch Upper Iowa River, and their tributaries. However, only 2.0 acres of potentially suitable NLEB summer habitat are located within the current 5,258-acre Project Site; this acreage includes two small riparian patches located east of the Little Cedar River on the western and northwestern edges of the Project Site.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 63 (SP Application).

¹⁹⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 67 (SP Application).

¹⁹⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 68 (SP Application).

¹⁹⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 68 (SP Application).

²⁰⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 69 (SP Application).

182. Landcover within the Project Site is primarily row crop agriculture; however, any areas of native, unplowed prairie could provide suitable habitat for prairie bush clover. Remnants of native prairie habitat have been known to occur along roadsides, railroad rights-of way, and isolated patches of private land throughout Minnesota, and if present could provide habitat for this species. Based on a desktop review and field observations during wetland delineations, no suitable habitat for Prairie bush clover was identified within the wetland survey area.²⁰¹
183. No federally designated critical habitat, for either species, is present within the Project Area.²⁰²
184. Merjent, under MNDNR license agreement LA-958, conducted a query of the MNDNR's NHIS to determine if state-listed and rare species have been documented within 1 mile (1.61 km) of the Project Boundary. Seven State-Protected and Rare Species are potentially present within 1 Mile (1.61 km) of the Project Boundary: Rattlesnake Master, Redfin Shiner, Suckermouth Minnow, Creek Heelsplitter, Wild Quinine, Sullivant's Milkweed, and Edible Valerian. The field survey results showed that creek heelsplitter may be present in the Project area, but the other species were not observed during the field survey.²⁰³
185. Eagles may occur within the Project Area throughout the year. Bald eagles may nest and breed within the general Project Area and are likely to occur year-round. Based on bald eagle data from the USFWS, one documented eagle nest is located within one mile (1.61 km) of the Project Boundary.²⁰⁴
186. A review of the MBS data identified multiple Sites of Biodiversity Significance ("SOBS") within 1 mile (1.61 km) of the proposed Project. A site's biodiversity significance rank is based on a variety of factors, including the quality (i.e., size and condition) of native plant communities ("NPCs") within the site, the presence and numbers of rare species populations, and the site's context within the landscape (i.e., whether the site is isolated in a landscape dominated by cropland or developed land, or whether it is contiguous with or close to other areas with intact NPCs). These sites are ranked by grouping and rated within each of the state's ecological classification system subsections. A rank of outstanding is assigned to those sites which contain the largest, most intact functional landscapes, and the best occurrences of the rarest plant and animal species.²⁰⁵
187. NPC are referred to as native habitats or natural communities and are named for the characteristic plant species within them or for characteristic environmental features. In 1997, the MNDNR surveyed active railroad rights-of-way for native prairie remnants.

²⁰¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 69 (SP Application).

²⁰² Ex. RCW-103 at 69-71 (SP Application).

²⁰³ Ex. RCW-103 at 69 (SP Application).

²⁰⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 71 (SP Application).

²⁰⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 71 (SP Application).

Many native or sensitive plants in Minnesota can be found in native prairie remnants along railroads.²⁰⁶

188. No SOBs are located within the Project Site; therefore, impacts on SOBS are not anticipated. No NPCs are located within the Project Site; therefore, impacts on NPCs are not anticipated. No railroad prairies as identified and designated by the MNDNR are located within 1 mile (1.61 km) of the Project Boundary.²⁰⁷
189. In terms of potential impacts to federally listed species like the NLEB, the collision risk for NLEB at the Project are expected to be comparable to other wind energy facilities in the region.²⁰⁸ Also, while the prairie bush-clover has been documented within the northwest corner of Mower County, due to the predominance of agricultural land and overall lack of suitable habitat within the Project Area, this species is considered unlikely to be present. Furthermore, according to an NHIS data request, there are no documented occurrences of the prairie bush-clover species within the Project Area; therefore, impacts to this species are not anticipated.²⁰⁹
190. The Project Site may contain suitable habitat for some state-listed species; however, the Project Area is largely dominated by agricultural land. Project infrastructure has been sited to avoid disturbing undeveloped habitats to reduce potential impacts to state-listed species. Impacts to the following species are not anticipated: Rattlesnake Master, Redfin Shiner, Suckermouth Minnow, Creek Heelsplitter, Wild Quinine, Sullivant's Milkweed, and Edible Valerian.²¹⁰
191. Rose Creek completed state-protected plant habitat surveys in June 2022. Rose Creek found that State-protected plants (Sullivant's milkweed and edible valerian) are not present within the project design / survey areas.²¹¹
192. Rose Creek will continue to design and construct the Project to reduce potential impacts to rare and unique species and will implement numerous conservation measures during project construction, operation, and decommissioning to further avoid and minimize impacts to rare and unique species. Based on these planned voluntary measures, Rose Creek anticipates that additional Project mitigation measures are not necessary.²¹²
193. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to avoid and minimize impacts to rare and unique natural features. Further, Section 7.1 of the Draft Site Permit contains adequate conditions to monitor and mitigate the Project's potential impacts on rare and unique natural resources.

²⁰⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 71 (SP Application).

²⁰⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 72 (SP Application).

²⁰⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 72 (SP Application).

²⁰⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 72-73 (SP Application).

²¹⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 73-74 (SP Application).

²¹¹ Ex. RCW-102 at 6 (Flo Direct).

²¹² Ex. RCW-103 at 74 (SP Application).

P. Vegetation

194. The majority of land within the Project boundary is agricultural crop with existing turbines. Other land types include developed open space (2.4%) and hay/pasture (0.27%), with all other land cover categories composing less than 1% of the Project Site.²¹³
195. WEST conducted a desktop assessment to identify potentially undisturbed grasslands within the Project Area that may contain native prairie. Additional potentially undisturbed grassland areas were identified and classified as either potential prairies or probable degraded grasslands. Nineteen potentially undisturbed grassland areas are potentially present within the Project Area, including one potential prairie and five probable degraded grasslands within 100 ft of proposed Project infrastructure – specifically, collector lines and access roads.²¹⁴
196. No MNDNR-designated railroad right-of-way prairies or Minnesota Biological Survey (“MBS”) native prairie, MBS NPC, or Sites of SOBS are located within the Project Site. A review of the MBS data identified multiple SOBS and NPCs within 1 mile (1.61 km) of the proposed Project.²¹⁵
197. Vegetation will be removed during construction and installation of Project infrastructure, including turbine pads, access roads/crane paths, and collector lines. Less than one half of one percent of the total Project Site will be permanently converted from its current land use and the majority of Project infrastructure will be located in agricultural lands.²¹⁶
198. Temporary vegetation impacts will occur during construction and will be associated with activities such as access road improvements, trenching of collector lines, the use of laydown areas and construction easements. Proposed laydown areas and construction easements have been routed primarily on agricultural lands.²¹⁷
199. The Project will avoid woodlands, shrublands, potentially undisturbed grasslands (i.e., potential prairies and probable degraded grasslands), and water resources to the extent practicable. In addition, the Project infrastructure will avoid SOBS and state-designated NPCs.²¹⁸
200. Rose Creek completed native prairie surveys in June 2022. Rose Creek found one instance of potential native prairie within the project boundaries, on the west side of 660th Ave., south of 120th St., on June 12, 2022. This prairie community is located within a highly disturbed site, at the bottom of an excavated roadside ditch. The site receives runoff from the adjacent crop land and gravel road, and groundwater seepage was observed at the base of the ditch slopes. A narrow, ephemeral waterway is present at the

²¹³ Ex. RCW-103 at 56 (SP Application).

²¹⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 56 (SP Application).

²¹⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 57 (SP Application).

²¹⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 57 (SP Application).

²¹⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 57 (SP Application).

²¹⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 57 (SP Application).

bottom of the ditch, which flows into a perennial waterway that bisects the ditch. Since the construction of this ditch, the bottom and lower slopes have been colonized by a combination of native wet prairie species, native wetland generalist species, and exotic species. The native species present were common in the surrounding prairie-dominated landscape prior to conversion to agriculture. The vegetation is dominated by native plant species with exotic species also abundant but comprising less than 50% total cover. The dominant species in descending order are prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), hairy-fruited sedge (*Carex trichocarpa*), reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), wild parsnip (*Pastinaca sativa*), big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*), common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*), marsh hedge nettle (*Stachys palustris*), swamp milkweed (*Asclepias incarnata*), giant goldenrod (*Solidago gigantea*), Jerusalem artichoke (*Helianthus tuberosus*), and white meadowsweet (*Spiraea alba*).²¹⁹ The Applicant provided a figure depicting where the native prairie community was observed.²²⁰

201. Rose Creek has and will continue to design and construct the Project to minimize impacts to natural communities to the extent practicable. Should minor, unavoidable temporary impacts occur to degraded grasslands, adjacent wetlands and/or shrubland as a result of construction, Rose Creek is committed to restoring and seeding these areas to previous conditions, as appropriate for the region and landowner agreement.²²¹
202. Section 4.7 of the Draft Site Permit addresses the issue of native prairie.²²² Rose Creek will coordinate with the MNDNR and MDOC on preparation of a Native Prairie Protection Plan, which will document the avoidance, minimization or mitigation measures that Rose Creek will implement to reduce adverse effects to potential native prairies during Project construction, restoration, and operation. Land cover mapping within the Project Site indicates that nearly all Project development will occur in agricultural fields. Mitigation measures will include restoring non-agricultural vegetation areas to pre-construction conditions using a seed mix consistent with state requirements.²²³
203. Land cover mapping within the Project Site indicates that nearly all Project development will occur in agricultural fields. Mitigation measures will include restoring non-agricultural vegetation areas to pre-construction conditions using a native seed mix consistent with state requirements.²²⁴
204. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to avoid and minimize impacts to vegetation. Further, the Draft Site Permit contains adequate conditions to monitor and mitigate the Project's potential impacts on vegetation.

Q. Soils, Geologic, and Groundwater Resources

²¹⁹ Ex. RCW-102 at 6-7 (Flo Direct).

²²⁰ Ex. RCW-102 Schedule D (Flo Direct).

²²¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 57 (SP Application).

²²² Ex. PUC-6 at Section 4.7 (Draft Site Permit).

²²³ Ex. RCW-103 at 57 (SP Application).

²²⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 57 (SP Application).

205. Overall, the Project Site is comprised of 38 soil types. Soils within the Project Site range from poorly drained to somewhat well drained. Three soil types account for over half of the soils (68%) within the Project Site and are generally composed of silt loams to clay loams with 0-3% slopes. Twelve of the soil types within the Project Site are classified as hydric.²²⁵
206. Construction and operation of the Project will result in short and long-term impacts to soils within the Project Site. Short-term impacts will result from the clearing of vegetation, generation of dust, and the excavation, stockpiling, and redistribution of soils. During construction, there is also the potential for localized soil erosion and sedimentation. Long-term impacts will include soil compaction in areas of permanent disturbance. Soils that are the most prone to compaction are soils with high moisture content or medium to fine textures. Soils within the Project Site may be prone to compaction from heavy construction equipment, especially when wet.²²⁶
207. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”) will be developed prior to initiating earth-disturbing activities. Impacts, including sedimentation and erosion, will be minimized by developing and implementing BMPs in accordance with the SWPPP. BMPs may include mulching, hydroseeding, erosion control blankets, silt fence installation, jute matting, or revegetation. Water and chemical application may be used to suppress dust.²²⁷
208. Following the completion of construction, impacted soils that will not continue to be used for operation of the Project will be decompacted and restored to preconstruction conditions in accordance with landowner agreements. Additional impacts are not anticipated; therefore, no additional mitigation is necessary.²²⁸
209. Construction of the turbine foundations will require minor impacts to glacial drift. Geotechnical testing will occur at turbine locations prior to construction to determine soil stability and depth to bedrock. The Project will not cause adverse impacts to geologic resources.²²⁹
210. According to the Minnesota Well Index online database, there are wells interspersed throughout the Project area. Major impacts to groundwater resources and wells are not expected from Project-related activities due to turbine setbacks from water wells and the minimal water-related needs of the Project. Water used for dust abatement and other construction needs would either come from a local well or may be trucked in from a suitable local source and stored at the laydown yard. The source of water will be determined closer to construction.²³⁰

²²⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 48 (SP Application).

²²⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 50 (SP Application).

²²⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 50 (SP Application).

²²⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 50 (SP Application).

²²⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 51 (SP Application).

²³⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 51 (SP Application).

211. Construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to impact geologic or groundwater resources; therefore, mitigation is not anticipated. The Applicant will obtain necessary water use and dewatering permits from the MNDNR, prior to construction.²³¹
212. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to avoid and minimize impacts to soils, geologic, and groundwater resources. Further, Sections 5.3.5, 5.3.6, and 5.3.7 of the Draft Site Permit contain adequate conditions to monitor and mitigate the Project's potential impacts on soil.

R. Surface Water and Wetlands

213. The Project area is located within two U.S. Geological Survey ("USGS") Hydrologic Unit Code 8 watersheds: Upper Cedar River (07080201) and Upper Wapsipinicon (07080102), which are both part of the larger Upper Mississippi River System.²³²
214. The topography across the Project Area is generally flat to gently rolling. The landform and hydrology of large portions of the Project Area have been modified to improve drainage and facilitate agricultural crop production. Because agricultural practices alter surface water flow patterns, any potential waterways will be field-verified to confirm their presence and jurisdictional potential.²³³
215. According to the DNR PWI dataset, there is a tributary to Little Cedar River located in the north central portion of the Project. Based on Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") floodplain maps, no FEMA-designated floodplains are present within the Project Site. There are no recorded waterbodies within the Project Site listed as impaired by the MPCA, per the 2018 Impaired Waters List. No wildlife management lakes are present within the Project Site. No other special waters are located within the Project Site, including sensitive lakeshores; trout streams; outstanding resource value waters; State Wild, Scenic or Recreation Rivers; or Migratory Waterfowl Feeding and Resting Areas. There are no NRI-listed rivers within the Project Area. The closest Nationwide Rivers Inventory ("NRI") segment listed is the Shell Rock River, approximately 25 miles (40.23 km) west of the Project.²³⁴
216. Rose Creek completed wetland and waterbody surveys in 2021 and 2022 within the areas of proposed infrastructure. Within the survey corridor, 11 wetlands and four waterbodies were identified. The initial report was filed in January 2022 and an updated wetland and waterbody survey report will be provided when complete.²³⁵
217. The Project was designed to avoid or minimize impacts to surface waters. Permanent impacts to surface waters may occur from the installation of permanent culverts

²³¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 51 (SP Application).

²³² Ex. RCW-103 at 51 (SP Application).

²³³ Ex. RCW-103 at 52 (SP Application).

²³⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 52-53 (SP Application).

²³⁵ Ex. RCW-102 at 6 (Flo Direct).

associated with roadway access to turbine locations, without impeding natural hydrology of the landscape.²³⁶

218. Temporary impacts to surface waters may result from the installation and removal of temporary waterway crossings placed below the ordinary high-water mark to allow for vehicle and equipment access throughout the Project. Temporary impacts to surface waters may also occur when collector lines are installed beneath waterbodies. During this installation, temporary dewatering may be required to ensure the line is safely installed.²³⁷
219. Where necessary, the collector lines will be installed under waterways using the directional bore method, which is not anticipated to permanently or directly impact waterways. There is also limited potential for groundwater dewatering associated with the placement of the concrete collar around the base of turbine foundations. Permanent dewatering will not occur. Rose Creek will work with the MNDNR and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“USACE”) to obtain all necessary licenses, permits, or approvals prior to conducting waterway crossings or any work within waterways.²³⁸
220. While significant dewatering is not anticipated, it may be necessary in conjunction with deeper excavations, foundation installation, or collector line installation under waterways, based on site conditions. Sediment basins and filtration systems can help filter the dewatered water before it is discharged to a surface water within uplands. Dewatering will be conducted in a manner such that the velocity of the discharged water will not cause scouring of the receiving area. If the receiving area is a structural BMP (i.e., basin or sump), the design of the BMP will be based on the anticipated flow from the dewatered area.²³⁹
221. Should dewatering occur, measures to address dewatering may include the following to ensure sediment laden water will not be directly discharged to surface waters: Constructing a temporary sediment trap for pretreatment of water discharge; Use of a portable sediment containment system such as dumpsters; Application of natural based flocculent technology such as chitosan in sediment traps or a series of ditch checks to contain sediment; Discharge water through a series of fiber logs or a rock weeper into a large, vegetated buffer area; Provide energy dissipation and erosion control BMPs at all discharge points; and Utilize a dewatering bag to ensure discharged water does not contribute sedimentation to receiving waters.²⁴⁰
222. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”)/State Disposal System (“SDS”) permit will be obtained prior to construction. The MPCA, which administers the NPDES/SDS, requires a SWPPP be designed for construction activities to prevent sedimentation and erosion through the implementation of BMPs. The type of BMP

²³⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 53 (SP Application).

²³⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 53 (SP Application).

²³⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 53 (SP Application).

²³⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 53 (SP Application).

²⁴⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 53-54 (SP Application).

implemented will vary depending upon site conditions such as slope gradients and the susceptibility of soil to wind and water erosion. No surface water mitigation is anticipated at this time.²⁴¹

- 223. Rose Creek has and will continue to design and construct the Project to minimize impacts to waterbodies to the extent practicable. Should minor, unavoidable temporary impacts occur as a result of construction, Rose Creek is committed to returning these areas to pre-construction conditions. All necessary permits will be secured prior to construction.²⁴²
- 224. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to avoid and minimize impacts to surface waters and wetlands. Further, the Draft Site Permit contains conditions that adequately address potential impacts.

S. Air and Water Emissions

- 225. Temporary short-term air quality impacts may occur during the construction phase of the Project as a result of vehicle exhaust from the construction equipment and from vehicles traveling to and from facility locations as well as fugitive dust emissions due to travel on unpaved roads.²⁴³
- 226. During construction, water may be applied to gravel roadways near residences for dust control to abate dust and prevent nuisance conditions. In high traffic areas, it may be determined that the application of chemical dust suppressants, such as calcium chloride, is warranted.²⁴⁴
- 227. A SWPPP will be developed prior to initiating earth-disturbing activities. Impacts, including sedimentation and erosion, will be minimized by developing and implementing BMPs in accordance with the SWPPP.²⁴⁵
- 228. Following construction, as applicable, public roadway maintenance and repairs will be performed associated with Project activities. BMPs will be implemented to ensure public roadways are kept clear of debris and do not pose hazardous conditions to the public.

T. Solid and Hazardous Wastes

- 229. During construction and operation of the Project, hazardous wastes will be properly stored and contained. Where necessary, hazardous materials will be stored in a secondary containment structure. Secondary containment will ensure that if leaks occur, they will be contained.²⁴⁶ Hazardous materials used and stored during Project construction may include fuel, lubricating oil, hydraulic oil, propylene glycol, and other materials commonly required for construction vehicles and equipment. During operation, a third-

²⁴¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 54 (SP Application).

²⁴² Ex. RCW-103 at 54 (SP Application).

²⁴³ Ex. RCW-103 at 87 (SP Application).

²⁴⁴ Ex. RCW-103 at 50 (SP Application).

²⁴⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 87 (SP Application).

²⁴⁶ Ex. RCW-103 at 41 (SP Application).

party vendor may maintain the turbines and may require the use and on-site storage of hazardous materials including hydraulic oil, lube oil, grease, and cleaning solvents. During operation, the Project will also require pad-mounted and grounding transformers, which commonly contain liquids for insulation, typically consisting of mineral oil.²⁴⁷

230. Prior to construction, Rose Creek will conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment to identify and avoid existing recognized environmental conditions within the Project boundary.²⁴⁸ Rose Creek will use information obtained from this assessment to avoid recognized environmental conditions (“RECs”) and, if RECs cannot be avoided, they will be investigated to verify the presence or absence of contamination. In the unlikely event contamination is identified at concentrations above established criteria, remediation activities may be required. Rose Creek and its contractors will handle and dispose of any wastes generated during any phase of the Project in accordance with Minn. R. Chapter 7045, local rules and regulations. In addition, should more than 1,320 gallons of oil be stored at the site than a site-specific Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan (“SPCC Plan”) will be developed for the construction and operation phases of the Project, as applicable. The SPCC Plan will detail the appropriate storage, cleanup, disposal, and transportation of hazardous wastes to ensure potential impacts are minimized.²⁴⁹
231. The record demonstrates that Rose Creek has taken steps to avoid and minimize potential impacts such that the Project is not expected to result in adverse environmental impacts due to hazardous materials.²⁵⁰ Further, Section 5.3.24 of the Draft Site Permit contains adequate conditions to monitor and mitigate the Project’s potential impacts from solid and hazardous wastes.

U. Future Development and Expansion

232. The Project is located in a rural, agricultural region in southeastern Minnesota.²⁵¹ There are 11 existing wind turbines within the Project Site, 15 turbines within 1,000 ft of the Project Boundary, and 21 turbines within 0.5 mile of the Project Boundary.²⁵² The existing 11-turbine Rose Wind Project represents less than 3% of the turbines within a 10-mi-radius of the Project Boundary.²⁵³
233. Section 4.1 of the Draft Site Permit imposes a wind access buffer and provides for setbacks from properties where Rose Creek does not hold wind rights, unless a waiver is approved by the Commission.²⁵⁴

²⁴⁷ Ex. RCW-103 at 41 (SP Application).

²⁴⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 41 (SP Application).

²⁴⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 42 (SP Application).

²⁵⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 41-42 (SP Application).

²⁵¹ Ex. RCW-103 at 14 (SP Application).

²⁵² Ex. RCW-103 at 20 (SP Application).

²⁵³ Ex. RCW-103 at 65 (SP Application).

²⁵⁴ Ex. PUC-6 at Section 4.1 (Draft Site Permit).

234. As of the date that the application was e-filed with the MPUC, Rose Creek had land lease agreements or good neighbor agreements in place for all the private land required for construction and operation of the Project, with the exception of four parcels needing a good neighbor agreement for a wind access buffer setback.²⁵⁵ Since then, Rose Creek has worked with landowners to secure one additional good neighbor agreement and the agreement for the laydown yard site. The Applicant provided updated Application Figures 4a and 4b reflecting these additional land rights.²⁵⁶
235. Rose Creek is continuing to negotiate one collection line agreement and expects to secure that easement prior to the start of construction.²⁵⁷
236. Rose Creek continues to be open to negotiating agreements needed to construct turbine Alternative T1, but if these negotiations are unsuccessful, Rose Creek would not build Alternative T1 and would instead construct only the six primary turbines reflected in the Application.²⁵⁸
237. There is no evidence that the Project is inconsistent with any future development or expansion plans.

V. Decommissioning, Turbine Abandonment, and Restoration

238. Rose Creek has requested that the expiration date for the permit be 30 years following the date of Site Permit issuance.²⁵⁹
239. Rose Creek developed a Decommissioning Plan to decommission the Project at the end of its 30-year operating life.²⁶⁰ The Draft Site Permit contains appropriate conditions to ensure proper decommissioning and restoration of the Project site.²⁶¹ Pursuant to Section 11.1 of the Draft Site Permit, Rose Creek will file an updated decommissioning plan in accordance with the requirements of Minnesota Rule 7854.0500, subp. 13 with the Commission 14 days before the pre-construction meeting. At the end of commercial operation, the Project owners will be responsible for removing wind facilities and removing the turbine foundations to a depth of four feet below grade.²⁶²
240. The decommissioning of the existing Rose Wind will be conducted pursuant to conditional use permits issued by Mower County.²⁶³
241. DOC-EERA recommended that the Site Permit contain a condition that requires Rose Wind to follow the requirements of the permits issued by Mower County and any

²⁵⁵ Ex. RCW-103 at 7 (SP Application).

²⁵⁶ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 Schedule A (Andi Direct).

²⁵⁷ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 4 (Andi Direct).

²⁵⁸ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 4 (Andi Direct).

²⁵⁹ Ex. RCW-103 at 91 (SP Application).

²⁶⁰ Ex. RCW-103 at 91 (SP Application).

²⁶¹ Ex. PUC-6 at Section 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 (Draft Site Permit).

²⁶² Ex. PUC-6 at Section 11.2 (Draft Site Permit).

²⁶³ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 8 (Andi Direct).

requirements deemed necessary by Mower County Staff. Additionally, DOC-EERA recommended that decommissioning of the Rose Wind facility be completed prior to the beginning of construction of Rose Creek Wind.²⁶⁴

242. Rose Creek responded to the proposed condition and noted that it is critical to the overall economics of the Project that the period of time in which no renewable energy is being produced is as short as possible. Rose Wind and Rose Creek both use the same interconnection facilities, so it is physically impossible for both projects to operate simultaneously. However, it is likely that the decommissioning activities and construction activities will overlap to minimize downtime, efficiently utilized labor and equipment at the site, and ensure that Rose Creek can begin producing renewable energy as soon as practicable.²⁶⁵ Accordingly, Rose Creek opposed the proposed decommissioning timing restrictions proposed by DOC-EERA.
243. Rose Creek proposed the following revisions to Special Condition 6.1 of the Draft Site Permit relating to the decommissioning of the existing Rose Wind facility that allows decommissioning of Rose Wind and construction of Rose Creek to proceed simultaneously:

6.1 Decommissioning of the Existing Rose Wind Facility

The existing Rose Wind facility must be decommissioned and removed in accordance with all requirements set forth in the permits issued by Mower County and per any requirements deemed necessary by Mower County staff. ~~Decommissioning of the existing Rose Wind facility must be completed prior to beginning construction of the Rose Creek Wind facility authorized by this permit.~~

244. On August 15, 2022, DOC-EERA filed post-hearing comments agreeing that concurrent decommissioning and construction will reduce the facility's generation down time, improve labor and construction equipment efficiencies, and help to minimize impacts caused by construction equipment mobilization and movement throughout the site. DOC-EERA therefore agreed with Rose Creek's proposal to delete the second sentence in Draft Site Permit Special Condition 6.1.²⁶⁶
245. The record demonstrates that it is reasonable to amend Section 6.1 of the Draft Site Permit as proposed by Rose Creek to remove the timing restriction related to decommissioning.

XII. SITE PERMIT CONDITIONS

246. The Draft Site Permit includes a number of proposed permit conditions, many of which have been discussed above. The conditions apply to site preparation, construction,

²⁶⁴ Ex. EERA-9 (DOC-EERA Comments)

²⁶⁵ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 9 (Andi Direct).

²⁶⁶ EERA Hearing comments (August 15, 2022) (eDocket No. [20228-188365-01](#)).

cleanup, restoration, operation, maintenance, abandonment, decommissioning, and other aspects of the Project.

247. Many of the conditions contained in the Draft Site Permit were established as part of the site permit proceedings of other wind projects permitted by the Commission. Comments received by the Commission have been considered in development of the Draft Site Permit for this Project.
248. Rose Creek proposed several minor corrections to Section 2.1 of the Draft Site Permit.²⁶⁷ It is reasonable to include these corrections in the Site Permit for the Project.
249. As discussed above, the FAA requires obstruction lighting or marking of structures over 200 ft (60.96 m) above ground level because they have the potential to obstruct air navigation.²⁶⁸ Additionally, under Minn. Stat. § 216F.084, subd. 3, an LWECS must be equipped with a light-mitigating technology that meets the requirements established in Chapter 14 of the Federal Aviation Administration's Advisory Circular 70/760-1. Minn. Stat. § 216F.084, subd. 4(b)(2) provides that the Commission may grant exemption to the requirement for a light-mitigating system if the owner of the LWECS can demonstrate that equipping an LWECS with a light-mitigating technology imposes a significant financial burden on the permittee.
250. Rose Creek seeks an exemption under Minn. Stat. § 216F.084, subd. 4(b)(2) from the requirement to install light-mitigating technology, commonly referred to as ADLS.
251. In support of an exemption, Rose Creek stated that the Project is small, with only 6 or 7 turbines proposed, whereas the existing Rose Wind project, which includes 11 existing wind turbines, does not use ADLS lighting. Based on the vendor estimates for equipment and operational costs, the cost of the ADLS would be approximately 3-4% percent of the total development costs of the Project and would likely require an increase in the price of purchased power from the Project.²⁶⁹
252. Concerning visual impacts, the inclusion of ADLS would have limited effect on the visual impacts of the Project. The current 11 Rose Wind turbines, which do not have ADLS installed, will be replaced by the up to 7 Rose Creek wind turbines, reducing the number of operating FAA lights in the area. Additionally, there are still hundreds of FAA lights visible from this site due to existing surrounding wind farms. The Applicant provided photographs of the night sky from several locations within the Rose Creek Project Area.²⁷⁰ As shown in these photographs, eliminating FAA lights on up to seven turbines will have limited impact on the night sky.²⁷¹

²⁶⁷ Exs. RCW- 100 and RCW-101 at 6 (Andi Direct).

²⁶⁸ Ex. RCW-103 at 26 (SP Application).

²⁶⁹ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 7 (Andi Direct).

²⁷⁰ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 Schedule B (Andi Direct).

²⁷¹ Exs. RCW-100 and RCW-101 at 8 (Andi Direct).

253. Rose Creek has provided sufficient information for the Commission to grant an exemption under Minn. Stat. § 216F.084, subd. 4(b)(2). Accordingly, the Administrative Law Judge recommends the following revisions to Section 5.3.28 of the Draft Site Permit relating to Federal Aviation Administration Lighting:

5.3.8 Federal Aviation Administration Lighting

Towers shall be marked as required by the FAA. There shall be no lights on the towers other than what is required by the FAA. This restriction shall not apply to infrared heating devices used to protect the wind monitoring equipment. ~~The Permittee shall install and employ an FAA-approved lighting mitigation system, such as an ADLS, light intensity dimming solution (“LIDS”), or other FAA-approved mitigation method. The Permittee shall describe the lighting mitigation system used for the project in its site plan.~~

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and the record in this proceeding, the Commission makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Any of the forgoing Findings of Fact more properly designated as Conclusions of Law are hereby adopted as such.
2. The Commission and the Administrative Law Judge have jurisdiction over the Site Permit applied for by Rose Creek for the up to 17.4 MW proposed project pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 216F.04.
3. Rose Creek has substantially complied with the procedural requirements of Minn. Stat. Chapter 216F, Minn. Stat. § 216E.03, and Minn. R. Chapter 7854.
4. The Commission has complied with the procedural requirements of Minn. Stat. Chapter 216F and Minn. R. Chapter 7854.
5. Public hearings were conducted on July 27, 2022 (in person) and July 28, 2022 (remote access). Proper notice of the public hearings was provided, and the public was given an opportunity to speak at the hearings and to submit written comments.
6. The Commission has the authority under Minn. Stat. § 216F.04 to place conditions in a LWECS site permit.
7. The Draft Site Permit contains a number of important mitigation measures and other reasonable conditions that adequately address the potential impacts of the Project on the human and natural environments.
8. It is reasonable to issue a Draft Site Permit including changes to Sections 2.1, 5.3.8 and 6.1 of the Draft Site Permit as suggested by Rose Creek.

9. The Project complies with the criteria set forth in Minn. Stat. Chapter 216F and Minn. Stat. § 216E.03, subd. 7 and Minn. R. Chapter 7854 and all other applicable legal requirements.
10. The Project, with the Draft Site Permit conditions revised as set forth above, satisfies the criteria for a LWECS in Minn. Stat. § 216F.03 and meets all other applicable legal requirements.
11. The Project, with the applicable permit conditions, does not present a potential for significant adverse environmental effects pursuant to the Minnesota Environmental Rights Act, Minn. Stat. Chapter 116B and/or the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act, Minn. Stat. Chapter 116D.
12. Any of the foregoing Conclusions of Law which are more properly designated Findings of Fact are hereby adopted as such.

Based upon these Conclusions, the ALJ makes the following:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon these Conclusions, the ALJ recommends that the Commission issue a LWECS Site Permit to Rose Creek Wind, LLC, to decommission, construct and operate the Project and associated facilities in Mower County, and that the permit include the permit conditions amended as set forth in the Conclusions above.

THIS REPORT IS NOT AN ORDER AND NO AUTHORITY IS GRANTED HEREIN. THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION WILL ISSUE THE ORDER THAT MAY ADOPT OR DIFFER FROM THE PRECEDING RECOMMENDATION.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

**In the Matter of the Application of Rose
Creek Wind, LLC for a LWECS Site
Permit for the up to 17.4 MW Rose Creek
Wind Project in Mower County, Minnesota**

**OAH Docket 23-2500-38341
MPUC Docket IP-7065/WS-21-643**

I, Malinda Maier, hereby certify that on the August 29, 2022, I have efiled, on behalf of Rose Creek Wind, LLC, a true and correct copy of the following documents with the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission:

1. Cover Letter;
2. Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendations; and
3. Certificate of Service.

A copy has also been served in accordance with the service list of record in this docket.

Executed on: August 29, 2022

Signed: /s/ Malinda M. Maier
Fredrikson & Byron, P.A.
200 South Sixth Street
Suite 4000
Minneapolis, MN 55402

[illegible]

First Name	Last Name	Email	Company Name	Address	Delivery Method	View Trade Secret	Service List Name
Nathaniel	Runke	nrunke@local49.org		611 28th St. NW Rochester, MN 55901	Electronic Service	No	OFF_SL_21-643_Official CC Service List
Will	Seuffert	Will.Seuffert@state.mn.us	Public Utilities Commission	121 7th Pl E Ste 350 Saint Paul, MN 55101	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_21-643_Official CC Service List
Janet	Shaddix Elling	jshaddix@janetshaddix.com	Shaddix And Associates	7400 Lyndale Ave S Ste 190 Richfield, MN 55423	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_21-643_Official CC Service List
Suzanne	Todnem	suzanne.todnem@state.mn.us	Office of Administrative Hearings	600 Robert St N PO Box 64620 St. Paul, Minnesota 55164	Electronic Service	Yes	OFF_SL_21-643_Official CC Service List